Associated British Foods

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP

.

04/16/2025, 12:56 pm

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ GBP

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Associated British Foods (ABF) is a diversified international food, ingredients and retail Group with revenues of 19.8bn, 133,000 employees and operations in 55 countries across Europe, Africa, the Americas, Asia and Australia. Our purpose is to provide safe, nutritious, affordable food and clothing that is great value for money. We have a devolved operating model across our five business segments of Grocery, Ingredients, Agriculture, Sugar and Retail and believe the best way to create enduring value involves setting objectives from the bottom up rather than the top down. To bring a consistent approach to a diversified Group, we have an internal operating rule book containing internal operating procedures, which apply to all subsidiaries, joint ventures and associates of ABF. These internal operating procedures state that all businesses are required to operate in an ethical manner in terms of their stewardship of the environment, their employees, suppliers and workers in the supply chain and the communities in which they operate. Grocery comprises brands which occupy leading positions in markets across the globe. In the UK, nine out of 10 households use our brands. Twinings has been blending tea since 1706 and sells premium teas and infusions in over 100 countries. Ovaltine malted beverages and snacks are consumed across the globe. Patak's is the spice blending expert recognised for authentic Indian food that is quick to prepare. Jordans uses traditional methods to produce delicious wholegrain cereals. Blue Dragon offers authentic ingredients to create delicious dishes from China, Thailand, Japan and Vietnam. Mazzetti is our leading Balsamic Vinegar of Modena. ACH makes and market leading cooking and baking products. These include Mazola and Capullo cooking oils, Fleischmann's yeast, Karo corn syrup and Argo corn starch. Anthony's Goods is a leading brand of organic and natural ingredients and superfoods. Kingsmill produces bakery products for the whole family. Dorset Cereal's award-winning muesli and granolas are renowned for quality ingredients. Ryvita is UK category leader in crispbreads. We also supply the Indian, Chinese and Thai foodservice with Lucky Boat noodles, Rajah spices, and Elephant atta flour.

George Weston Foods is one of Australia and New Zealand's largest food manufacturers. Tip Top is one of the most recognised bakery brands in Australia while Don manufactures bacon, ham and meat products. Yumi's produces hommus, vegetable dips and snacks and is the leader in the Australian market. Our Grocery segment comprises: UK Grocery, Twinings Ovaltine, George Weston Foods and ACH. Ingredients - Our Ingredients businesses are leaders in yeast and bakery ingredients as well as in specialty ingredients for the food, human and animal nutrition, pharmaceutical and various other industries. Our Ingredients segment comprises of, ABF Ingredients (ABFI) and AB Mauri. ABFI is a global leader in specialty ingredients offering innovative, differentiated, sustainable and value-added products to the food, health and nutrition, pharmaceutical, animal health and industrial sectors. AB Mauri has a global presence in bakers' yeast with significant market positions in the Americas, Europe and Asia. Agriculture - AB Agri is an international agri-food business and a leader in the UK supplying farm performance services, animal feed, speciality ingredients and supplements to farms, feed manufacturers, food producers and retailers. AB Agri employs more than 3,000 people around the world, it sells products and services into more than 100 countries and its global operations continue to grow. AB Agri has an expert understanding of agriculture and animal nutrition, it combines data and technology with industry expertise to enable the production of nutritious and affordable food. Sugar - ABF Sugar produces a range of food, feeds, fuels and other products from sugar cane, sugar beet and wheat in Africa, the UK, Spain and China. ABF Sugar is a group of agribusinesses which together employ 30,000 people and operate 20 plants in nine countries, with the capacity to produce some 4.5 million tonnes of sugar annually. It farms more than 330,000 hectares worldwide, and works with over 25,000 growers. In Africa, it has sugar cane operations in Eswatini, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania and Zambia, and packing operations in Rwanda. It is the largest sugar producer in Spain and in the UK it is the sole processor of the beet sugar crop and one of the largest bioethanol producers. ABF Sugar also has a sugar business in China. Retail - Primark is one of the largest clothing retailers in Europe, with the highest sales by volume in the UK and a growing presence in the US. ABF reports on data from countries where we have direct manufacturing, processing, retail operations and offices.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

07/31/2023

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ 3 years

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

Select from:

☑ 3 years

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

Select from:

☑ 3 years

[Fixed row]

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

19800000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

0006731235

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada

☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Zambia
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Uruguay
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Argentina
☑ New Zealand
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ France
☑ Malawi
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Ecuador
☑ Colombia
☑ Eswatini
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Singapore
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Mozambique
☑ Netherlands
☑ United States of America
☑ United Republic of Tanzania
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?

(1.8.1) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?

Select from:
☑ No, this is confidential data

(1.8.2) Comment

We have the data and will share with customers on a case by case basis as part of our commercial engagements. Given the number of our operating sites, it is not viable to provide all the geolocation data within CDP.
[Fixed row]

(1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure?

Production

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Value chain (including own land)

Processing/ Manufacturing

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Distribution

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

101426

(1.22.8) Did you convert the total commodity volume from another unit to metric tons?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Paper

☑ Primary packaging

☑ Secondary packaging

☑ Tertiary packaging

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ 1-5%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

We use timber products in our primary, secondary and distribution packaging in the form of paper and carton board

Palm oil

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

41102

(1.22.8) Did you convert the total commodity volume from another unit to metric tons?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm kernel oil derivatives

☑ Palm oil derivatives

☑ Refined palm oil

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

Our consumption of palm oil, palm kernel oil, palm related derivatives and products containing palm inputs are consumed around our five strategic business sectors

Cattle products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Beef

☑ By-products (e.g. glycerin, gelatin)

☑ Hides/ leather

☑ Tallow

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Small volume

☑ Small procurement spend

☑ Small revenue

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

Leather represents less than 1% of materials used for Primark products. Since joining the Leather Working Group in 2016, Primark has been working with suppliers to improve transparency and reduce the environmental impact of leather production. Under its Animal Welfare Policy, Primark has publicly committed to only source leather from domesticated animals that are a by-product of the meat industry.

Soy

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

(1.22.3) Indicate if you have direct soy and/or embedded soy in your value chain

Select from:

☑ Mixture of embedded soy and direct soy

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is confidential

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soybean meal

☑ Soybean oil

☑ Soy derivatives

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ 1-5%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

We consume soy beans, soy meal, soy bean oil and other soy based derivatives across our grocery, ingredients and agriculture businesses

Cocoa

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Cocoa

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Small volume

☑ Small procurement spend

☑ Small revenue

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

Not a major consumer of this commodity, but where relevant, individual businesses have responsible sourcing approaches in place.

Coffee

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Coffee

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Small volume

☑ Small procurement spend

☑ Small revenue

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

Not a major consumer of this commodity, but where relevant, individual businesses have responsible sourcing approaches in place.
[Fixed row]

(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 21-30%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

In the reporting year, Primark's revenue represented 45% of the Group's revenue. From pyjamas to t-shirts, baby grows, jeans, towels and bedding, cotton is the most important fibre relied upon by Primark to make its products. Primark want to make more sustainable fashion affordable for everyone. Primark are committed to

ensuring that by 2030 all clothes will be made from recycled or more sustainably sourced materials, carbon emissions halved across the entire value chain and pursuing a living wage for workers in the supply chain. Some 55% of Primark's clothes today are already made from either recycled or more sustainably sourced materials. Started in 2013, the business has expanded their Sustainable Cotton Programme and have trained 299,388 farmers by July 2023, exceeding the prior target of 275,000 farmers for the same year, in the largest programme of its kind managed by a fashion retailer.

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our businesses use these commodities, but it is not considered to be significant.

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our businesses use this commodity, but it is not considered to be significant.

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our businesses use this commodity, but it is not considered to be significant.

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our businesses use this commodity, but it is not considered to be significant.

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our brands use this commodity, for example our brand Dorset Cereals.

Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:
☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our brands use this commodity, for example our brand Dorset Cereal.

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:
☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our businesses use this commodity.

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:
☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our businesses use this commodity, but it is not considered to be significant.

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Westmill is a UK Grocery business and a leading supplier of food products, including rice to the Indian, Chinese and Thai foodservice sectors

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Produced and sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

ABF Sugar produces sugar, and a range of food feeds fuels and other products from sugar cane sugar beet in Africa the UK Spain and China

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

Our tea brand Twinings has been blending tea since 1706 and sells premium teas and infusions in over 100 countries

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:
☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Some of our businesses use this commodity, but it is not considered to be significant.

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

We have a number of brands using wheat, examples include in the UK the Kingsmill produces bakery products for the whole family and Ryvita is UK category leader in crispbreads. In Australia we own the Tip Top brands that produces bakery products.

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders relevant but not included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Answer to this question refers to Primark and Twinings only. Primark publishes its global sourcing map which shows information about the factories that manufacture products for Primark. This shows suppliers' production sites, which produce 95% of Primark products for sale in our stores. Details include factory names, addresses, the number of workers and gender split of the workforce. The map is reviewed and updated once a year. https://globalsourcingmap.primark.com/. Regarding the highest supplier tier known but not mapped, we refer to tier 4 suppliers in the context of some cotton, Primark is aware of the communities and farmers involved in cotton production through Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme. Twinings' website includes a sourcing map that details where its tea and key herbs are sourced. It includes the details of the majority of tea gardens Twinings buys from as well as the origins of its key herbs. https://www.sourcedwithcare.com/en/our-approach/sourcing-map/
[Fixed row]

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.5) Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**This information is not mapped at a Group level

(1.24.1.6) Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain

We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships. Our business may take accountability for undertaking such value chain mapping activity should they see this to be a strategic priority. Most of our businesses who purchase packaging will understand their packaging supply chains including the source of some of the raw materials used by our packaging converters, however, this information is not mapped at Group level. ABF conducts an annual group-wide survey to determine how much packaging we place onto the market each year, including plastic packaging.

[Fixed row]

(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?

	Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity	Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No	*Select from:* ☑ Tier 4+ suppliers
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No	*Select from:* ☑ Tier 4+ suppliers
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No	*Select from:* ☑ Tier 2 suppliers

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

Short-term risks and opportunities have been considered over the period to 2025.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Medium-term risks and opportunities have been considered over the period to 2030. Our most financially material businesses, Primark and ABF Sugar have set 2030 emission targets. These targets are supported by emission reduction plans.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

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

Long-term risks and opportunities have been considered over the period to 2050. Year 2050 is consistent with many national and industry targets. Primark is aligned with the UNFCCC Fashion Industry Charter goal of net zero emissions across all three Scopes by 2050.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water
☑ Plastics
☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain
☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:
☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:
☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term
☑ Medium-term
☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:
☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply
☑ National
☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools
☑ SEDEX
☑ WRI Aqueduct
☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Databases
☑ Maplecroft Global Water Security Risk Index

Other
☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Desk-based research
☑ External consultants
☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Internal company methods
☑ Jurisdictional/landscape assessment
☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

☑ Heat waves

☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

☑ Wildfires

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Soil erosion

☑ Water stress

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Temperature variability

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation

☑ Impact on human health

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The Board is accountable for effective risk management, for agreeing the principal, including emerging, risks facing the Group and ensuring they are successfully managed by the businesses. The process for identifying, assessing and managing climate-related risks is the same as for other risks within the Group and sits with the business where the risk resides. These risks, including climate risks, are collated and reviewed at both a business and divisional level, and then any material risks reported to the Director of Financial Control who reviews the key risks with the Board. More information on our risk management process is available in the 'Our approach to risk management' section on page 68 of the 2023 ABF Responsibility Report. We have integrated climate-related considerations into processes affecting our financial statements, including considerations of capital expenditure within the ABF Sugar business as well as for impairment assessments. Last year in the ABF TCFD Statement (page 83-95 of the 2022 ABF Annual Report), we described our groupwide materiality-based risk assessment, focused on financially material climate risks and opportunities at a divisional level and our decentralised structure. This assessment identified risks and opportunities in the most material divisions contributing to Group adjusted operating profit and GHG emissions – ABF Sugar, Primark and Twinings. Our cross-functional divisional teams worked with third-party experts to understand climate related physical and transition risks and opportunities. These were included in our scenario analysis. Following this we worked with the third-party experts and performed high-level assessments across the remainder of our businesses to understand whether the risks and opportunities in individual businesses, but also in aggregate, could be material to the Group. The most significant risks were incorporated into relevant risk registers, in line with our existing risk management process. We have considered, in aggregate, other risks and opportunities that might have a material impact. None were identified. This year, ABF Sugar and Primark formalised their transition plans, which confirmed that the risks and opportunities identified last year were still appropriate. No new risks or opportunities were identified in 2023.

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

ABF is a diversified group, with a wide range of food and ingredients businesses as well as our retail brand, Primark. Our businesses depend upon agricultural systems for most of the raw materials we use in our products, which are dependent on biodiversity and healthy natural ecosystem. We recognise the need to support more sustainable farm management practices. Global agricultural systems are under increasing pressure to provide for a growing population while responding to the challenges and effects of climate change. Extreme weather events, increasing water stress, biodiversity loss and soil degradation are all adding to pressures within the system. We expect our businesses to go further than legal compliance by continuously considering and implementing other appropriate activities, voluntary commitments and internationally recognised management systems to reduce their environmental and social impacts and risks. Many of our businesses rely on agricultural crops with complex supply chains which are spread across the world. For example, as part of our risk assessment, long-term climate change impacts on agricultural crops and workers during extreme weather events have been assessed to understand the potential disruption across value chains. The full assessment process, is described on page 84 of our Annual Report 2023.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities

☑ Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to water

☑ Other location with substantive nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities, please specify

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We have carried out a high-level water risk assessment for our Group operations using internationally recognised methodologies to identify sites operating in water-stressed areas. Furthermore as part of our TCFD assessment we have evaluated, using scenario analysis, physical and transition risks. Acute risks that are unanticipated and event-driven, including increased severity of extreme weather events, may impact the availability of key agricultural raw materials and disrupt our operations. For ABF, these raw materials could be sugar on our own or leased land, cotton in our supply chain or other commodities such as wheat, rice, tea and edible oils. As experienced over recent years, acute physical events have led to crops in our supply chain being damaged by floods, extreme frosts and winds. These risks have the potential to disrupt the value chain, increase operational costs and impact our ability to do business. Some of the locations in which we operate are prone to flooding, drought and extreme weather events such as cyclones and heatwaves, which can affect harvests and impact supplies of raw materials, energy and water. Our businesses invest in a range of adaptation measures such as infrastructure upgrades to reduce flood damage, improved water efficiencies and reused more water where possible. They also collaborate with suppliers to build resilience in the supply chain where flooding and drought are prevalent. ABF has a substantial international agricultural footprint through our supply chain and operations on our own land. Therefore it is imperative that we respect the natural environment by managing our impacts as well as responding to changes resulting from climate change such as variability in seasons, changing weather and precipitation patterns, changing mean temperatures and the impact of these on natural resources. These physical risks could impact the availability, quality and price of key agricultural raw materials and commodities. In addition, chronic physical risks could start to impact the secure supply of materials, geographical growing regions or harvest seasons. Each business is responsible for understanding the risks pertinent to each location in which they operate. Where potential risks are identified, each business CEO may report risks to the Group level depending on materiality. The inability to source raw materials as a result of change in climate patterns is mitigated through our risk processes and engagement with suppliers. As examples, Illovo Sugar Africa and ABF Sugar China work with their third party sugar growers to improve resilience to climate change impacts. Given our diversified structure, our businesses and divisions are empowered to consider and implement their own mitigation and adaptation strategies.

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Shareholder value

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

The delivery of our strategic objectives and the sustainable growth and long-term shareholder value of our business is dependent on effective risk management. We regularly face business uncertainties, and it is through a structured approach to risk management that we are able to mitigate and manage these risks and embrace opportunities when they arise. The Board is accountable for effective risk management, for agreeing the principal, including emerging, risks facing the Group and

ensuring they are successfully managed by the businesses. The Board undertakes a robust annual assessment of the principal risks that would threaten the business model, future performance, solvency or liquidity. We determined materiality for the Group to be 66m (2022 – 65m), which is 4.5% (2022 – 5%) of adjusted profit before taxation. An event or series of events that exceed this financial threshold could be considered to have a substantive financial or strategic impact as it would most likely impact the delivery of the group's strategic objectives or have a detrimental effect on the group's sustainable growth and long-term shareholder value. Environmental factors, including the potential implications of climate change within our businesses and their supply chains, are considered as part of the risk management framework and they also frame opportunities for our businesses.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Shareholder value

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

The delivery of our strategic objectives and the sustainable growth and long-term shareholder value of our business is dependent on effective risk and opportunity management. We regularly face business uncertainties, and it is through a structured approach to risk management and opportunity identification that we are able to mitigate and manage these risks and embrace opportunities when they arise. The Board is accountable for effective risk management, for agreeing the principal, including emerging, risks facing the Group and ensuring they are successfully managed by the businesses. The Board undertakes a robust annual assessment of the principal risks and opportunities that would threaten the business model, future performance, solvency or liquidity. We determined materiality for the Group to be 66m (2022 – 65m), which is 4.5% (2022 – 5%) of adjusted profit before taxation. An event or series of events that exceed this financial threshold could be considered to have a substantive financial or strategic impact as it would most likely impact the delivery of the group's strategic objectives or have a detrimental effect on the group's sustainable growth and long-term shareholder value. Environmental factors, including the potential implications of climate change within our businesses and their supply chains, are considered as part of the risk management framework and they also frame opportunities for our businesses.
[Add row]

(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health?

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

We recognise that water is a vital resource. We have carried out a high-level water risk assessments for our Group operations using recognised methodologies and we are working steadily to reduce our water footprint. A significant amount of our water use in our own operations occurs in crop irrigation and we are focused on improving the efficiency of this process. Each ABF facility has dedicated HSE resources who have the technical skills and expertise to identify, assess and manage potential water pollutants in their direct operations and factories. Water management practices differ per division, dependent upon their business activity. For example, Primark main water use is within its supply chains and the business is committed to the ZDHC Programme (Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals Foundation.) and are members of the AFIRM Group. These partnerships help the business to phase out certain chemicals deemed more hazardous and replace them with safer alternatives. Primark's Restricted Substances List (RSL), which combines the limits for chemicals in the materials used to make products, and the substances in chemicals that suppliers are not permitted to use in the manufacture of Primark products and materials. The RSL is aligned with the ZDHC Manufacturing Restricted Substances List and the AFIRM RSL. Primark share the RSL with all suppliers and facilities that manufacture Primark products and provide in-country supplier training on their chemical management requirements.
[Fixed row]

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities.

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Our own food factories discharge process wastewater under strict discharge limits including total volume (Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and chemical oxygen demand (COD) suspended solids grease/oil/fats and pH levels. Firstly, in order to not exceed their permitted discharge concentrations they minimise any polluting materials entering their wastewater. Secondly they ensure that there is sufficient monitoring quality controls and treatment on site so that whatever is eventually discharged complies with the terms of its discharge permit. Any treatment could use one or more of a range of technologies including settlement of solids aerobic digestions and anaerobic digestion. The selection of technologies addresses the local aquatic sensitivities and water quality objectives. For example, in the case of AB Mauri, our yeast and ingredients business, most of its production facilities have complex on-site effluent treatment plants that include biological and physical processes. At a minimum, sites equalise their flow so as not to disrupt any downstream municipal processes.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

To minimise the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants, our food factories depend on the expertise of the regulatory bodies to determine what is safe to be discharged. The role of the factories is therefore to ensure that any discharges meet or exceed the prescribed quality standards. Lack of or ineffective wastewater treatment could lead to exceeding the limits applied to volume, chemicals, solids, pH levels and other determinants and as a result impact the balance of the receiving watercourse. For example, AB Mauri production processes require a significant amount of water to produce yeast. The business invests in water treatment technologies to ensure that the water it returns to the environment is safe and compliant with local standards.

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Fertilizers

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Nitrates, ammonia and phosphates from fertiliser into surface and ground water have the potential to negatively impact aquatic life and environmental habitats by causing potential algal blooms and resultant oxygen depletion.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Fertilizers are used with ABF Sugar's direct operations. Impacts of Fertilizers for all other businesses are only present through their supply chains. To manage our fertiliser related risks, we follow the recommendations of soil and leaf samples analysed by reputable laboratories and use enhanced nitrogen carriers where necessary. As an example, Germains Seed Technology is researching how seed can be inoculated with a bacterial endophyte that contains a gene associated with atmospheric nitrogen fixation. When brassica seeds are coated with the endophyte, they colonise inside the plant roots and shoots, helping the plant to reduce the use of fertiliser through nitrogen 'fixing'. This is the biological process by which nitrogen is pulled from the air by the broccoli plant, and deposited back into the soil.

This allows the farmer to use less fertiliser during the growing season. Additionally, UK feed business ABN has joined a consortium of UK companies, research institutes and farmer networks on a four-year project, 'Nitrogen Efficient Plants for Climate Smart Arable Cropping Systems' (NCS). The initiative aims to increase pulse cropping in arable rotations from 5% to 20% across the UK, and to develop and test new feed rations.

Row 4

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Pesticides

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Pesticides have toxic properties and have the potential to contaminate ground and surface water sources negatively affecting ecosystems and biodiversity. In Illovo previously the spraying of chemicals to control pests like Yellow Sugarcane Aphids and Thrips was done via aerial application, however with the conversion to subsurface drip irrigation in Nchalo Malawi, Illovo is now in a position to apply these chemicals through the irrigation system. In particular this is via subsurface irrigation reducing the risk of contamination to the environment considerably. As the risk of runoff is reduced so is the environmental risk of polluting the wetlands and water sources on the sugar estate.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Procedure(s) under development/ R&D

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

ABF Sugar promotes sustainable agricultural practices across all its operations, and looks to invest in new technology such as subsurface drip irrigation where financially feasible. ABF Sugar promotes the use of the best available registered and recommended insecticides and applies these according the manufacturer standards. As an example Azucarera in Spain collaborates with AIMCRA (Asociación de Investigación para la Mejora del Cultivo de la Remolacha Azucarera) on

disease and pest control. Dosage has been adjusted to cut back on the use of herbicides insecticides and fungicides to control weeds pests and diseases. This reduces the quantity of product used, the associated costs of production and the exposure to and adverse effects of excessive use on the crops growers and environment. Integrated pest control was also included within crop rotation as well as use of the type of product best suited to the particular conditions of each area to control plant disease.

Row 5

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Wastewater discharge quality

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Primark uses industry tools to restrict the use of almost 300 chemicals during the manufacture of its products. Its Chemical Management Programme is aligned to industry best practice.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Primark is committed to supporting its suppliers factories with the tools and guidance needed to use chemicals safely. It has regional environmental teams across strategic sourcing regions, which engage directly with suppliers' facilities to provide awareness and training in relation to chemical management. This includes requirements for facilities to compile and submit chemical inventories so that Primark can assess their usage of chemicals in reference to the ZDHC Manufacturing RSL. In 2022, 175 of its key wet processors generated ZDHC In Check reports. Primark's ETES team delivers regular training on its chemical management requirements to suppliers and wet processors in the supply chain. With Primark's support, 80 facilities in the supply chain completed ZDHC's Supplier to Zero programme, focused on improving chemical management systems. A further 61 wet processors have been selected to complete ZDHC Chemical Management System training, including implementation efforts supported by a consultant to identify improvements and help put them into practice. Primark also successfully

expanded its focus on wastewater testing beyond Bangladesh to include China, India and Turkey this year. 107 of its key wet processors tested to the ZDHC guidelines from January to December 2022. The ZDHC guidelines apply to certain facilities such as those discharging wastewater above a daily threshold (15m3 /day). A further 20 key facilities have been selected to undertake targeted risk-based test
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

For Timber products, we recognise that risks exist, but no substantive impact is anticipated. ABF's businesses are responsible for monitoring and complying with all relevant legislation. For example, the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive and EU Timber Regulations for our businesses operating in Europe and the Australian Packaging Covenant which requires formal packaging data to be collected for all brands distributed in Australia. ABF requires all businesses to implement appropriate levels of risk management to ensure compliance with all local legislation, group policies and business principles taking into account local business needs and circumstances. The level of risk and policy to address will vary across the Group depending on the exposure to and usage of these forest risk commodities. There is sufficient diversity in the Group and across our supply chains, and continuous review of our procurement approaches, that forest-related risks associated

with timber products are likely to be low and not substantive at the Group level. With regard to Palm Oil and Soy, risks exist, but no substantive impact is anticipated. ABF requires all businesses to implement appropriate levels of risk management to ensure compliance with all local legislation, group policies and business principles taking into account local business needs and circumstances. The level of risk and policy to address will vary across the Group depending on the exposure to and usage of these forest risk commodities. There is sufficient diversity in the Group and across our supply chains, and continuous review of our procurement approaches, that forest-related risks associated with palm oil are likely to be low and not substantive at the Group level. Within ABF's Responsibility Report 2023 we detailed certain forest commodities as those with "potential" to cause damage to the environment which our businesses then are required to assess in a local business context.

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

Assessing and prioritising the most material environmental and social risks and opportunities is the responsibility of our businesses. They are best placed to do so because they understand their markets, supply chains and local communities. They also experience first-hand the direct impacts of global and national trends where they operate. Over the past 12 months, we have engaged with some of our businesses to understand their material issues and to support them in their materiality assessments. More sustainable packaging, including forms of plastic which contain recycled materials and are recyclable, contributes to reducing waste and supporting a circular economy has been identified as a material topic as a direct result of this exercise. We recognise the harmful effects of plastic waste on ecosystems, but also understand that many forms of plastic packaging play a vital role in the food sector, helping to protect consumers by keeping foods safe to eat

and reducing waste by extending usable life when supplied to the market. Our challenge is to ensure that we use plastic materials responsibly. Wherever possible, our businesses are removing unnecessary and problematic plastic packaging. For example, some are switching to more easily recyclable types of plastic or are increasing the use of recycled content in the plastics they use, supporting the principle of circularity. We continue to see a focus from business, government and civil society to move towards a more circular economy, which focuses on eliminating waste, keeping material in use and regenerating natural systems. This offers significant opportunities, as well as challenges. We identify food waste, plastic waste and textile waste as three significant challenges where urgent collaborative action is required to combat the economic, environmental and social consequences of waste and enable the move from a linear to a more circular economy. [Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ India

☑ Pakistan

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Climate impact on cotton yields - The key climate-related physical risks for cotton production are extreme temperatures, heavy rainfall and the timing and duration of the monsoon season. Our work on climate change scenarios to 2030 shows that the effects on cotton yields are minimal (analysis focused on Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme locations in India and Pakistan which represent some 97% of Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme in FY2022). The outcomes range from virtually no impact to a reduction of some 4%. These projections are well within the bounds of the year-on-year yield variations that we have already experienced, and even then the capability is in place to work with smallholders to mitigate these effects. For example, training helps farmers make better seed selections and understand planting patterns to maximise yields. In 2050, the yield impact is projected to decline by 14% under RCP8.5 and 4% under RCP2.6, before mitigating actions. Based on yield uplifts we have seen historically, the majority of this impact would be offset by sourcing all cotton from sustainable or recycled programmes. Scenarios assessed RCP2.6/RCP8.5

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Adopt regenerative agriculture policies

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Actions taken to mitigate risks: By 2022, 40% of Primark's cotton clothing sales (units) contain cotton that is organic, recycled or is sourced from Primark's Sustainable Cotton Programme ('PSCP'). Cotton sourced through PSCP is grown using farming methods with a lower environmental impact, including reducing water, chemical pesticide and fertiliser use and training farmers in these methods. Our 2013-2019 study concluded that switching to these farming methods led to increased yields which help mitigate negative yield impacts caused by climate change, lower input costs and an overall increase in income for the farmers trained in these methods. As at July 2023, 299,388 farmers had received training through the programme compared to a target of 275,00 farmers. Targets & Metrics: The proportion of cotton clothing sales (units) that contain cotton that is organic, recycled or sourced from Primark's Sustainable Cotton Programme: 100% by 2027. 46% of cotton clothing units sold against this metric in 2023.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Bangladesh

☑ China

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Impact of flooding risk on Primark's third-party manufacturers. Bangladesh and China represent the top two countries from which Primark products are sourced. Bangladesh is exposed to both coastal and river flooding (based on RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Scenarios). Many of our suppliers' factories are located in the greater Dhaka region. This is a low-lying, densely populated area on the Ganges Delta that is exposed to coastal and river flooding. The flood risk outcomes through to 2030 are minimal, but by 2050 there is a distinct increase in flood risk. A proportion of Primark's third-party factories in China are at risk of being disrupted by flooding. This risk changes minimally by 2030 and 2050. The flood risk in China (also based on RCP8.5) changes minimally through to 2030 and 2050. Coastal flooding is projected at 1% in 2030 and less than 2% in 2050. River flooding is projected at less than 5% for 2030 and 2050. Primark has a large geographical spread of supplier factories which would require a large number of rivers and coastlines to flood simultaneously for there to be a material problem. Primark tracks the number of supplier factories (China and Bangladesh) subject to high flood risk. In 2023, 10.9% of factories in China face high ravine flood risk at baseline, and 2.9% of factories in China face high coastal flood risk at baseline. In Bangladesh, 10.2% of factories face high ravine flood risk at baseline whilst 5.1% of factories face high coastal flood risk at baseline.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Increase supplier diversification

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To mitigate this risk, Primark's Sourcing Strategy has been in place for two years with a focus on geographical diversification, creating a more balanced global footprint and developing risk mitigation strategies to increase flexibility and agility when unexpected events occur. Analysis shows that the majority of Primark's suppliers in Bangladesh are located in areas of Dhaka which are less susceptible to flooding and the local Dhaka community regularly deals with flooding and has adapted processes to mitigate its impacts. Primark continues to ensure a geographical spread of supplier factories across China. Primark has mobilised an engineering team under its Structural Integrity Programme to pilot an approach in Bangladesh to support supplier factories to mitigate flood risk. Primark has appointed Mott MacDonald to investigate flood risk associated with factories within Primark's supply chain that are deemed high risk. The programme seeks to understand the detailed risk to each site and how those supplier factories have taken appropriate measures to minimise the potential impact of flooding such as damage to property, plant and equipment and finished goods as well as protecting the wellbeing of factory workers. Primark will use the pilot to determine how to deploy wider activity within the existing Structural Integrity Programme. Progress in this area will be provided in next year's report. However, the overarching goal is to help factories ensure they have the right flood mitigation measures in place.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Temperature variability

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Malawi

☑ Mozambique

☑ South Africa

☑ United Republic of Tanzania

☑ Zimbabwe

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Impact of climate on sugar yields in Africa (Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania and Zambia) - Climate impact on sugar yields, assessed as part of the TCFD analysis, varies country by country. The outcomes to 2030 under the USDA's EPIC crop model indicate a range from no change to a decline of 10%. The outcomes to 2050 indicate a 5% gain to a 29% decline. In 2023, ABF Sugar has produced 2.8m tonnes of sugar and abstracted 830 million m3 of water.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Agricultural practices

☑ Adopt sustainable irrigation practices

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

ABF Sugar has a target to reduce its end-to-end supply chain water usage by 30% by 2030 and has reduced water usage by 4% between 2017/18 and 2022/23. Our African sugar businesses already experiences and manage significant climate variability, so their responses to weather events are well developed. ABF Sugar is improving irrigation efficiency to mitigate the risk of drought, including investing in drip irrigation and river defences to reduce storm damage. Improving irrigation efficiency to mitigate the risk of drought, including investing in drip irrigation and river defences to reduce storm damage. For example, Illovo Sugar Malawi is

implementing drip irrigation conversion, a bulk water supply efficiency programme and sub-surface drainage. These are a few of the ongoing projects to improve irrigation and drainage and therefore reduce water usage. This is measured primarily through solutions implemented and volume of water saved.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Kenya

☑ Argentina

☑ Indonesia

☑ Sri Lanka

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The outcomes through 2030 and 2050 show a positive impact on tea yields. However, the crop model has limited representation of acute weather events such as extreme temperatures, heavy rainfall and droughts. We have a well-grounded experience in understanding volatility in regional tea yields as a result of weather

events and by extension the world's tea-growing regions. With this, we can respond to extreme weather events by sourcing tea products to continue to produce tea to our set standards. Where this is not an option for single origin blends, the impact would not be material to the business.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially. Currently, Twinings sourcing capability coupled with its blending capability enables the business to manage localised yield issues. In the future, Twinings will continue to focus on enhancing farming practices, particularly irrigation. Also, tea is a profitable crop that, after some higher-than-average start-up costs, can be harvested for decades. There should be incentive to replant in new regions if climate changes locally.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Agricultural practices

☑ Adopt sustainable irrigation practices

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Currently, Twinings sourcing capability coupled with its blending capability enables the business to manage localised yield issues.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Currently, Twinings sourcing capability coupled with its blending capability enables the business to manage localised yield issues. In the future,.Since the impact of climate change on tea yields is assessed as low, no metrics are disclosed. We will continue to monitor this risk and will develop a metric at such a time where the risk could be material.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Bangladesh

☑ China

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Impact of flooding risk on Primark's third-party manufacturers. Bangladesh and China represent the top two countries from which Primark products are sourced. Bangladesh is exposed to both coastal and river flooding (based on RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Scenarios). Many of our suppliers' factories are located in the greater Dhaka region. This is a low-lying, densely populated area on the Ganges Delta that is exposed to coastal and river flooding. The flood risk outcomes through to 2030 are minimal, but by 2050 there is a distinct increase in flood risk. A proportion of Primark's third-party factories in China are at risk of being disrupted by flooding. This risk changes minimally by 2030 and 2050. The flood risk in China (also based on RCP8.5) changes minimally through to 2030 and 2050. Coastal flooding is projected at 1% in 2030 and less than 2% in 2050. River flooding is projected at less than 5% for 2030 and 2050. Primark has a large geographical spread of supplier factories which would require a large number of rivers and coastlines to flood simultaneously for there to be a material problem. Primark tracks the number of supplier factories (China and Bangladesh) subject to high flood risk. In 2023, 10.9% of factories in China face high ravine flood risk at baseline, and 2.9% of factories in China face high coastal flood risk at baseline. In Bangladesh, 10.2% of factories face high ravine flood risk at baseline whilst 5.1% of factories face high coastal flood risk at baseline.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Determining the potential impact of climate risks is challenging due to their significant time horizon and inherent difficulty in accurate quantification. Medium term impacts judged not to be significant once mitigating actions are considered. As such, the impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Increase supplier diversification

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

N/A

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Strategy has existed for two years with a focus on geographical diversification for sourcing product, creating a more balanced global footprint and developing risk mitigation strategies to increase flexibility and agility when unexpected events occur. Future mitigating actions: • Primark will consider flood risk as part of its Structural Integrity programme and is currently developing a pilot to test an approach in Bangladesh. • Bangladesh's National Determined Contribution plan includes a focus on infrastructure and risk management. • Primark will continue to consider how best to diversify the sourcing of product in line with its Sourcing Strategy. The analysis shows that the majority of Primark's suppliers in Bangladesh are located in areas of Dhaka which are less susceptible to flooding. • The local Dhaka community regularly deals with flooding and has adapted processes to mitigate its impacts. • Ensuring a geographical spread of supplier factories across China. • Primark's Sourcing Strategy has been in place for two years with a focus on geographical diversification, creating a more balanced global footprint and developing risk mitigation strategies to increase flexibility and agility when unexpected events occur.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Impact of carbon pricing mechanisms on ABF Sugar - Carbon prices are likely to increase as governments take action to decarbonise. This risk was assessed using the International Energy Agency's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario, Sustainable Development Scenario and Stated Policies Scenario Assessment. Incremental

impact ranges from 0m to 48m in 2030. ABF Sugar has developed a plan to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 30% by 2030 (from a 2018 baseline), achieved through a series of fuel substitution and energy-efficiency programmes that generally have a return on investment above 15%. Beyond 2030, while some technologies exist, they are not yet commercially viable.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

To mitigate this risk, ABF Sugar has a detailed plan to achieve its 30% absolute GHG reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030. Some 12% reduction has already been delivered versus its 2018 baseline. As an example of mitigating actions taking place, to address it's physical risks, ABF Sugar is using SAI platform FSA to support assessing, improving and validating on-farm sustainability. This focuses on soil health, pest management and climate change. ABF Sugar is in the process of defining metrics to monitor the progress of this programme. It will align these metrics to the SAI regenerative agriculture framework. For further details please see our Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) 2023.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

48000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Incremental impact ranges from 0m to 48m in 2030. ABF Sugar has developed a plan to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 30% by 2030 (from a 2018 baseline), achieved through a series of fuel substitution, technology investments and energy-efficiency programmes that generally have a return on investment above 5%. Beyond 2030, while some technologies exist, they are not yet commercially viable.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Participation in environmental collaborative industry frameworks, initiatives and/or commitments

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

N/A

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

ABF Sugar has a detailed plan to achieve its 30% absolute GHG reduction by 2030. Some 12% reduction has already been delivered versus its 2018 baseline. ABF Sugar has categorised existing and new plans and projects into three timeframes: 1. Short term (present to 2025): Focus on improving efficiency and reducing operational GHG emissions; investing in energy efficiency with the aim of reducing energy consumption and eliminating coal. 2. Medium term (2026 to 2030): Targeting key sites and pairing them with key technological resources. 3. Long term (beyond 2030): Focusing on employing lowemission technologies, managing

climate-related risks across the value-chain, and partnering to innovate at factories across the business. There are assumptions on low-emission technologies for hydrocarbons and government regulations surrounding biogas that underpin these goals. The above short- and medium-term goals have been identified to achieve ABF Sugar's 2030 commitments. These goals have been set in line with the Science Based Targets Initiative ('SBTi'). ABF Sugar's emissions reduction target were validated by the SBTi in 2023. In alignment with the best practice, ABF Sugar will need to develop a strategy to neutralise residual emissions that will not be abated through emissions reductions initiatives in the future. The progress of each project is monitored by a defined governance structure which aligns with the capital and performance improvement programme quarterly review. This is owned by the Head of Advocacy who monitors each project with appropriate metrics. Progress against the transition plan is also monitored as part of this process. The selection and implementation process for these projects are included in ABF Sugar's financial planning process. Each selected project undergoes a formal capital expenditure process.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk9

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

This risk was assessed using the International Energy Agency's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario, Sustainable Development Scenario and Stated Policies Scenario. Incremental impact ranges from 55m to 155m in 2030, driven by hypothetical carbon taxes on Scope 3 upstream emissions. Scope 1 and 2 make up less

than 2% of Primark's total emissions. Primark's decarbonisation programme is managed as an integral part of the Primark Cares strategy with a road map to reduce absolute emissions by 50% by 2030 and mitigate potential exposure to increased carbon taxation.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Primark is continually managing inflationary pressures. In the event that carbon prices were to increase or be applied to goods that are currently not in scope, these would be managed and offset as required as with any other cost input.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

55000000

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

155000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Primark is continually managing inflationary pressures. In the event that carbon prices were to increase or be applied to goods that are currently not in scope these would be managed and offset as required as with any other cost input. Incremental impact ranges from 55m to 155m in 2030, driven by hypothetical carbon taxes on Scope 3 upstream emissions. Scope 1 and 2 make up less than 2% of Primark's total emissions. Primark's decarbonisation programme is managed as an integral part of the Primark Cares strategy with a road map to reduce absolute emissions by 50% by 2030 and mitigate potential exposure to increased carbon taxation. The plan focuses on Primark's top five sourcing markets and support to suppliers with implementing energy-efficient measures and making a switch to renewable sources. The plan does not assume the purchase of offsets.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Participation in environmental collaborative industry frameworks, initiatives and/or commitments

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

N/A

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Primark's decarbonisation programme is managed as an integral part of the Primark Cares strategy with a road map to reduce absolute emissions by 50% by 2030 and mitigate potential exposure to increased carbon taxation. The plan focuses on Primark's top five sourcing markets and support to suppliers with implementing energy-efficient measures and making a switch to renewable sources. The plan does not assume the purchase of offsets. Primark has a worked-up plan to achieve a significant reduction in supplier emissions by the end of the decade and is aligned with the UNFCCC Fashion Industry Charter goal of net zero emissions across all three Scopes by 2050.
[Add row]

(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Impact of carbon pricing mechanisms on Primark: Incremental impact ranges from 55m to 155m in 2030, driven by hypothetical carbon taxes on Scope 3 upstream emissions. Scope 1 and 2 make up less than 2% of Primark's total emissions. Primark's decarbonisation programme is managed as an integral part of the Primark Cares strategy with a road map to reduce absolute emissions by 50% by 2030 and mitigate potential exposure to increased carbon taxation. The plan focuses on Primark's top five sourcing markets and support to suppliers with implementing energy-efficient measures and making a switch to renewable sources. The plan does not assume the purchase of offsets. In mitigation, Primark has a worked-up plan to achieve a significant reduction in supplier emissions by the end of the decade and is aligned with the UNFCCC Fashion Industry Charter goal of net zero emissions across all three Scopes by 2050. In 2023, Primark achieved a 50% absolute reduction in Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 2030 from a 2018 baseline. See also the transition plan on pages 66 and 67 of the 2023 Responsibility Report.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :N/A

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Not financially material and therefore not quantified. As ABF consists of five business segments a substantive risk to the Group as a whole is very rare because if something impacts one segment, the other four will continue to operate and it is unlikely to move the Group's share price. The impact of site-level water risks at the Group level is low and unlikely to meet the material financial impact threshold of 66 million or have a strategic impact. At an aggregated level, the sites consolidated within a division may meet the ABF financial threshold of 66 million or be considered a potential strategic risk based on reputational issues. These consolidated sites within ABF Sugar, GWF and AB Mauri could amount to a potential substantive financial risk or strategic risk based on reputation, for example, the risk of not meeting water commitments or maintaining employment levels.
[Add row]

(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zambia
☑ Zambezi

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization’s total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ilovos site in Zambia accounts for 29% of ABFs total abstracted water for own operations.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Murray - Darling

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization’s total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization’s total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

George Weston Foods site operating in the Murray Darling basin accounts for 0.06% of ABFs total abstracted water in its own operations

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify **:**Yellow Sea and East China Sea

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Water abstracted from one site in China accounts for 0.05% of ABFs total extracted water in its own operations

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Douro

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

3

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Three of Azucareras sites in Spain account for 0.02% of ABFs total abstracted water in its own operations

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify :Indian Ocean

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

5

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Illovos five sites in South Africa account for 0.4% of ABFs total extracted water in its own operations

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Other, please specify :Iberian Peninsula

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

One of Azucareras sites in Spain accounts for 0.06% of ABFs total abstracted water in its own operations

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Ebro

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization’s total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization’s total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

One of Azucareras sites in Spain accounts for 0.01% of ABFs total abstracted water in its own operations

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Malawi

☑ Other, please specify **:**Lake Nyasa

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization’s total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization’s total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

One of Illovos sites in Malawi accounts for 10% of ABFs total abstracted water in its own operations

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Malawi

☑ Other, please specify **:**Shire

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization’s total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization’s total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

One of Illovos sites in Malawi accounts for 22% of ABFs total extracted water in its own operations

Row 10

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United Republic of Tanzania

☑ Rufiji

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization’s total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization’s total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Illovos site in Tanzania accounts for 9% of ABFs total extracted water in its own operations

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Eswatini

☑ Maputo

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Illovos site in Eswatini accounts for 25% of ABFs total extracted water in its own operations.
[Add row]

(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.3.2) Fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties

Select all that apply

☑ Enforcement orders or other penalties

☑ Fines, but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

These are issues that are being addressed by the relevant sites across the ABF Group with targeted support to the specific sites. We regret any issues caused as a result of these incidents, and always prioritise timely remedial action to ensure we meet the standards expected of us by our neighbours and other stakeholders, as well as the regulations under which we operate.
[Fixed row]

(3.3.1) Provide the total number and financial value of all water-related fines.

(3.3.1.1) Total number of fines

10

(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines

6614

(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated

0.3

(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(3.3.1.5) Comment

In this reporting year ten water-related fines were received. These were largely due to the treatment of wastewater. Last year four wastewater-related fines were received. These are issues that are being addressed by the relevant sites across the ABF Group with targeted support to the specific sites. We regret any issues caused as a result of these incidents, and always prioritise timely remedial action to ensure we meet the standards expected of us by our neighbours and other stakeholders, as well as the regulations under which we operate.
[Fixed row]

(3.3.2) Provide details for all significant fines, enforcement orders and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations in the reporting year, and your plans for resolving them.

Row 1

(3.3.2.1) Type of penalty

Select from:

☑ Fine

(3.3.2.2) Financial impact

1529

(3.3.2.3) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify **:**Indian Ocean

(3.3.2.4) Type of incident

Select from:

☑ Effluent limit exceedances

(3.3.2.5) Description of penalty, incident, regulatory violation, significance, and resolution

These are issues that are being addressed by the relevant sites across the ABF Group with targeted support to the specific sites. We regret any issues caused as a result of these incidents, and always prioritise timely remedial action to ensure we meet the standards expected of us by our neighbours and other stakeholders, as well as the regulations under which we operate.

Row 2

(3.3.2.1) Type of penalty

Select from:

☑ Fine

(3.3.2.2) Financial impact

5085

(3.3.2.3) Country/Area & River basin

Italy

☑ Po

(3.3.2.4) Type of incident

Select from:

☑ Effluent limit exceedances

(3.3.2.5) Description of penalty, incident, regulatory violation, significance, and resolution

These are issues that are being addressed by the relevant sites across the ABF Group with targeted support to the specific sites. We regret any issues caused as a result of these incidents, and always prioritise timely remedial action to ensure we meet the standards expected of us by our neighbours and other stakeholders, as well as the regulations under which we operate.
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply
☑ EU ETS
☑ South Africa carbon tax
☑ UK ETS

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

EU ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

4

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

81066

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

104696

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

185762

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

N/A

UK ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

29

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

330609

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

327151

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

657760

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

N/A

[Fixed row]

(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

South Africa carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

5

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

164433

(3.5.3.5) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

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

Our strategy for compliance is to: 1 - Meet compliance levels for all appropriate environmental legislation and other requirements relating to our activities. Our site-level environmental managers and finance teams collaborate to ensure compliance with national or regional tax price schemes. 2 - Continually improve our environmental performance through a process of monitoring, measuring and reviewing our environmental impacts. For energy, we utilise energy more efficiently to reduce the use of fossil fuels and the production of associated greenhouse gas emissions. Where financially or operationally viable, our businesses will change to less carbon-intensive fuels for manufacturing and transportation. 3 -Maximise the efficient use of our raw materials and minimise waste generation through promotion of re-use and recycling. 4 - Include environmental regulation tracking as part of the group-wide environmental compliance and risk management audit programme.

This is a rolling site-level audit programme conducted by an independent third-party provider. This data is collected and reviewed annually as part of the ABF HSE year-end verification process. Where there is a risk of regulatory non-compliance, the finding is reported to ABF's HSE team and progress towards closure of the finding is monitored.

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

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased sales of existing products and services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Our businesses have expanded into climate-change driven products which maximise commercial opportunities as well as replace GHG emissions from fossil fuel use through the generation of renewables. Bioethanol is a co-product of our sugar beet processing operations and provides an additional income stream for our sugar businesses. Producing biofuels at Wissington is one example of British Sugar realising an opportunity and meeting market demands. There are no additional costs incurred to deliver the current biofuels to the market from the Wissington factory; however, there would be additional costs to produce bioethanol at another facility. This would be costed as part of ABF Sugar's capital projects approval process.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

The impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

As one of the UK's leading agri-processors with an interest in innovative new technology, British Sugar began production of bioethanol in September 2007. At British Sugar's Wissington site, the first plant to manufacture bioethanol in the UK, the sugar biorefinery produces bioethanol from the residual sugar syrup products from sugar beet processing and process it for sale in the market.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Other resource efficiency opportunity, please specify **:**Packaging Optimization

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

As a leading provider of food, ingredients and clothing, packaging contributes significantly to our environmental footprint. Paper is the main packaging material used across the Group, followed by plastic and glass. We also use wood, steel, aluminium and a number of other materials. We have a commitment to use more recycled material and less overall material when designing and sourcing packaging-both of which offer, in addition to the sustainability benefit, a cost saving benefit to the organisation. In 2023, our businesses used 246,683 tonnes of packaging compared with 267,638 tonnes used in 2022. This is an 8% annual decrease even though tonnes of production from Group operations increased by 3%. There has been a decrease in the use of all the packaging materials, including plastic, steel, glass and paper. Tonnes of plastic used as a packaging material has decreased by 9% this year and demonstrates the commitment of our businesses to reduce the use of plastic where appropriate and viable.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Primark aims to reduce its reliance on 'virgin' paper and packaging, and reduce paper waste. To support approaches and systems to protect the world's Ancient and Endangered Forests, Primark will collaborate with Canopy to work with innovative companies and suppliers to encourage the development of materials which reduce environmental and social impacts, with a focus on recycled materials and agricultural residues. Primark will participate in trials where appropriate, where there is fibre producer innovation. Primark will put in place a preference for purchasing man-made cellulosic fibre products made from innovative fibre sources and develop a 2030 procurement target. Primark joined Canopy's Pack4Good initiative, which is working to ensure companies move away from forests to use more eco-friendly, low-impact paper packaging options and reduce dependency on virgin wood-derived packaging. Primark's preference is to reduce the use of virgin paper where possible and use wood fibres certified by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), or the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC). The certified wood is harvested from forests that are responsibly managed and economically viable. It is also exploring next-generation alternatives to wood fibre.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Reduced water usage and consumption

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Malawi

☑ Zambia

☑ United Republic of Tanzania

☑ Eswatini
☑ Mozambique
☑ South Africa

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Incomati
☑ Zambezi
☑ Other, please specify

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Agricultural operations require significant energy to pump water for abstraction and irrigation, at significant cost. Illovo Sugar Africa has a long-standing performance improvement programme focused on optimising water use. The business takes a strategic approach to water efficiency across its estate with continuous investment in enhanced irrigation systems.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Medium-term
☑ Long-term

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

Select from:
☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

The impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Illovo has identified three primary opportunities to reduce the energy requirement and improve water use efficiency: 1. Improving the efficiency of conveyance systems to minimise losses 2. Improving irrigation efficiency to reduce the water required to grow a stick of sugarcane 3. Improving the accuracy of irrigation scheduling to ensure the crop is irrigated effectively. It has completed a study this year to audit all bulk water abstraction locations and has completed the process of metering 50% of all abstraction sites, with the rest to be completed in 2024. Two major projects underway are the Shire Valley Transformation Project and the SWIM (Smart Water and Irrigation Management) project at the Nchalo estate in Malawi. These projects will have a major impact on water usage. The largest project addressing bulk water usage is the Shire Valley Transformation Project. This 30m project is expected to achieve water savings of 17% at the estate, as well as a significant reduction in power demand. Further details are below. In irrigation scheduling, there are ongoing training sessions and workshops, as well as soil water potential meters and irrigation efficiency assessments. At the Nchalo estate, the SWIM project (Smart Water and Irrigation Management) piloted a satellite and centralised data system irrigation scheduling tool in 2023, which will be rolled out to all sites.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Spain

☑ Malawi

☑ Zambia

☑ Mozambique

☑ South Africa

☑ United Republic of Tanzania

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Energy efficiency has long been a driver of better performance for our Group and identified as a major opportunity. We remain focused on finding ways to produce more from less energy.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

The impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We continuously seek efficiency opportunities across our operations. For example, ABF Sugar has delivered a number of projects to support the transition to a low-carbon economy focusing on the short-term on energy reduction, energy efficiency and smaller fuel switching projects. These have included projects that enable the

reduction of steam usage in the factory and fuel reduction in our animal feed dryers. By minimising our factories' energy demand in the near-term, this will enable ABF Sugar to deploy technological and larger fuel-switching projects in the medium- to long-term. There is a strong pipeline of accretive GHG reduction projects. Each ABF Sugar business has its own environmental plan which has been categorised between short- and long-term. For example, in the UK, projects focus on smaller factory energy efficiency/steam reduction, coal elimination and reduction of energy use for pulp drying. In Africa, projects focus on energy efficiency and coal elimination/reduction in South Africa.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp6

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Development of new products or services through R&D and innovation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Finland

☑ Germany

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We provide products and services that have the potential to assist others in reducing their carbon emissions often referred to as carbon enablement. Carbon enablement is integral to ABFIs offer to customers and a key focus for investment and innovation. AB Enzymes an industrial biotech company that specialises in the development of enzymes used in multiple industries for various applications and has enablement at the core of its purpose. Enzymes are biological catalysts that

essentially accelerate biochemical reactions making them a very effective alternative to petrochemical based products. AB Enzymes has developed a number of innovative products that enable emissions reductions with no impact on product performance.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

The impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

AB Enzymes has developed a number of innovative products that enable emissions reductions with no impact on product performance. One example is washing powder that uses a specialist enzyme produced by the business that enables clothes to be washed at 30C just as effectively as at 40C. This has the potential to reduce electricity consumption by around 260kWh or 120 kg of CO2e per 1,000 washes compared to when using an average detergent. Another example is a product that reduces the water temperature required to biopolish cotton textiles. Biopolishing is a stage of cotton production which cleans the surface and removes fluff. For many years, that process involved immersing the fabric in water heated to 50C, but this enzymes-based alternative has enabled the same results in 30C water. This has the potential to reduce energy consumption by around 350kWh or 360 kg CO2e for every tonne of cotton processed compared to untreated biopolishing processes. This potential saving has the capability to be particularly significant given that textile processing tends to be carbon-heavy. Another example from ABFI company AB Biotek Human Nutrition and Health is the formulation of inactivated yeast postbiotics that do not require refrigeration. This allows for more energy-efficient transportation and storage of perishable foods and medicines that would normally need to be chilled, resulting in lower energy consumption. Calculations for kg of CO2e per 1,000 washes are based on the emissions savings from the reduced in energy consumption in the South East Asia region, which is the largest cotton producing region. The use of the enzymes results in an average reduction of 20C in water temperature, which equates to a reduction of 350 kWh and 360kg avoided emissions. Calculations for kg CO2e for every tonne of cotton processed are based on the emissions saving from the reduced energy consumption when using an average detergent and washing machine type with 164 cycles per household in Central Europe. The use of the enzyme results in an average reduction of 13C in washing temperature, which equates to a reduction of 258 kWh electricity and 119kg avoided emissions per 1000 washing cycles.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp7

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Development of new products or services through R&D and innovation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Many of our businesses, like Vivergo, are advantageously positioned to supply products and services to help customers and companies reduce their emissions. Vivergo is the largest bioethanol plant in the UK and one of the largest in Europe. The blending of bioethanol with petroleum is a key aspect of many governments' greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The impact has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

At peak capacity, Vivergo will use around one million tonnes of UK feed-grade wheat, typically around 40% of the UK's exportable surplus. One of the main co-products is protein for animal feed, and at peak capacity the business will also be the largest single-source animal feed supplier in the UK. At full capacity, it is estimated that the plant will produce 420 million litres of ethanol product per year. The net benefit of using this product blended with gasoline to create E10 is the saving of approximately 500,000 tonnes of CO2 emitted from vehicle tailpipes on an annual basis.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp8

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased sales of existing products and services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Eswatini

☑ Spain

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Several of our businesses are contributing to decarbonisation by exporting renewable energy to national grids. During 2023, 909 GWh of renewable energy generated by our sites was exported, with ABF Sugar contributing 94% towards the Group total

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The impact has not been quantified financially

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Across all ABF Sugar sites combined heat and power plants (CHP) are used to provide the steam and electricity needed throughout the sugar-making process. By efficiently generating its own heat and electrical energy, the business is reducing its carbon emissions and impact on the environment. The surplus electricity is fed back to the national grid from some operations including the UK, Spain and Eswatini. In June 2023, Illovo Sugar Africa's Eston plant also started to export power into their national grid.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp9

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Development of new products or services through R&D and innovation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We have identified an environmental opportunity in the area of on-farm carbon measurement. AB Agri, our agrifood business, has taken the opportunity to calculate the environmental footprint of its products. AB Agri has committed to calculating product environmental footprints for all branded animal nutrition products by 2027. To do this, it has developed a carbon footprint tool for its feed using emission values from the Global Feed LCA Institute GFLI database. While this database provides a lot of information there is still a significant gap in the industry's emission value information. In addition, AB Agri's business AB Sustain runs VIVE a programme which its customers use to monitor and improve environmental and social aspects of their agricultural commodity supply chain

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

The impact has not been quantified financially

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

To realise this opportunity, this year AB Agri gathered emission values for all the raw materials used in its compound feeds globally. This has been achieved by using data values provided by suppliers where available. Otherwise, it has been established using suitable proxies based on nearest type of raw material, or closest/ similar location, or by working with external experts. The values within the tool are then incorporated into formulation systems, which calculate a total carbon footprint for products. To ensure the approach is robust, the carbon footprint tool and methodology was peer reviewed by University College, London. The business is now mapping out its speciality feed ingredients. This is much more complex as in many cases this information is unavailable or not easily accessible. Working closely with its technical teams, suppliers and carbon footprint specialists, it aims to have completed this work by 2025, with all remaining products completed by 2027. The AB

Sustain VIVE programme supports its customers to encourage further economic viability, social protection and environmental preservation within their selected agricultural commodities supply chain, by monitoring performance of nearly 1,000 indicators, including due diligence on child labour and worker rights. As VIVE is aligned to the UN SDG targets and is benchmarked to different sustainability initiatives and standards such a SAI Platform and ProTerra, a single VIVE assessment also enables assessment against other programmes. Where supply chain issues are identified, the VIVE customer engages in remediation to ensure that action plans are created, implemented and evaluated as part of continuous improvement. These indicators and remediation plans are monitored through independent second-party assessments by organisations such as Control Union and SGS. This approach to supply chain transparency is enabling buyers of VIVE-assessed products to better understand supply chain-issues and further collaborate with suppliers.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp10

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Reduced water usage and consumption

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Spain

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Douro

☑ Ebro

☑ Guadalquivir

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Reducing water use while trying to maintain or improve yields in an increasingly hot climate is a difficult goal to achieve for ABF Sugar and its growers. Azucarera is leveraging innovative and smart technology to harness the sun instead of fighting it.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The impact has not been quantified financially

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Working alongside the Research Association for Sugar Beet Crop Improvement (AIMCRA), Azucarera has installed more than 80 more sustainable watering systems. The innovative structures extract water from an underground well, powered entirely by solar energy. They have reduced water consumption by 20%, representing an annual saving of 1.6 million m3 of water. By replacing a less-efficient diesel-powered system, they have also saved around 28,000 litres of diesel per year.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp11

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In 2018 AB Agri launched NovaPro a product derived from rapeseed, once the seed has been crushed for oil. NovaPro has been proven to perform as well as soya in dairy cow diets and has the benefit of being a coproduct of rapeseed oil production. More than 40000 tonnes of NovaPro are now supplied to UK farms per year saving more than 130000 tonnes CO2e compared with an equivalent South American soya-based diet.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

The impact has not been quantified financially

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The impact has not been quantified financially

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Deforestation is a key focus area within AB Agri's Responsible Sourcing Policy and that of many of our customers. NovaPro is a proven alternative feed ingredient for dairy cattle instead of soy, without the risks of deforestation. It is therefore positioned well to increase its growth in use, as the dairy supply chain from farmer to processor seeks to reduce deforestation. Hence our strategy is to align with the developing needs of this supply chain.
[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Not quantified

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Not quantified

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Not quantified

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Not quantified

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Not quantified

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Not quantified
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

We operate under the principle that we should be a Group where anyone with ambition and talent can have a great career, regardless of their age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, educational and socio-economic background, cognitive and personal strengths or any of the other qualities that make people unique. In respect of Board composition: we are committed to: • maintaining at least 33% female directors on the Board; and • maintaining at least one person from an ethnic minority background on the Board; we also aspire to: • having at least 40% female directors on the Board by the end of 2025; and • maintaining at least one woman in

the Chair, Chief Executive, Finance Director or Senior Independent Director role. In line with the UK Corporate Governance Code and the Listing Rules, we will report annually on Board diversity within the Corporate Governance statement in our Annual Report, including on the implementation of this policy.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

ABF_Board_Diversity_Policy.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify **:**The STIP for executive directors is primarily based on the financial performance of the Company. 15% of the STIP is based on ESG performance.

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board continues to have oversight over, and responsibility for, climate-related risks and opportunities. The Board receives specific updates each year on climate and other ESG matters from the Group Corporate Responsibility Director, the Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and the Chief People and Performance Officer. This year, this included: • an update on TCFD requirements and the additional areas we are required to report against • our approach to transition plans and why the focus is on ABF Sugar and Primark • an update on UK Mandatory Climate Disclosures and which entities are in scope • update on strategic decisions taken by businesses in addressing climate change and wider ESG issues The Board receives relevant updates, such as updates on transition plans throughout the year outside of this annual presentation. All operating businesses present periodically to the Board, including on significant climate matters. The Board is proactive and has taken prior assessments of climate risks and opportunities and information from the above meetings and used these to influence strategic decisions. In 2023 this has primarily crystallised through approval and drive of transition plans. From this year we are including an ESG and Strategic KPI element in our short-term incentive plan (STIP) for executive directors. Our governance processes in relation to overseeing, assessing and managing climate-related issues evolve every year. This year we enhanced our processes to address the evolving requirements of climate change and other ESG matters.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The board of Associated British Foods plc (the Board) is responsible for overseeing our businesses' management of forest-related issues. The Board reviews each business segment in depth every year, which includes a review of material ESG issues, potentially including forest-related issues. The Board receives specific updates each year on climate and other material ESG matters, which could include forest-related issues, from the Group Corporate Responsibility Director, the Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and the Chief People and Performance Officer. All operating businesses present periodically to the Board, including on significant environmental matters, which includes forest-related issues. Both the Board and the Audit Committee have been briefed specifically on the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) reporting (see 2023 Annual Report pages 56 to 67).

Water

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

Select all that apply
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify **:**The STIP for executive directors is primarily based on the financial performance of the Company. 15% of the STIP is based on ESG performance

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The board of Associated British Foods plc (the Board) is responsible for overseeing our businesses' management of water-related issues. The Board reviews each business segment in depth every year, which includes a review of material ESG issues, potentially including water-related issues. The Board receives specific updates each year on climate and other material ESG matters, which could include water-related issues, from the Group Corporate Responsibility Director, the Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and the Chief People and Performance Officer. All operating businesses present periodically to the Board, including on significant environmental matters, which includes water-related issues. Both the Board and the Audit Committee have been briefed specifically on the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) reporting (see 2023 Annual Report pages 56 to 67).

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify **:**The STIP for executive directors is primarily based on the financial performance of the Company. 15% of the STIP is based on ESG performance

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board receives updates and provides views on TCFD- related matters. As part of an annual standing agenda item, the Board receives updates in February and September from the Group Corporate Responsibility Director and the Chief People and Performance Officer on any material climate, water and environmental issues. In February 2023, the Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary, Group Corporate Responsibility Director and the Finance Project Director for ESG and TCFD Reporting presented an ESG update to the Board. This included an update on the Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme. Individual businesses may also include biodiversity-related matters in their regular updates to the Board as appropriate to their business.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience
☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition
☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

☑ Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

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

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition
☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and Chief people and Performance Officer

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary who reports to the Chief Executive and has responsibility for ESG issues. He acts as the focal point for communications to the Board and shareholders on ESG matters. The Chief People and Performance Officer (CPPO) who reports to the Chief Executive and has responsibility for initiatives within procurement in our supply chains, the coordination of environmental reporting across our operations.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary who reports to the Chief Executive and has responsibility for ESG issues. He acts as the focal point for communications to the Board and shareholders on ESG matters

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and Chief people and Performance Officer

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary who reports to the Chief Executive and has responsibility for ESG issues. He acts as the focal point for communications to the Board and shareholders on ESG matters. The Chief People and Performance Officer (CPPO) who reports to the Chief Executive and has responsibility for initiatives within procurement in our supply chains, the coordination of environmental reporting across our operations.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary who reports to the Chief Executive and has responsibility for ESG issues. He acts as the focal point for communications to the Board and shareholders on ESG matters
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

15

(4.5.3) Please explain

15% of the short-term incentive targets for the Chief Executive and Finance Director, equivalent to 30% of base salary, is linked to strategic, primarily ESG, measures. See pages 104, 105, 107 and 108 of the ABF Annual Report 2023 for further details. The same target applies for a further 39 people within the Group. Climate related targets are included in the personal performance incentive assessment of senior management. Primark also has a n ESG element on their director incentives which applies to 79 people..

Forests

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

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to introduce them in the next two years

(4.5.3) Please explain

15% of short-term incentive targets for the Chief Executive and Finance Director, equivalent to 30% of base salary, is linked to strategic, primarily ESG, measures. See pages 104, 105, 107 and 108 of the ABF Annual Report 2023 for further details. The same target applies for a further 39 people within the Group. Climate related targets are included in the personal performance incentive assessment of senior management. Primark also has a n ESG element on their director incentives which applies to 79 people.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

15

(4.5.3) Please explain

15% of short-term incentive targets for the Chief Executive and Finance Director, equivalent to 30% of base salary, is linked to strategic, primarily ESG, measures. See pages 104, 105, 107 and 108 of the ABF Annual Report 2023 for further details. The same target applies for a further 39 people within the Group. Climate related targets are included in the personal performance incentive assessment of senior management. Primark also has a n ESG element on their director incentives which applies to 79 people.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply
☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets
☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Increased alignment of capex with transition plan and/or sustainable finance taxonomy

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

This year our STIP strategic KPIs were all related to ESG. We are committed to a range of sustainability goals and believe that the best way to incentivise management to deliver these is by setting targets in their short-term incentive plans linked to the delivery of key projects. In line with our governance model, we have assessed the STIP outcome taking into account progress in four key areas: Primark sustainability, People and community, Carbon, Water. In relation to carbon KPIs include: • Progress on key Sugar projects in the UK designed to reduce carbon emissions including:• modifications to driers to enable them to run on natural gas rather than coal; and • removing calcium from juice to enable evaporators to operate more efficiently.• For further information please refer to page 65 of our Annual Report 2023. The targets set were demanding and tightly-aligned with our approach to ESG. For more details please see page 104 of our Annual Report 2023.

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

The incentive is linked to the delivery of projects that will lead to progress against our top ESG priorities.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water accounting, reporting, and third-party verification

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

This year our STIP strategic KPIs were all related to ESG. We are committed to a range of sustainability goals and believe that the best way to incentivise management to deliver these is by setting targets in their short-term incentive plans linked to the delivery of key projects. In line with our governance model, we have assessed the STIP outcome taking into account progress in four key areas: Primark sustainability, People and community, Carbon, Water. In relation to water KPIs include: • Around half of Illovo abstraction sites have 95% instrumentation accuracy and capital plans are in place to ensure remaining sites are at this level by the end of 2024.• Carried out annual water risk assessments for our operations using internationally recognised methodologies to identify sites in water-stressed areas. • 25% of water abstracted was reused before being returned to watercourses. The targets set were demanding and tightly-aligned with our approach to ESG. For more details please see page 104 of our Annual Report 2023.

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

The incentive is linked to the delivery of projects that will lead to progress against our top ESG priorities.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Increased alignment of capex with transition plan and/or sustainable finance taxonomy

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

This year our STIP strategic KPIs were all related to ESG. We are committed to a range of sustainability goals, including reaching net zero by 2050, and believe that the best way to incentivise management to deliver this is by setting targets in their short-term incentive plans linked to the delivery of key projects. In line with our governance model, we have assessed the STIP outcome taking into account progress in four key areas: Primark sustainability, People and community, Carbon, Water. In relation to carbon KPIs include: • Progress on key Sugar projects in the UK designed to reduce carbon emissions including:• modifications to driers to enable them to run on natural gas rather than coal; and • removing calcium from juice to enable evaporators to operate more efficiently.• For further information please refer to page 65 of our Annual Report 2023. The targets set were demanding and tightly-aligned with our approach to ESG. For more details please see page 104 of our Annual Report 2023.

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

The incentive is linked to the delivery of projects that will lead to progress against our top ESG priorities.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water accounting, reporting, and third-party verification

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

This year our STIP strategic KPIs were all related to ESG. We are committed to a range of sustainability goals and believe that the best way to incentivise management to deliver these is by setting targets in their short-term incentive plans linked to the delivery of key projects. In line with our governance model, we have assessed the STIP outcome taking into account progress in four key areas: Primark sustainability, People and community, Carbon, Water. In relation to water KPIs include: • Around half of Illovo abstraction sites have 95% instrumentation accuracy and capital plans are in place to ensure remaining sites are at this level by the end of 2024.• Carried out annual water risk assessments for our operations using internationally recognised methodologies to identify sites in water-stressed areas. • 25% of water abstracted was reused before being returned to watercourses. The targets set were demanding and tightly-aligned with our approach to ESG. For more details please see page 104 of our Annual Report 2023.

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

The incentive is linked to the delivery of projects that will lead to progress against our top ESG priorities.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

ABF Group Environment Policy: The Group Environment Policy sets the minimum expectations on businesses. Responsibility for compliance with the Group Policy and any divisional or business-level policies is devolved to the chief executive or managing director of each of our businesses.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

ABF046_Environment-Policy.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water
☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

ABF Group Supplier Code of Conduct sets out the minimum standards which we expect our suppliers and partners to comply with.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

Water-specific commitments

☑ Other water-related commitment, please specify :The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes.

Social commitments

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

ABF-Supplier-Code-of-Conduct-Policy.pdf

Row 4

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Selected facilities, businesses or geographies only

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Primark support approaches and systems commits to protect the world's ancient and endangered forests by applying circular design principles, procuring responsibly and prioritising Next Generation Solutions in the future. Wood-Derived Materials must NOT: • Derive from unknown sources, or timber that has been illegally harvested or traded, • Originate from wood harvested from Ancient or Endangered Forests such as the Canadian and Russian Boreal Forests, Coastal Temperate Rainforests; tropical forests and peatlands of Indonesia, the Amazon, and West Africa, • Originate from endangered species habitat, • Originate from wood harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights, • Originate from wood harvested in contravention of First Nations/tribal/indigenous peoples' and community rights, • Originate from wood harvested in forests where high conservation values are threatened, • Originate from wood harvested in forests which have converted to plantations or non-forest use post-1994, • Originate from wood harvested from forests that contain species that have been genetically modified. Moreover, according to the policy: • Materials should be certified by a recognised forest management certification scheme, preferably FSC, if virgin materials are being used, • Man Made cellulosic fibres should be purchased from fibre producers with a Canopy green shirt Hot Button ranking rating.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species

Social commitments

☑ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of commodities covered by the policy

☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Primark-Wood-andâ€“ Wood-Fibre-Policy-2022 (1).pdf

Row 5

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Selected facilities, businesses or geographies only

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

AB Agri are committed to playing their part in collaborating across their industry to enable it to achieve zero deforestation. The business has committed that by 2025 all its soya and palm oil usage will be certificated, supporting zero deforestation responsible sourcing schemes. For clarity, this would include palm oil and palm derivatives, palm kernel expeller, soya meal, beans, oil and soya bean meal concentrates. This is a complex objective, and a regional approach has been taken, regarding how the business will achieve it's goals across the globe, to consider legislation, supply chains and market forces. In the UK and EU markets AB Agri began the process of eliminating deforestation, prioritising soya meal usage in the businesses own brand products as certified responsibly sourced, with FEFAC

Benchmark approved responsible sourcing schemes, on a book and claim basis. AB Agri have developed wider coverage and are gradually replacing book and claim supply chains for soya with mass balance models. Since 2015, AB Agri have, and will continue to source 100% of their global palm oil and palm oil derivatives sustainably using RSPO Palm Trace certificated, formally Green Palm. Since 2016, a proportion of their sustainable palm oil used is sourced via the mass balance method. AB Agri are investigating practicalities of moving towards a more physical supply chain for palm. From Sep 2023, they will certify 100% of AB Agri's Palm Kernel expeller usage.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to no-deforestation by target date, please specify **:**2025

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Deforestation Statement printable _ 1 document (1).pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ B Corporation
☑ UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy
☑ Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS)
☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Soy (RTRS)
☑ Sustainable Apparel Coalition (SAC)
☑ Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC)
☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
☑ Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI)
☑ Ellen MacArthur Foundation Global Commitment
☑ Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP)
☑ Other, please specify **:Textiles 2030 Australian Foods Pact Australian Packaging Covenant Organisation (APCO) National Plastics and Recycling Scheme (NPRS) European Feed Manufacturers' Federation (FEFAC)'s Sustainability Committee Courtauld Commitment 2030**

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

Primark has committed to reducing absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 50% by 2030 from a 2018/19 base year. This year, Primark has also had its science-based target validated by the SBTi. The Primark business has also committed to Textiles 2030, a voluntary initiative led by WRAP, which includes a target to reduce the aggregate GHG footprint of new products by 50%. In partnership with WRAP and Textile 2030 signatories, Primark continues to explore creating an industry standard for durability, as one currently does not exist. Primark is working alongside WRAP and its signatories to develop a set of testing protocols by product category and create the foundations for a minimum durability standard. Primark joined the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) as a funding member in December 2021, supporting its approach to improve the use of water resources and its commitment to adopt and promote a universal water stewardship framework, the AWS Standard. Through an AWS-led Impact Accelerator programme, Primark committed to its first collective action project last year, enrolling 15 key suppliers based in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The programme is designed to bring brands, governing bodies and other stakeholders together to tackle shared water challenges within a water catchment area. ABF Sugar is an active member of the Sustainable Agricultural Initiative (SAI), the global food and drink industry platform for developing sustainable agriculture solutions, and a founding member of its Regenerative Agriculture Platform. Growers for Azucarera and British Sugar and Illovo's estates are using the SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) tool to drive continuous improvement in on-farm sustainability practices. ABF Sugar is committed to reducing Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 30% from a 2018 baseline by 2030. It is in the process of validating its reduction targets of Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions against the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), with this process likely to be completed by the end of the calendar year. AB Agri is an active member of the European Feed Manufacturers' Federation (FEFAC) Sustainability Committee, which introduced soya sourcing guidelines in October 2015, as well as the Agricultural Industries Confederation Sustainability Committee and the UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy. Since 2009, businesses within the UK Grocery division have supported the Waste Resources Action Programme (WRAP) food sector-wide Courtauld Commitment. Initially focused on waste reduction, the programme has evolved to include supply chain decarbonisation. UK Grocery businesses are signatories to the Courtauld Commitment 2030, which outlines an ambitious set of industry-wide targets aligned to a 1.5C pathway. The commitment is to achieve net zero by 2050 across the wider food sector. UK Grocery has committed to a 50% reduction across Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 2030 against a 2015 baseline, in line with the Courtauld Commitment 2030. For UK Grocery businesses, the Courtauld Commitment 2030 includes the goal to deliver a 50% per capita reduction in food waste by 2030 against the UK 2007 baseline (covering manufacture, retail, hospitality and food service, and household). The Courtauld Commitment 2030 includes an overall target that 50% of fresh food is sourced from areas with sustainable water management by 2030. Since 2018, UK Grocery's businesses have been members of the UK Plastics Pact. Led by WRAP, the voluntary UK Plastics Pact commits signatories to eliminate problematic or unnecessary single-use packaging through redesign, innovation or alternative delivery models. The commitment requires food

producers and other users of plastic materials to factor recyclability into the specification and design of their packaging, and the waste reprocessing sector to adapt to ensure that those materials that technically can be recycled easily are collected and taken for reprocessing. Similarly, George Weston Foods is a signatory to the Australian Packaging Covenant Organisation (APCO) 2025 National Packaging Targets and a foundational member of the National Plastics and Recycling Scheme (NPRS). The NPRS is being developed by Australia's food and grocery manufacturing industry, with funding support from the federal government, to create a new advanced recycling industry in Australia, aiming to turn plastic packaging back into new food-grade packaging. In 2022, George Weston Foods' Tip Top Bakeries became a signatory of the Australian Food Pact which aims to halve food waste in Australia by 2030. y. Tip Top Bakeries sends
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

(4.11.3) Global environmental treaties or policy goals in line with public commitment or position statement

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

abf-responsibility-report-2023.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

ABF is both diversified and decentralised. We wholly support policies that are aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C. We are successful because we trust the people who run our businesses. Close to their markets, they use their knowledge, skills and judgement to serve their customers. The Group provides a framework of expectations and engages with our business leaders, but it doesn't dictate the specific agendas or methods used by the businesses, which operate within unique markets where solutions to complex sustainability issues may vary. Our Group Company Secretary acts as a focal point for corporate governance and corporate responsibility communications. This role regularly liaises with Corporate Responsibility, Public Relations and other advocacy-related roles within the businesses to ensure alignment. This happens when required and through a formal annual reporting process whereby the businesses provide information on their internal activities, work with their value chain and any public policy activities related to a range of corporate responsibility issues including water stewardship. Any public policy engagement conducted by the businesses must be approved at a senior level. The businesses review engagement activities to ensure they are aware of current and future legislation that will impact their value chains. Policy engagement covers energy, waste, water and other issues that the businesses and the Group as a whole consider to represent a risk or an opportunity. Engagement activities are reviewed at least annually to ensure alignment with Group strategy and the policy landscape. In line with our devolved business model, our businesses set plans and targets that are appropriate to their operations and supply chains. Our businesses are all committed to cutting their Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and several of our businesses have set their own GHG emissions reduction targets. ABF Sugar, Primark, Twinings Ovaltine and UK Grocery have all set specific reduction targets. Primark has set targets in line with the Science Based Targets initiative ('SBTi'). ABF Sugar is in the process of validating its reduction targets against the SBTi, and we expect this work to be completed by the end of the calendar year.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ European Feed Manufacturers' Federation (FEFAC)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

AB Agri agree with the importance of correct provision of animal nutrients to optimise performance on efficient growth, fertility and animal health which all are beneficial to carbon emissions. AB Agri also support the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines which were updated in July 2023 and act a benchmark for schemes delivering the requirements and in doing so avoiding deforestation which is a known drive of climate change. FEFAC is also a member of the Global Feed Life Cycle Institute (GFLI) as is AB Agri. The GFLI has enabled a standardised methodology for developing carbon values for feed ingredients which is aligned with EU PEFCR and FAO LEAP.

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ No, we have not evaluated

Row 4

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**British Retail Consortium

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

In the UK, Primark is a member of the British Retail Consortium (BRC). BRC campaigns for the retail industry and engages with government on matters relevant to the sector. Primark is a signatory to the BRC's Climate Action Roadmap, the retail industry’s commitment to deliver net zero in their own operations and the products they sell by 2040.

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

110000

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

To promote the story of retail in the UK, help shape debates and influence policy on issues that are important to the sector, including climate change and climate action..

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization’s engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 5

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**Irish Business and Employers Confederation (Ibec) and Retail Ireland

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

In the Republic of Ireland, where Primark is headquartered, Primark are a member of the Irish Business and Employers Confederation (Ibec) and Retail Ireland. Retail Ireland provide a public affairs service on policy developments at Irish and EU level. Primark works with the trade association on submissions to public consultations.

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

123000

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

To represent the sectors and Primark's interests to Government, media and all other stakeholders. Provision of professional services relating to EHS, employee relations and employment law

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 6

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**EuroCommerce

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

Primark is a member of EuroCommerce, the principal European organisation representing the retail and wholesale sector. EuroCommerce advises members of key legislative files at EU level, providing information, updates and access to policymakers. Primark is also a member of the Policy Hub in Amsterdam, which works with the apparel and footwear industry on policies that accelerate circular practices..

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

42000

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

To further Primark's understanding of EU legislative files and provide a conduit for influencing policy, including climate-related policy.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Biodiversity indicators

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status metrics

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

all

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

abf-responsibility-report-2023.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Our Responsibility Report 2023 was published in November 2023 and, unless otherwise indicated, the information and data recorded relates to the period from 1 August 2022 to 31 July 2023. It has been independently assured by Ernst & Young (EY) against the International Federation of Accountants' International Standard on Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information – known as ISAE 3000 (Revised). EY has provided independent limited assurance over the 29 environment and safety key performance indicators (KPIs) for the year ended 31 July 2023 and those non-financial KPIs reported on page 13 of our Annual Report 2023.

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Commodity volumes
☑ Deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status metrics
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Water accounting figures

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

AR: Page 46-68

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

abf-annual-report-2023.pdf.downloadasset (1).pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

We published our approach to TCFD in the 2021 Annual Report before our first TCFD report in the 2022 Annual Report. Last year we met the requirements of Listing Rule 9.8.6R with TCFD disclosures in line with the 2017 TCFD framework. This year we have applied the same framework, now including the 2021 implementation guidance which requires details of transition plans. For the first time, we have included transition plans for ABF Sugar and Primark as they contribute most significantly to adjusted operating profit and total GHG emissions. Twinings' transition plan will be included next year. These disclosures also meet the Companies Act 2006 requirement to make UK Mandatory Climate Disclosures.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Scenario analysis for Climate has been carried out and disclosed in our TCFD report. Wider environmental scenario analysis and assessment is being considered with the view to emerging regulation in the area, such as CSRD. The Board is accountable for risk management, for agreeing the principal, including emerging, risks facing the Group and ensuring these are successfully managed by the businesses. ESG risks are considered by the Board alongside other principal business risks.

The process for identifying and assessing ESG risks is the same as for other risks within the Group and sits with the business where the risk resides. These risks are collated and reviewed at both a business and divisional level, and then reported to the Director of Financial Control, who reviews any risks material to the relevant division with the Board. For example, Our Ingredients businesses source agricultural commodities, such as palm oil, that are linked with potential risks related to deforestation and biodiversity loss. AB Mauri and ABFI's purchasing practices are guided by these risks.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA SDS

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We decided to undertake a detailed assessment of climate risks and opportunities focusing on ABF Sugar, Primark and Twinings, our most material businesses, comprising 76% of Group adjusted operating profit (2022 – 81%) and 72% of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas ('GHG') emissions (2022 – 70%), mainly from ABF Sugar and Twinings. We used third-party experts, to advise us on, and then carry out, scenario analysis. While many scenario models and techniques are advanced, we recognise that knowledge in this area is growing and we should expect models and pathways to evolve with time. Models also have limitations, and there are certain areas which are challenging to model, such as the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. However, our businesses are still able to consider how they would mitigate or adapt to such events. Additionally, in certain situations different models can project contrasting results. In these situations, we have considered how different outcomes may impact our businesses..

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The International Energy Agency's (IEA) scenarios have been used to assess transition impacts with each scenario built on a set of assumptions on how the energy system might evolve. Each scenario has a different temperature outcome. We used scenarios covering 1.5C,

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We decided to undertake a detailed assessment of climate risks and opportunities focusing on ABF Sugar, Primark and Twinings our most material businesses, comprising 76% of Group adjusted operating profit (2022 – 81%) and 72% of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas ('GHG') emissions (2022 – 70%), mainly from ABF Sugar and Twinings. We used our third-party experts, South Pole, to advise us on, and then carry out, scenario analysis. While many scenario models and techniques are advanced, we recognise that knowledge in this area is growing and we should expect models and pathways to evolve with time. Models also have limitations, and there are certain areas which are challenging to model, such as the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. However, our businesses are still able to consider how they would mitigate or adapt to such events. Additionally, in certain situations different models can project contrasting results. In these situations, we have considered how different outcomes would impact our businesses.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 were used to analyse impact of flooding risk on Primark's third-party manufacturers. Bangladesh is exposed to both coastal and river flooding. The flood risk outcomes through to 2030 are minimal, but by 2050 there is a distinct increase.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We decided to undertake a detailed assessment of climate risks and opportunities focusing on BF Sugar, Primark and Twinings remain our most material businesses, comprising 76% of Group adjusted operating profit (2022 – 81%) and 72% of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas ('GHG') emissions (2022 – 70%), mainly from ABF Sugar and Twinings. We used our third-party experts, South Pole, to advise us on, and then carry out, scenario analysis. While many scenario models and techniques are advanced, we recognise that knowledge in this area is growing and we should expect models and pathways to evolve with time. Models also have limitations, and there are certain areas which are challenging to model, such as the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. However, our businesses are still able to consider how they would mitigate or adapt to such events. Additionally, in certain situations different models can project contrasting results. In these situations, we have considered how different outcomes may impact our businesses.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The International Energy Agency's (IEA) scenarios have been used to assess transition impacts with each scenario built on a set of assumptions on how the energy system might evolve. Each scenario has a different temperature outcome. We used scenarios covering 1.5C,

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We decided to undertake a detailed assessment of climate risks and opportunities focusing on ABF Sugar, Primark and Twinings, our most material businesses, comprising 76% of Group adjusted operating profit (2022 – 81%) and 72% of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas ('GHG') emissions (2022 – 70%), mainly from ABF Sugar and Twinings. We used our third-party experts, South Pole, to advise us on, and then carry out, scenario analysis. While many scenario models and techniques are advanced, we recognise that knowledge in this area is growing and we should expect models and pathways to evolve with time. Models also have limitations, and there are certain areas which are challenging to model, such as the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. However, our businesses are

still able to consider how they would mitigate or adapt to such events. Additionally, in certain situations different models can project contrasting results. In these situations, we have considered how different outcomes may impact our businesses.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The International Energy Agency's (IEA) scenarios have been used to assess transition impacts with each scenario built on a set of assumptions on how the energy system might evolve. Each scenario has a different temperature outcome. We used scenarios covering 1.5C,

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Acute physical

☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Cost of capital
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We decided to undertake a detailed assessment of climate risks and opportunities focusing on ABF Sugar, Primark and Twinings remain our most material businesses, comprising 76% of Group adjusted operating profit (2022 – 81%) and 72% of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas ('GHG') emissions (2022 – 70%), mainly from ABF Sugar and Twinings. We used our third-party experts, South Pole, to advise us on, and then carry out, scenario analysis. While many scenario models and techniques are advanced, we recognise that knowledge in this area is growing and we should expect models and pathways to evolve with time. Models also have limitations, and there are certain areas which are challenging to model, such as the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. However, our businesses are still able to consider how they would mitigate or adapt to such events. Additionally, in certain situations different models can project contrasting results. In these situations, we have considered how different outcomes would impact our businesses. We used the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) to assess physical climate risk. RCPs are commonly used by climate scientists to assess physical climate risk, with each pathway representing a different greenhouse gas concentration trajectory which can then be translated into global warming impacts. We used climate data from the World Climate Research Programmes Coupled Model Intercomparison Project – Phase 5 (CMIP 5 adjusted for spatial resolution and bias corrected) to do this translation. RCPs feed into climate, crop and flood models. In all physical risk analysis we have used the RCP8.5 scenario, which is widely considered to represent one of the worst-case climate scenarios. In addition to RCP8.5, the evaluation of physical risks has been supplemented where useful, with analysis using either RCP2.6 or RCP4.5 scenarios, depending on which climate scenario is most applicable to the risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our third-party experts advised us which crop models to use to assess climate change impacts on crop yields. In some cases (e.g. for cotton and tea), only one crop model was available that was deemed to be sufficiently robust to use to evaluate future climate impacts on yields. Although in these situations only one crop model was used, the analysis was based on the input of five climate models providing sensitivity to the analysis. For other crops (e.g. sugar cane, wheat and corn), multiple crop models were used.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We decided to undertake a detailed assessment of climate risks and opportunities focusing on ABF Sugar, Primark and Twinings remain our most material businesses, comprising 76% of Group adjusted operating profit (2022 – 81%) and 72% of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas ('GHG') emissions (2022 – 70%), mainly from ABF Sugar and Twinings. We used our third-party experts, South Pole, to advise us on, and then carry out, scenario analysis. While many scenario models and techniques are advanced, we recognise that knowledge in this area is growing and we should expect models and pathways to evolve with time. Models also have limitations, and there are certain areas which are challenging to model, such as the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. However, our businesses are still able to consider how they would mitigate or adapt to such events. Additionally, in certain situations different models can project contrasting results. In these situations, we have considered how different outcomes would impact our businesses. We used the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) to assess physical climate risk. RCPs are commonly used by climate scientists to assess physical climate risk, with each pathway representing a different greenhouse gas concentration trajectory which can then be translated into global warming impacts. We used climate data from the World Climate Research Programmes Coupled Model Intercomparison Project – Phase 5 (CMIP 5 adjusted for spatial resolution and bias corrected) to do this

translation. RCPs feed into climate, crop and flood models. In all physical risk analysis we have used the RCP8.5 scenario, which is widely considered to represent one of the worst-case climate scenarios. In addition to RCP8.5, the evaluation of physical risks has been supplemented where useful, with analysis using either RCP2.6 or RCP4.5 scenarios, depending on which climate scenario is most applicable to the risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our third-party experts advised us which crop models to use to assess climate change impacts on crop yields. In some cases (e.g. for cotton and tea), only one crop model was available that was deemed to be sufficiently robust to use to evaluate future climate impacts on yields. Although in these situations only one crop model was used, the analysis was based on the input of five climate models providing sensitivity to the analysis. For other crops (e.g. sugar cane, wheat and corn), multiple crop models were used.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We decided to undertake a detailed assessment of climate risks and opportunities focusing on ABF Sugar, Primark and Twinings our most material businesses, comprising 76% of Group adjusted operating profit (2022 – 81%) and 72% of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas ('GHG') emissions (2022 – 70%), mainly from ABF Sugar and Twinings. We used our third-party experts, South Pole, to advise us on, and then carry out, scenario analysis. While many scenario models and techniques are advanced, we recognise that knowledge in this area is growing and we should expect models and pathways to evolve with time. Models also have limitations, and there are certain areas which are challenging to model, such as the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. However, our businesses are still able to consider how they would mitigate or adapt to such events. Additionally, in certain situations different models can project contrasting results. In these situations, we have considered how different outcomes may impact our businesses. We used the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) to assess physical climate risk. RCPs are commonly used by climate scientists to assess physical climate risk, with each pathway representing a different greenhouse gas concentration trajectory which can then be translated into global warming impacts. We used climate data from the World Climate Research Programmes Coupled Model Intercomparison Project – Phase 5 (CMIP 5 adjusted for spatial resolution and bias corrected) to do this translation. RCPs feed into climate, crop and flood models. In all physical risk analysis we have used the RCP8.5 scenario, which is widely considered to represent one of the worst-case climate scenarios with temperatures reaching some 4C above pre-industrial levels by 2100. This scenario projects an extreme view of physical climate change impacts.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our third-party experts advised us which crop models to use to assess climate change impacts on crop yields. In some cases (e.g. for cotton and tea), only one crop model was available that was deemed to be sufficiently robust to use to evaluate future climate impacts on yields. Although in these situations only one crop model was used, the analysis was based on the input of five climate models providing sensitivity to the analysis. For other crops (e.g. sugar cane, wheat and corn), multiple crop models were used.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

Scenario analysis has helped our businesses confirm the actions they need to take and strategies they need to adopt on an ongoing basis to mitigate and adapt to risks and take advantage of opportunities. Mitigating actions are managed by the relevant businesses as the actions are specific to them. We consider that the scenario analysis performed in conjunction with the mitigating actions undertaken by our businesses demonstrate that our business models and strategy are resilient to climate change in each of the transition and physical scenarios outlined above. Having evaluated, using scenario analysis, all physical and transition risks in the table on page 58 of the 2023 Annual Report, we disclose below the risks we believe have the potential to be the most financially significant and/or of the most interest to stakeholders. Climate impact on cotton yields hold a low risk through to 2030, and medium risk through 2050. the outcomes to 2030 show that effects of climate risks such as extreme temperatures, heavy rainfall and timing/duration of monsoon season range from virtually no impact to a reduction of approximately 4% under RCP8.5. The outcomes to 2050 project a negative impact on yield of 14% under RCP8.5 and 4% under RCP2.6 before mitigating actions. We assessed the Impact of climate on sugar yields in Africa (Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania and Zambia), which resulted in a low risk through to 2030, and medium risk through 2050. Climate impact on sugar yields varies country by country. The outcomes to 2030 under the USDA's EPIC crop model indicate a range from no change to a decline of 10%. The outcomes to 2050 indicate a 5% gain to a 29% decline. Our African sugar businesses already experience and manage significant climate variability, so their responses to weather events are well developed. Improving irrigation efficiency to mitigate the risk of drought, including investing in drip irrigation and river defences to reduce storm damage. Assessment of Climate impact on tea yields resulted in Low risk through 2030 and 2050. The outcomes through 2030 and 2050 show a positive impact on tea yields. However, the crop model has limited representation of acute weather events such as extreme temperatures, heavy rainfall and droughts. We have a well-grounded experience in understanding volatility in regional tea yields as a result of weather events and by extension the world's tea-growing regions. With this, we can respond to extreme weather events by sourcing tea products to continue to produce tea to our set standards. Where this is not an option for single origin blends, the impact would not be material to the business. Twinings' sourcing capability coupled with its blending capability enables the business to manage localised yield issues. Impact of carbon pricing mechanisms on ABF Sugar resulted in a medium risk through to 2030. Incremental impact ranges from 0m to 48m in 2030. ABF Sugar has developed a plan to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 30% by 2030 (from a 2018 baseline), achieved through a series of fuel substitution and energy-efficiency programmes that generally have a return on investment above 15%. Beyond 2030, while some technologies exist, they are not yet commercially viable. Some 12% reduction has already been delivered versus its 2018 baseline. Impact of carbon pricing mechanisms on Primark also resulted in a medium risk through 2050. Incremental impact ranges from 55m to 155m in 2030, driven by hypothetical carbon taxes on Scope 3 upstream emissions. Scope 1 and 2 make up less than 2% of Primark's total emissions. Primark's decarbonisation programme is managed as an integral part of the Primark Cares strategy with a

road map to reduce absolute emissions by 50% by 2030 and mitigate potential exposure to increased carbon taxation. The plan focuses on Primark's top five sourcing markets and support to suppliers with implementing energy-efficient measures and making a switch to renewable sources. The plan does not assume the purchase of offsets. Primark's road map aims to achieve a significant reduction in supplier emissions by the end of the decade and is aligned with the UNFCCC Fashion Industry Charter goal of net zero emissions across all three Scopes by 2050. In line with the 2021 TCFD implementation guidance, this year we are disclosing transition plans for ABF Sugar and Primark. We have applied a materiality-based methodology as set out in the climate risk and opportunity section. ABF Sugar and Primark are currently our largest contributors to GHG emissions. Twinings will be included next year. Please see pages 65-67 of the 2023 Annual Report for more information on the resulting transition plans.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

The analysis shows that the majority of Primark's suppliers in Bangladesh are located in areas of Dhaka which are less susceptible to flooding. • The local Dhaka community regularly deals with flooding and has adapted processes to mitigate its impacts. • Ensuring a geographical spread of supplier factories across China. • Primark's Sourcing Strategy has been in place for two years with a focus on geographical diversification, creating a more balanced global footprint and developing risk mitigation strategies to increase flexibility and agility when unexpected events occur.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Collectively our businesses are working towards an ambition to achieve net zero by 2050 or sooner. Beyond that broad ambition, we do not set groupwide climate-related plans or targets. In line with our devolved business model, our businesses set plans and targets that are appropriate to their operations and supply chains. We are making good progress on our emissions reductions plans. However, achieving net zero across the Group will depend on a number of factors that are currently beyond our control – for example, the availability of renewable energy and the decarbonisation of vehicle fleets and processing equipment. We plan to use our expertise and influence to help address these and shape wider solutions.

(5.2.7) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

Whilst ABF Sugar and Primark prepare and execute their own transition plans, the Board has overall accountability for their transition plans. Transition plans were reviewed by the Board in June. The Board reviews these plans to ensure they align and further the Group's transition to a low-carbon economy. The Board will receive an update annually on the status and execution of the transition plans with the transition plans being revised every three years, or sooner if a material event occurs. The ABF Sugar chief executive and local managing directors are responsible for overseeing climate-related risks, opportunities, overall strategy and transition plans. ABF Sugar holds regular meetings with the corporate centre which act as a forum for climate-related content, particularly updates on: climate commitments, transition plans, GHG reduction roadmaps and any additional risks or opportunities identified. The frequency of these meetings has increased in this first year of reporting on transition plans. The overall responsibility for the Primark transition plan lies with Primark's Chief Financial Officer. The Director of Primark Cares and

Head of Environmental Sustainability work with the Chief Financial Officer to implement the plan. Primark has established dedicated forums for the governance of its decarbonisation strategy (transition plan), which fall under the broader Primark Cares governance structure. In particular, these forums engage key stakeholders across the business, including board members, and cover related climate commitments, GHG emissions reduction roadmaps and any relevant risks or opportunities identified. For additional information, please refer to the Primark Sustainability and Ethics report, 'Governance' section. Additional ad-hoc meetings with the corporate centre have been held in this first year of reporting on transition plans to ensure alignment across the Group,

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ Annually

(5.2.10) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

We have applied a materiality-based methodology as set out in the climate risk and opportunity section. ABF Sugar and Primark are currently our largest contributors to GHG emissions. At present, Primark has not included residual emissions neutralisation ("carbon offsetting") in its transition planning. However, in alignment with industry standards, for its long-term ambition Primark will need to develop an approach to neutralising the residual emissions that will not be abated through its emissions reduction strategy. Key priority areas for action were identified on the basis of the influence and materiality of emissions categories, assessed from the base year of 2018. These are Scope 1 and 2 emissions, where the business has stronger influence, and the most significant Scope 3 categories in terms of absolute emissions. ABF Sugar is committed to reducing absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 30% from a 2018 baseline by 2030. There are assumptions on low-emission technologies for hydrocarbons and government regulations surrounding biogas that underpin its transition plan goals. The above short- and medium-term goals have been identified to achieve ABF Sugar's 2030 commitments. Some of the long-term projects are reliant on external factors. For example, development of hydrogen solutions will require significant government policy change and support. If this does not eventuate, ABF Sugar will have to reassess its long-term plans.

(5.2.11) Description of progress against transition plan disclosed in current or previous reporting period

Since communicating its 2030 commitments in 2021, Primark has started several key projects focussed on the priority areas identified in the road map and using a pilot-learning-scale approach. Once at scale, these projects are expected to drive the bulk of Primark's decarbonisation as they tackle the most material value chain emissions categories. Projects include Renewable energy procurement, Customer education, Energy efficiency improvements in both own operations and supply chain. Primark developed the Packaging Centre of Excellence in 2019 and has set a target to remove all single-use plastic by 2027. It estimates it has already removed and/or avoided more than 1 billion units of single-use plastic from its business in 2019. For more information, please see page 113 of the 023 Responsibility Report. This year, there has been an overall increase of 11% in carbon emissions across the value chain against Primark's baseline year 2018/19. This is the result of an increased volume of material used to produce the products sold over that period. In the short term, this trend is likely to continue, but there will be a decline as Primark increases the use of more sustainably sourced materials across its product range and once the energy programmes being rolled out across the supply chain begin to deliver at scale. Since communicating its 2030 commitments, ABF Sugar has delivered a number of projects to support the transition to a low-carbon economy. These are a sample of the projects ABF Sugar has delivered, there is a larger number and carbon impact. Projects include: Modifications made to the Bury St Edmunds hot gas generator dryer, leading to a 1% decrease in carbon emissions (9,833 tCO2e)., Newark decalcification to, which enables evaporators to operate more energy efficiently, leading to a 0.3% decrease in carbon emissions (3,302 tCO2e). Newark heater, facilitating improved heat transfer and improved energy performance, leading to a 0.2% decrease in carbon emissions (1,758 tCO2e). Wissington Gas turbine performance has been improved, leading to a 1% decrease in

carbon emissions (10,407 tCO2e). A switch from heavy fuel oil to natural gas at the Cantley site, leading to a 0.1% decrease in carbon emissions (1,422 tCO2e). Finally, Bury cossette quality improvement, leading in turn to less process water for sugar extraction and lower evaporation demand. This has led to a 2% decrease in carbon emissions (20,242 tCO2e).

(5.2.12) Attach any relevant documents which detail your climate transition plan (optional)

abf-responsibility-report-2023.pdf

(5.2.13) Other environmental issues that your climate transition plan considers

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Plastics

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(5.2.14) Explain how the other environmental issues are considered in your climate transition plan

Primark has set a target to remove all single-use plastic by 2027 and estimates it has already removed and/or avoided more than 1 billion units of single-use plastic from its business in 2019. Primark has also set targets to develop all clothes to be recyclable by design by 2027 and to develop all clothes from recycled or sustainably sourced materials by 2030. The selection and implementation process for these projects are included in Primark's financial planning process. Each selected project undergoes a formal capital expenditure process where capital spend is involved. Influencing customers on how to use Primark's products is important to support the decarbonisation of its downstream value chain. Key behavioural drivers to emissions reductions include reducing the number of washes, avoiding tumble drying and keeping clothes in active use for longer. Primark's plan is to collaborate with customers and industry partners to advance our understanding and extend our sphere of influence. Building on the learning of small-scale energy and water efficiency pilot projects conducted over years in China using the Apparel Impact Institutes (Aii) Clean by Design (CBD), Primark has now scaled its energy efficiency programmes to engage 57 factories in Bangladesh, China and Cambodia. Suppliers involved learn about more energy efficient practices and receive support on data collected and analyse to create their own emissions reduction action plan, while improving manufacturing processes. These programmes support improvements in factory operations by delivering training, guidance and workshops.Also, further regenerative agricultural practices will be used in the Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme. Bury cossette quality improvement project initiated by ABF Sugar focused on reducing water usage. Slicer machines were replaced with newer models allowing for higher quality cossette and lower water usage leading in turn to less process water for sugar extraction and lower evaporation demand. This has led to a 2% decrease in carbon emissions (20,242 tCO2e).
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Our businesses and their supply chains rely on a secure supply of finite natural resources, some of which are vulnerable to external factors such as natural disasters and climate change. For example, our Mozambique operation was seriously impacted by severe flooding which resulted in the destruction of over 98% of the sugar

cane crop. In our assessment of climate-related business risks we recognise that the cumulative impacts of changes in weather and water availability could affect our operations at a Group level. However, the diversified and devolved nature of the Group means that mitigation or adaptation strategies are considered and implemented by the individual businesses. Some of our businesses have continued to work with third-party experts to understand climate-related risks and opportunities. The most significant and material risks are incorporated into the business risk registers. Over the past year, our businesses have continued to implement specific projects which aim to reduce the impact of climate change and natural disasters on our businesses. For example, Illovo Sugar is implementing a variety of irrigation and drainage projects across its African businesses. Climate change is creating commercial opportunities, supporting the growth of some businesses which are developing products or co-products such as bioethanol, and sustainability services to help customers respond to climate change such Intellync's supply chain carbon emissions service. Carbon enablement is where our products or services assist others in reducing their carbon emissions. It is integral to several of our businesses' offer to customers, and a key focus for investment and innovation. Several ABF businesses – AB Enzymes, AB Agri and ABF Sugar – have enablement at the core of their purpose. They each play a role in enabling others to reduce Scope 3 emissions. For example, AB Enzymes is an industrial biotech company that specialises in the development of enzymes used by companies in multiple industries. The business has extensive research and development expertise in molecular biology and biochemistry. Enzymes are biological catalysts, found everywhere in nature, that essentially accelerate biochemical reactions. They also biodegrade rapidly, and they are a very effective alternative to petrochemical-based products. AB Enzymes has developed a number of innovative products that enable emissions reductions with no impact on product performance. One example is washing powder that uses a specialist enzyme produced by the business that enables clothes to be washed at 30C just as effectively as at 40C. This has the potential to reduce electricity consumption by around 260kWh or 120 kg of CO2e per 1,000 washes. Another example is related to British Sugar, part of AB Sugar. Across all ABF Sugar sites, combined heat and power plants (CHP) are used to provide the steam and electricity needed throughout the sugar-making process.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Our businesses and their supply chains rely on a secure supply of finite natural resources, some of which are vulnerable to external factors such as natural disasters and climate change. Climate change continues to represent a material risk throughout our supply chains and poses challenges to some of our businesses. Many of our businesses rely on agricultural crops with complex supply chains. Long-term climate change will impact agricultural crops and workers while extreme weather events have the potential to cause disruption to supply chains and operations. For example, extreme adverse weather conditions in the UK resulted in significantly lower beet yields from the 2022/23 crop; British Sugar therefore moved swiftly to secure alternative sources of supply. As each business operates across different geographies, sources different raw materials such as cotton, wheat and sugar, and also has different product lines, they are best placed to decide when they will implement an approach towards climate change. Where climate risks and opportunities are prevalent in our businesses, particularly in agricultural activities in direct operations and supply chain, they form part of regular decision-making processes, are integrated into strategy development and are part of the group's risk management process. Throughout ABF, our supply and value chain depend on our ability to purchase and then produce goods for sale. As part of their strategy planning, ABF's businesses consider various responses including sourcing raw materials from new regions and increasing focus and investment with suppliers to build their resilience to physical climate-related risks over the short to medium term. Our businesses are continuously adapting climate-related physical risks in their sourcing strategies and engage with key suppliers to address climate issues. For example, cotton is critical to Primark, representing a significant share of the total fibre mix in garments sold by Primark.Cotton produced in the Primark's Sustainable Cotton Programme (PSCP) is grown through a unique process using CottonConnect's REEL (responsible environment enhanced livelihoods) Code. Farmers receive multi-year training to address an over dependence on chemical fertilizers and chemical pesticides in order to preserve biodiversity and help mitigate against climate change. Over the past year, our businesses have continued to implement specific projects which aim to reduce the impact of climate change and natural disasters on our businesses. For example, Primark is mobilising a specialist engineering team to support the development of a pilot approach in Bangladesh to support supplier factories to assess and mitigate flood risk.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

As part of their business planning cycle, our businesses consider material impacts from climate change. At the local level, each business considers which R&D programmes they should focus investment in to ensure they are reducing the impact of climate change on their operating model. Technical R&D centres exist at AB Mauri in Australia, the Netherlands, the USA and in the UK, and ABF Ingredients' business AB Enzymes in Finland and Germany. These centres support the technical resources of the divisions and work in collaboration with customers from around the world to bring innovations to local markets. For example, this investment reinforces AB Mauri's position as a technology-led business and market leader in bakery and yeast ingredients. As a result of its focus on innovation AB Mauri's fermentation technology also enjoys a strong position in the bio-ethanol market, a key technology for decarbonising transport. AB Enzymes has extensive research and development expertise in molecular biology and biochemistry. AB Enzymes constantly seeks to improve its products, to find new applications where use of enzymes adds value and to discover novel molecules for the benefit of its customers' products; these include cutting food waste by extending the shelf life of bread, lowering the energy consumption required for the production of paper, and lowering the temperature required for washing detergents resulting in lower energy use by customers. Our scientists and technicians in AB Enzymes' R&D function develop new and improved enzymes and proprietary technologies in order to maintain our competitive edge in innovative and high-quality products. The R&D function includes specialists in molecular biology, biochemistry, microbiology, food chemistry and biotechnology. The UK sugar beet industry funds the independent British Beet Research Organisation (BBRO) through British Sugar and a levy on the beet growers. The BBRO looks at protecting resources, improving yields and productivity and enhancing the environmental impact of the crop. The BBRO Betasoils has a soil health pillar that will have a direct impact on water health. Prior to drilling in 2024/25 the BBRO started a campaign to promote use of the correct amount of nitrogen, based on the RB209 nutrient management recommendation. This has manifested in podcasts, Beet Review articles and BeetTech event output. This activity will be backed up by account managers giving bespoke guidance to assist growers who have elevated levels of amino nitrogen in their sugar beet returns.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

We are reliant on a range of natural resources to deliver our products, and new processes and technologies have enabled us to become highly efficient at maximising the value that we can derive from them. Overall, our material environmental impacts come from: fuel and energy use; agricultural operations giving rise to GHG

emissions; use of land related to agricultural operations; the abstraction and management of water and wastewater especially in water-stressed areas; and waste which is not yet eliminated at source, reused or recycled, including single-use plastics. In addition to GHG emissions, our operations generate a range of other environmental impacts related to wastewater and waste which, if not controlled, could pose a risk to the environment and local communities, potentially creating risk to our licence to operate and resulting in additional costs. We recognise our role in transitioning to a low-carbon economy. We are targeting reductions in our GHG emissions through carbon reduction plans, energy efficiency and growing our use of renewable energy. We continuously seek ways to improve the efficiency of our operations, using technologies and techniques to reduce our use of natural resources and minimise waste and the subsequent impact on the environment. We are also increasing our focus on capturing this data and being able to report in line with regulatory requirements. We support the adoption of integrated farm management techniques and the responsible use of precision science and technology to maximise efficiency, reduce GHG emissions and limit biodiversity losses while maintaining commercially productive agricultural outputs. Besides a focus on reducing operational energy demands, our businesses continuously explore how they can integrate renewable sources of power into their energy mix to minimise reliance on fossil fuels and reduce their carbon emissions. Of the total energy consumed across the Group this year, 58% came from renewable sources mainly generated on our sites. Our Sugar businesses have continually improved energy use, efficiency and energy source over the last decade and have made significant reductions. For example, as well as producing both core sugar products and a range of speciality sugars, the advanced sugar manufacturing sites produce coproducts, including molasses, sugar beet pulp and bioethanol. Illovo Sugar Africa use bagasse as a fuel source for the boilers to generate steam and electricity to power their factories. Water is an essential input for clothing and food production. We remain aware that it is a valuable resource and our businesses aim to reduce the amount of water they abstract, to reuse process water as much as possible and to return treated wastewater to nature, having ensured it meets or exceeds local and national water standards, and protect aquatic ecosystems.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Our businesses consider all material risks and opportunities in their financial planning and risk management processes. From physical to reputation, the associated risks and opportunities could have an impact on revenues which is tracked at the business level. If climate change impacts our ability to produce or source the raw materials we use, there will be a direct influence on our ability to generate revenue. However, as our Group consists of five segments, a substantive risk to ABF as a whole is very rare because if something impacts one business or segment, the other four will continue and it is unlikely to lead to a move in the share price of the Group.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

When existing approaches to production and supply costs increase due to the impact of climate change, this becomes a core issue to the short to medium term sustainability of our business model. There can also be reductions in operating costs as we invest in renewable energy projects that take our sites off-grid and even supply the grid with surplus energy generated on our sites. This leads directly into cost savings for the sites as they reduce their energy requirements from the national grid and being subjected to energy price fluctuations and availability.

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Capital allocation

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Our businesses are investing in environmental risk management of which significant amounts were spent on energy improvement, reduction and innovation and to mitigate acute physical risks in certain regions where there have been recent experiences of floods, cyclones and heatwaves. Capital funding is made available to all our businesses where returns meet or exceed clearly defined criteria. Investment into the management and adaptation towards climate change is managed at the local level. For example, in recent years capital has been allocated for the conversion to sub-surface drip irrigation in Illovo's operations in Zambia, Eswatini and

Malawi and for the upgrade to pulp press infrastructure in AB Sugar China. Our factories, estates, stores and offices are part of our asset disclosure. The impact of climate change on these ranges from the need to build or to adapt sites so they can utilise different energy sources or minimise processes which generate emissions such as wastewater management. Our businesses are increasingly seeing the benefit of anaerobic digestion and investing in plants on site. These include AB Mauri, AB Agri, AB Sugar China and British Sugar.

Row 4

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Liabilities

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

In addition to GHG emissions, our operations generate a range of other environmental impacts related to wastewater and waste which, if not controlled, could pose a risk to the environment and local communities, potentially creating risk to our licence to operate and resulting in additional costs. Across countries where ABF businesses operate, there is increased regulatory scrutiny and ESG reporting requirements (including climate, forest and water related reporting requirements) that we must meet. Remaining compliant with these requirements and being able to report accurate and robust data on our environmental impact, is a priority for the Group and to our businesses. Each business is responsible for the management of its liabilities. They report to the Audit Committee material liabilities that may impact the financial performance of the business and therefore factor all material risks into their financial planning cycles.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization’s water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.2) Anticipated forward trend for CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.3) Water-related OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.4) Anticipated forward trend for OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

Not financially quantified
[Fixed row]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Carbon

[Fixed row]

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon.

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:
☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply
☑ Drive low-carbon investment
☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making
☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in risk assessment
☑ Navigate regulations

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment with the price of a carbon tax

☑ Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme

(5.10.1.4) Calculation methodology and assumptions made in determining the price

ABF has not set an internal carbon price but the decentralised nature of our Group means that each business is free to establish a price relevant to their decision making on carbon management. British Sugar have set an internal carbon price, aligned with the UK ETS as a tool to help manage risks and opportunities to operations participating in the UK ETS, and in anticipation of new carbon regulations. Our businesses have used this approach to support their efforts to plan their medium and long-term work in carbon management.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Differentiated

(5.10.1.7) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

British Sugar use the internal carbon price to as a tool to help manage risks and opportunities to operations participating in the UK ETS, and in anticipation of new carbon regulations. The use of an internal carbon price drives both emission reduction strategies and, aligned with this, reduced operating costs. The business has used this approach to support their efforts to plan their medium and long-term work in carbon management.

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Evolutionary

(5.10.1.9) Indicate how you expect the price to change over time

Over recent years, reforms to the UK ETS means that the price of carbon allowances has moved.

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

39.81

(5.10.1.11) Maximum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

95.81

(5.10.1.12) Business decision-making processes the internal price is applied to

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Impact management

☑ Operations

☑ Risk management

☑ Opportunity management

(5.10.1.13) Internal price is mandatory within business decision-making processes

Select from:

☑ No

(5.10.1.14) % total emissions in the reporting year in selected scopes this internal price covers

28

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Plastics

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

(5.11.3) Primary reason for not engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We engage with small holders (for example, on Cotton) but not for the commodities listed in this questionnaire.

(5.11.4) Explain why you do not engage with this stakeholder on environmental issues

We engage with small holders but not for the commodities listed in this questionnaire. For example, overall, cotton is the main fibre used in Primark's products. In 2013, it launched the Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme (PSCP) in India. The PSCP trains farmers, the majority of whom are smallholder farmers, on more sustainable agricultural practices. Cotton farmers within the programme are trained to reduce their use of water and dependence on chemical fertilisers and

pesticides, in addition to learning new skills such as seed selection; land preparation and sowing; crop management; and harvesting. As at the end of July 2023 299,388 farmers have received training in the Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme.

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Plastics

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Plastics

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Plastics

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Dependence on commodities

☑ Impact on water availability

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take, based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Unknown

Forests

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Dependence on commodities

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

We are a highly devolved Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Unknown

Water

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Dependence on commodities

☑ Impact on water availability

☑ Impact on plastic waste and pollution

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take, based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Unknown

Plastics

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

☑ Impact on plastic waste and pollution

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take, based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Unknown

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Product lifecycle

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

☑ Supplier performance improvement

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Leverage over suppliers

☑ Vulnerability of suppliers

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

☑ Product safety and compliance

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our businesses are responsible for assessing and prioritising their suppliers, who are best positioned to understand their markets, supply chains, and local communities. Our businesses depend upon agricultural systems for most of the raw materials we use in our products. Our businesses support a wide range of social and environmental interventions at farm level. These span a very broad range of farm management models including certified organic production, standards to promote wildlife biodiversity, engagement with smallholder growers in developing markets, as well as the adoption of farm management systems built on the

principles of sustainable intensification. For example, Primark launched its Sustainable Cotton Programme in 2013. While it is not possible for our businesses to intervene in every farm supply chain, collectively we support many farm-focused intervention programmes. The objective of these is to shape management practices to promote systemic commercial, social and environmental resilience for the long term. Science, technology and data are essential to achieving this aim.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Product lifecycle

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Leverage over suppliers

☑ Vulnerability of suppliers

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

☑ Supplier performance improvement

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our businesses are responsible for assessing and prioritising their suppliers, who are best positioned to understand their markets, supply chains, and local communities. Our businesses depend upon agricultural systems for most of the raw materials we use in our products. For example, our Ingredients businesses source agricultural commodities, such as palm oil, that are linked with potential risks related to deforestation and biodiversity loss. AB Mauri and ABFI's purchasing practices are guided by these risks. Our businesses support a wide range of social and environmental interventions at farm level. These span a very broad range of farm management models including certified organic production, standards to promote wildlife biodiversity, engagement with smallholder growers in developing markets, as well as the adoption of farm management systems built on the principles of sustainable intensification. While it is not possible for our businesses to intervene in every farm supply chain, collectively we support many farm-focused intervention programmes. The objective of these is to shape management practices to promote systemic commercial, social and environmental resilience for the long term. Science, technology and data are essential to achieving this aim.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Product lifecycle

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Leverage over suppliers

☑ Vulnerability of suppliers

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

☑ Supplier performance improvement

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our businesses are responsible for assessing and prioritising their suppliers, who are best positioned to understand their markets, supply chains, and local communities. Our businesses depend upon agricultural systems for most of the raw materials we use in our products. Our businesses support a wide range of social and environmental interventions at farm level. These span a very broad range of farm management models including certified organic production, standards to promote wildlife biodiversity, engagement with smallholder growers in developing markets, as well as the adoption of farm management systems built on the principles of sustainable intensification. For example, Primark launched its Sustainable Cotton Programme in 2013 with farmers in the programme trained to reduce their use of water and dependence on chemical fertilisers and pesticides, in addition to learning new skills such as seed selection; land preparation and sowing; crop management; and harvesting While it is not possible for our businesses to intervene in every farm supply chain, collectively we support many farm-focused intervention programmes. The objective of these is to shape management practices to promote systemic commercial, social and environmental resilience for the long term. Science, technology and data are essential to achieving this aim.

Plastics

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Procurement spend
☑ Product lifecycle
☑ Regulatory compliance
☑ Reputation management
☑ Supplier performance improvement
☑ Leverage over suppliers
☑ Vulnerability of suppliers
☑ Strategic status of suppliers
☑ Product safety and compliance

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

To prioritise which suppliers to engage with on plastic issues, our businesses consider several critical factors. As a leading provider of food, ingredients and clothing, packaging contributes significantly to our environmental footprint. Paper is the main packaging material used across the Group, followed by plastic and glass. Though we fully recognise the harmful effects of plastic waste on ecosystems, it currently plays a vital role in both food safety and reducing food waste, by extending the shelf life of food. Our challenge is to use plastic materials responsibly and find solutions which balance the needs of our customers and our desire to minimise our impact. Our approach to assessing and prioritising suppliers begins with our businesses, which are best positioned to understand their markets, supply chains, and local communities. Our businesses are doing this by removing unnecessary packaging, switching to more easily recyclable types of plastic and increasing the use of recycled content in the plastics we use. They also demonstrate their commitment to tackling plastic and packaging challenges by involvement with and support for a number of pacts and programmes, including the WRAP UK Plastics Pact and the Soft Plastic Recycling Scheme in New Zealand.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, suppliers have to meet environmental requirements related to this environmental issue, but they are not included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Supplier Code of Conduct sets out the standards we expect of our suppliers, including our requirement that they continually strive towards improving the efficiency and sustainability of their operations. We support and encourage operating practices, farming practices and agricultural production systems that are sustainable. The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes. ABF reserves the rights to verify the supplier's and representative's compliance with the Code. Where supplier and representative reviews or audits demonstrate shortcomings in any of these areas, the supplier and representative should strive to implement a time-bound programme of improvement (remediation) leading to conformance. If we become aware of any actions or conditions not in compliance with the Code, we reserve the right to request corrective actions. ABF reserves the right to terminate an agreement with any supplier and representatives that does not comply with the Code.

Forests

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, suppliers have to meet environmental requirements related to this environmental issue, but they are not included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Supplier Code of Conduct sets out the standards we expect of our suppliers, including our requirement that they continually strive towards improving the efficiency and sustainability of their operations. We support and encourage operating practices, farming practices and agricultural production systems that are sustainable. The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes. ABF reserves the rights to verify the supplier's and representative's compliance with the Code. Where supplier and representative reviews or audits demonstrate shortcomings in any of these areas, the supplier and representative should strive to implement a time-bound programme of improvement (remediation) leading to conformance. In the event that we become aware of any actions or conditions not in compliance with the Code, we reserve the right to request corrective actions. ABF reserves the right to terminate an agreement with any supplier and representatives that does not comply with the Code. Where risks have been identified, our businesses work directly with suppliers to implement programmes and procedures to strengthen them. AB Agri has an internal Responsible Sourcing Policy and Responsible Sourcing Standards which apply to all its businesses. The Policy outlines areas of focus for AB Agri, including deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, suppliers have to meet environmental requirements related to this environmental issue, but they are not included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Supplier Code of Conduct sets out the standards we expect of our suppliers, including our requirement that they continually strive towards improving the efficiency and sustainability of their operations. We support and encourage operating practices, farming practices and agricultural production systems that are sustainable. The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes. Where identified as material, our businesses engage with suppliers on water issues and monitor progress. For example, ABF's Spanish sugar business, Azucarera recognises that beet growing and sugar production are vital industries for large rural areas of Spain and for the sugar supply in Spain ABF reserves the rights to verify the supplier's and representative's compliance with the Code. Where supplier and representative reviews or audits demonstrate shortcomings in any of these areas, the supplier and representative should strive to implement a time-bound programme of improvement (remediation) leading to conformance. In the event that we become aware of any actions or conditions not in compliance with the Code, we reserve the right to request corrective actions. ABF reserves the right to terminate an agreement with any supplier and representatives that does not comply with the Code.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Few aspects of environmental management are included in the supplier assessment for example: the supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ No mechanism for monitoring compliance

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ None

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

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ None

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

Select from:

☑ No response

(5.11.6.12) Comment

As per ABF Supplier of Conduct, we support and encourage operating practices, farming practices and agricultural production systems that are sustainable. The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes. The following aspects of environmental management will be included in the supplier assessment: • there should be a company environment representative; • the company should be aware of and able to demonstrate compliance with all current legislation that may affect its activities; • the company should conduct an environmental review and consider all aspects of it products and services; and • any enforcement, improvement or prohibition notices served on the site within the last three years. All businesses within the Group are responsible for managing their relationships with suppliers and satisfying themselves that they operate in line with the principles contained in the Group Supplier Code of Conduct. We are not able to provide all requested details as our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships.

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**We support and encourage operating practices, farming practices and agricultural production systems that are sustainable.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ No mechanism for monitoring compliance

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ None

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

Select from:

☑ None

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

Select from:

☑ No response

(5.11.6.12) Comment

As per ABF Supplier of Conduct, we support and encourage operating practices, farming practices and agricultural production systems that are sustainable. The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes. The following aspects of environmental management will be included in the supplier assessment: • there should be a company environment representative; • the company should be aware of and able to demonstrate compliance with all current legislation that may affect its activities; • the company should conduct an environmental review and consider all aspects of it products and services; and • any enforcement, improvement or prohibition notices served on the site within the last three years. All businesses within the Group are responsible for managing their relationships with suppliers and satisfying themselves that they operate in line with the principles contained in the Group Supplier Code of Conduct. We are not able to provide all requested details as our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**"The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes."

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ No mechanism for monitoring compliance

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ None

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

Select from:

☑ None

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

Select from:

☑ No response

(5.11.6.12) Comment

As per ABF Supplier of Conduct, we support and encourage operating practices, farming practices and agricultural production systems that are sustainable. The supplier and representatives will continually strive towards improving efficiency and sustainability of their operations which will include water conservation programmes. The following aspects of environmental management will be included in the supplier assessment: • there should be a company environment representative; • the company should be aware of and able to demonstrate compliance with all current legislation that may affect its activities; • the company should conduct an environmental review and consider all aspects of it products and services; and • any enforcement, improvement or prohibition notices served on the site within the last three years. All businesses within the Group are responsible for managing their relationships with suppliers and satisfying themselves that they operate in line with the principles contained in the Group Supplier Code of Conduct. We are not able to provide all requested details as our diversified business model enables each of our businesses to choose which approach to take based on its specific supply chains and the nature of its supplier relationships.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

The Higg Facility Environmental Module (Higg FEM) is a sustainability assessment tool developed by the Sustainable Apparel Coalition (SAC) that allows brands to measure and evaluate the environmental performance (including carbon emissions) of manufacturing facilities in their supply chain, year over year. Primark mandates selected facilities associated to specific suppliers to complete the Higg FEM annually. These facilities are mainly cut & sew (Tier 1) factories engaged by suppliers that represent the highest Free On Board (FOB) spend (Top 100), but also include factories in the lower tiers of the supply chain (Tier 2 and 3). The rate of supplier adoption of the Higg FEM is a key measure of success for this initiative. In fact, having a high proportion of facilities completing the Higg FEM enables Primark to: • Gather environmental data across a considerable number of different facilities in a standardized way, with the possibility to have this data verified by third-parties; • Refine its Scope 3 emissions accounting by including more and more primary data; • Select suppliers to engage in emissions reduction initiatives based on their current performance and improvement potential. The figures here reported are conservative, since they only include Tier 1 facilities associated to Primark's Top 100 suppliers by FOB. In reality, there are active facilities associated to ex-Top100 suppliers who are still using the Higg FEM to disclose their emissions data. Moreover, in some regions (e.g., Bangladesh) Primark have rolled-out the Higg FEM to suppliers beyond Top100. Please note that the percentages reported for "% of tier 1-suppliers by procurement spend" and "% of tier 1 supplier-related Scope 3 emissions" refer to Primark only and are not related to the ABF Group. Primark is ABF's biggest division accounting for 45.6% of total Group revenues

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Reducing emissions

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

Select from:

☑ No

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Primark's Packaging Optimisation Programme began in 2018 and has contributed to a significant reduction in CO2 emissions across its whole supply chain as a result of less packaging being produced, transported and processed as waste. Primark, in partnership with the packaging optimisation company PAC-D, has developed a programme to train its suppliers' factories to accurately measure products and efficiently package them into shipping cartons. To make the most impact, Primark started by training its largest suppliers, whose factories products make up 75% of Primark's inbound carton volume, but in 2022 has extended this to circa. 90% of inbound volume. Since the programme was launched late in 2018, it has contributed to a 3.9% reduction (over 280,000 cubic metres) in packaging volume shipped and received and has created a 4% reduction (6.79 million square metres) of corrugate material being produced, shipped and recycled. Primark continues to roll out this programme to more suppliers and is now looking in detail at subtle changes to shipping carton specifications, to further reduce material usage. For example, from September 2023, product sourced from Bangladesh origin will only be accepted in 3-ply cartons, removing the option for 5-ply corrugate material to be used.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

In Pakistan, where Westmill Foods source basmati rice, water has become an increasingly contentious issue because agriculture uses more than 90% of the country's fresh water. Traditional rice-growing methods are particularly water-intensive and release a significant amount of GHGs into the atmosphere. Traditional rice cultivation is estimated to be responsible for 10% of the world's methane emissions. Together with their partner Galaxy Rice, and Westmill Foods are encouraging positive change in the Punjab region by promoting the standards of the Sustainable Rice Platform protocol (SRP), – a multi-stakeholder partnership set up by the United Nations. Galaxy Rice provide training in SRP techniques, and Westmill purchases the rice produced. The training is wide-ranging and benefits both farmers and their communities. It covers the use of water-saving technologies including land laser levelling and alternate wetting and drying, as well as other interconnected topics such as pesticide management and agribusiness techniques. By the end of the 2021/22 reporting year impressive results had been achieved: • 30% reduction in water use • 13% increase in yields • 24% increase in net incomes • 48% reduction in GHG emissions After starting out with 600 farmers, covering 20km of land, there are currently 800 farmers who are now involved covering 50km of land. The project has been expanded until 2025 to reach 1,200 farmers. Please note that the percentages reported for "% of tier 1-suppliers by procurement spend" and "% tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement" refer to Westmill Food only and is not related to the ABF Group. Our Westmill Food businesses account for around 1% of total Group revenues.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No, because our tier 1 suppliers are producers, and have no suppliers of commodities

Plastics

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Circular economy

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Our businesses demonstrate their commitment to tackling plastic and packaging challenges by involvement with and support for a number of pacts and programmes, including the WRAP UK Plastics Pact and the Soft Plastic Recycling Scheme in New Zealand. Since 2018, UK Grocery's businesses have been members of the UK Plastics Pact. Led by WRAP, the voluntary UK Plastics Pact commits signatories to eliminate problematic or unnecessary single-use packaging through redesign,

innovation or alternative delivery models. The commitment requires food producers and other users of plastic materials to factor recyclability into the specification and design of their packaging, and the waste reprocessing sector to adapt to ensure that those materials that technically can be recycled easily are collected and taken for reprocessing. Similarly, George Weston Foods is a signatory to the Australian Packaging Covenant Organisation (APCO) 2025 National Packaging Targets and a foundational member of the National Plastics and Recycling Scheme (NPRS). The NPRS is being developed by Australia's food and grocery manufacturing industry, with funding support from the federal government, to create a new advanced recycling industry in Australia, aiming to turn plastic packaging back into new food-grade packaging. ABF Sugar has committed to ensuring all its plastic packaging is reusable, recyclable, biodegradable or compostable by 2030. In Tanzania, it is trialling Biaxially Oriented Polypropylene 25kg and 50kg bags without plastic liners. These bags are extremely durable and resistant to water. Without plastic liners, Illovo's intention is to see if it can reduce the volume of packaging or remove other plastic liners, and see if the new packaging can be used/recycled in the future.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Twining's sent Life cycle assessment questionnaires to their top tea suppliers, to directly access their carbon emissions and reduction plans. The questionnaire focused on site factors such as existing reduction plans and renewable energy usage. Farm inputs including fuel use and fertiliser use and land use change, and also considering Regenerative farming practices and soil management.Twinings has started this activity with its Tea suppliers due to the fact their emissions represent a significant proportion of its Scope 3 emissions, and that the business has direct relationships with them and is therefore able to have greater influence and offer more direct support. Twinings will role these questionnaires out to our other major suppliers once tea is established and we can take our learnings into the other areas. The results are helping the business to identify where to prioritise reduction efforts and will help the business to identify and share good practice. Please note that the percentages reported for "% of tier 1-suppliers by procurement spend" refer to Twinings only and are not related to the ABF Group.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Circular economy

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

In 2023, Primark trained 286 of its suppliers on the Primark Cares protocols and standards, helping to support them as they move towards recycled or more sustainable fibres to ensure product claims are accurate. Primark has also developed digital training modules to educate our Product teams on how to integrate more of these materials into our products. Please note that the percentages reported for "% of tier 1-suppliers by procurement spend" and "% of tier 1 supplier-related Scope 3 emissions" refer to Primark only and are not related to the ABF Group. Primark is ABF's biggest division accounting for 45.6% of total Group revenues

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts on products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

299388

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts on products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

299388

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Financial incentives

☑ Pay higher prices linked to best agricultural practices

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Jordans Cereals, a brand of our Grocery business, was one of the first brands in the UK to differentiate on the basis of its values and has supported wildlife in its UK farm supply chain since 1985. The Jordans Farm Partnership (JFP) was created in 2016 and represents a unique collaboration between The Wildlife Trusts, Linking Environment and Farming (LEAF), The Prince's Countryside Fund and 34 British farms supplying oats, wheat and barley. Contracted farmers within the Jordans Farm Partnership are paid a premium for their grain. In return, they agree to manage at least 10% of their land for the benefit of wildlife. At the end of FY2023 that proportion was an average of 26% of the total farmland managed under the Partnership of around 15,000 hectares. That's a total farm area equivalent to around 7% of the total UK farmland used to grow oats. Jordans Cereals has taken a similar approach in the almond industry in California. It supports the Seeds for Bees programme, which provides wildflower seeds for ground cover in almond orchards. The ground cover provides forage for pollinators and boosts soil health along with water infiltration to improve crop resilience. Jordans Cereals' contribution to the programme provides ground cover equivalent to the total area of orchards required to supply its almonds that are used in their products. JDR contribution covers 220 hectares which is equivalent to 6000 tonnes.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No, because our tier 1 suppliers are producers, and have no suppliers of commodities

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Traditional rice-growing methods are particularly waterintensive and release a significant amount of GHGs into the atmosphere. Rice cultivation is estimated to be responsible for 10% of the world's methane emissions. Westmill, a UK Grocery business and a leading supplier of food products to the Indian, Chinese and Thai foodservice sectors, aims to promote the standards of the Sustainable Rice Platform (SRP), a multi-stakeholder partnership set up by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), of which Westmill is a founding member. In 2022/23, 49% of the basmati rice purchased by Westmill came from the SRP project in Pakistan. Due to the success of the project, Westmill set up an SRP project in Thailand to grow Thai hom mali rice. This project commenced in May 2023, with the first harvest expected in November 2023. By the end of the 2021/22 reporting year impressive results had been achieved: • 30% reduction in water use • 13% increase in yields • 24% increase in net incomes • 48% reduction in GHG emissions After starting out with 600 farmers, covering 20km of land, there are currently 800 farmers who are now involved covering 50km of land. The project has been expanded until 2025 to reach 1,200 farmers. Please note that the percentage reported for % of tier 1 suppliers refer to Westmill Food only and is not related to the ABF Group. Our Westmill Food businesses account for around 1% of total Group revenues.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No, because our tier 1 suppliers are producers, and have no suppliers of commodities

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

We engage regularly with shareholders and investors, including on climate-related issues. ABF has a mix of individual and institutional shareholders, including bondholders, whose views are valued. Shareholders and institutional investors are engaged with on key matter such as Business and financial performance, ESG matters, returns on investment and renumeration. The Responsibility Report is approved by the Board and is produced to provide greater transparency in response to increasing requests for information from investors. Climate-related issues are part of our conversation with those stakeholders. The Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and the Group Corporate Responsibility Director hold one-to-one stakeholder meetings on ESG issues, including those with investors. Also, we hold ESG investor events that are intended to develop into a deeper ongoing engagement with stakeholders so that feedback from those stakeholders can continue to be factored into our decision-making. For example, Primark's emissions reduction plan was referenced during our last ABF's ESG Investor briefings, held in May 2022, during which there were opportunities for feedback during the Q&A session. All the investor events, including the questions and answers, are available on the ABF website.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Shareholders and investors meetings and events provide an opportunity to discuss and collect feedback on climate-related issues and we consider their views and priorities in our materiality assessments.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

We engage regularly with shareholders and investors, including on forest-related issues. The Company has a mix of individual and institutional shareholders, including bondholders, whose views are valued. Shareholders and institutional investors are engaged with on key matter such as Business and financial performance, ESG matters, returns on investment and renumeration. The Responsibility Report is approved by the Board and is produced to provide greater transparency in response to increasing requests for information from investors. Forest-related issues are part of our conversation with those stakeholders. The Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and the Group Corporate Responsibility Director hold one-to-one stakeholder meetings on ESG issues, including those with investors. Also, we hold ESG investor events that are intended to develop into a deeper ongoing engagement with stakeholders so that feedback from those stakeholders can continue to be factored into our decision-making. For example, our last ABF's ESG Investor briefings, held in May 2022, focused on the most material environmental factors across a broad range of companies in the Group. We included an analysis of the most important environmental factors relevant to our businesses, including an overview of our TCFD analysis. Investors had the opportunity to ask questions at the events and three subsequent events were held for banks, insurers and employees respectively, giving them the opportunity to ask questions which included those relating to forest-related issues. All the investor events, including the questions and answers, are open source and available on the ABF website.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Shareholders and investors meetings and events provide an opportunity to discuss and collect feedback on forest-related issues and we consider their views and priorities in our materiality assessments.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

We engage regularly with shareholders and investors, including on water-related issues. The Company has a mix of individual and institutional shareholders, including bondholders, whose views are valued. Shareholders and institutional investors are engaged with on key matter such as Business and financial performance, ESG matters, returns on investment and renumeration. The Responsibility Report is approved by the Board and is produced to provide greater transparency in response to increasing requests for information from investors. Water-related issues are part of our conversation with those stakeholders. The Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary and the Group Corporate Responsibility Director hold one-to-one stakeholder meetings on ESG issues, including those with investors. Also, we hold ESG investor events that are intended to develop into a deeper ongoing engagement with stakeholders so that feedback from those stakeholders can continue to be factored into our decision-making. For example, our last ABF's ESG Investor briefings, held in May 2022, focused on the most material environmental factors across a broad range of companies in the Group. We included an analysis of the most important environmental factors relevant to our businesses, including an overview of our TCFD analysis. Investors had the opportunity to ask questions at the events and three subsequent events were held for banks, insurers and employees respectively, giving them the opportunity to ask questions which included those relating to water-related issues. All the investor events, including the questions and answers, are open source and available on the ABF website.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Shareholders and investors meetings and events provide an opportunity to discuss and collect feedback on water-related issues and we consider their views and priorities in our materiality assessments.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization’s goals to support customers’ targets and ambitions

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

The Courtauld Commitment is a voluntary agreement that enables collaborative action across the entire UK food network between manufacturers, retailers, and those in hospitality to help deliver reductions in greenhouse gas emissions within the UK food and drink sector. Our UK Grocery businesses are working closely with the UK retailers signed up to the Commitment that are customer of our businesses to work towards delivering the commitment. The rationale for selecting to be a part of this initiative was due to the collaboration required between key stakeholders within the UK food and drink sector

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

As of 2022, the signatories signed up to the Courtauld commitment have achieved a collective 12% reduction in emissions since the commitment started in 2015.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Primark firmly believes that it's not enough to change the way the business makes and source its clothes. Primark must also inform customers about the changes they are making and what it means for them. Sustainability and environmental claims are complex, and can be confusing for customers, so Primark are taking further steps to ensure customers can make more informed choices about the products they buy.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Primark has launched an expanded online glossary which explains the key terms the business uses within its commitments and shares information around the minimum percentage content of recycled and more sustainable fibres within its Primark Cares products. These minimum content standards are brought to life on the Primark Cares products the business sells, with its swing tags setting out the minimum percentage of fibres within the product. Primark also use QR codes in store to help guide and educate customers further. Primark's new website – which has now launched in all the markets where the business has stores – allows customers to read about all the work Primark Cares does and browse their product range, including the products under Primark Cares label. Primark is committed to continually improving how and what the business communicates about its products to their customers.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Primark wants to help customers love and wear their clothes for longer. One of the ways Primark has been working to achieve this objective is through free education workshops offered in stores and head offices, which show or remind people how to repair their clothes and give them a longer life. Mending clothes has become a lost art. However, there is a growing interest in learning new repair skills among their customers. After piloting the sessions with smaller groups during the pandemic, Primark started to roll the programme out more broadly in March 2022. Their workshops are led by Lecturer and Designer Lorraine Mitchell, a Primark customer, who approached the business about hosting a repair workshop together. During the workshops, she shares basic hand-sewing techniques and practical repair tips and guides attendees through the hands-on sessions. Following a successful series of repair workshops in 2022, Primark have now expanded the programme across a number of their markets including the Netherlands and France. Following on from their successful workshops in Rotterdam, they're now launching repair workshops in all Primark stores across the Netherlands over the next two years. Primark are also running a series of pilot workshops in Italian stores. Three new tutors have now joined Lorraine Mitchell in running the workshops. In their Manchester store, the business ran workshops in collaboration with The Fashion School, a community interest company aimed at empowering young people to love their clothes for longer through transforming and repurposing their clothes. Since anyone using Primark clothes can benefit from these workshops, they are offered for free to be accessible to as many people as possible. Next to the in-person repair workshops, Primark have also created an online customer hub featuring easy-to follow repair videos, covering everything from basic stitching to sewing on buttons and zips. The tutorials are available across Primark's social channels too.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Up to August 2023, Primark have run over 100 workshops in stores across the UK, Republic of Ireland, Netherlands and France and offered 1,600 free places to customers and colleagues. The number of workshops and places offered are the two indicators currently used to measure success for this initiative. However, Primark is exploring the potential of including additional metrics to measure the impact of customer-facing initiatives on customers' behaviour, and how that would ultimately affect emissions resulting from the use of its products. The proportional impact on Primark's customer base and customer-based emissions is less than 1% as the initiative targeted a small number of customers compared to the scale of Primark as a retailer.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Customer

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Primark wants to help customers love and wear their clothes for longer. One of the ways Primark has been working to achieve this objective is through free education workshops offered in stores and head offices, which show or remind people how to repair their clothes and give them a longer life. Mending clothes has become a lost art. However, there is a growing interest in learning new repair skills among our customers. After piloting the sessions with smaller groups during the pandemic, Primark started to roll the programme out more broadly in March 2022. Their workshops are led by Lecturer and Designer Lorraine Mitchell, a Primark customer, who approached the business about hosting a repair workshop together. During the workshops, she shares basic hand-sewing techniques and practical repair tips and guides attendees through the hands-on sessions. Following a successful series of repair workshops in 2022, Primark have now expanded the programme across a number of their markets including the Netherlands and France. Following on from their successful workshops in Rotterdam, they're now launching repair workshops in all Primark stores across the Netherlands over the next two years. Primark are also running a series of pilot workshops in our Italian stores. Three new tutors have now joined Lorraine Mitchell in running the workshops. In their Manchester store, the business ran workshops in collaboration with The Fashion School, a community interest company aimed at empowering young people to love their clothes for longer through transforming and repurposing their clothes. Since anyone using Primark clothes can benefit from these workshops, they are offered for free to be accessible to as many people as possible. Next to the in-person repair workshops, Primark

have also created an online customer hub featuring easy-to follow repair videos, covering everything from basic stitching to sewing on buttons and zips. The tutorials are available across Primark's social channels too.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Up to August 2023, Primark have run over 100 workshops in stores across the UK, Republic of Ireland, Netherlands and France and offered 1,600 free places to customers and colleagues. The number of workshops and places offered are the two indicators currently used to measure success for this initiative. However, Primark is exploring the potential of including additional metrics to measure the impact of customer-facing initiatives on customers' behaviour, and how that would ultimately affect emissions resulting from the use of its products. The proportional impact on Primark's customer base and customer-based emissions is less than 1% as the initiative targeted a small number of customers compared to the scale of Primark as a retailer.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Industry associations, suppliers, customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Our businesses demonstrate their commitment to tackling plastic and packaging challenges by involvement with and support for a number of pacts and programmes, including the WRAP UK Plastics Pact and the Soft Plastic Recycling Scheme in New Zealand.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Since 2018, UK Grocery's businesses have been members of the UK Plastics Pact. Led by WRAP, the voluntary UK Plastics Pact commits signatories to eliminate problematic or unnecessary single-use packaging through redesign, innovation or alternative delivery models. The commitment requires food producers and other users of plastic materials to factor recyclability into the specification and design of their packaging, and the waste reprocessing sector to adapt to ensure that those materials that technically can be recycled easily are collected and taken for reprocessing. Similarly, George Weston Foods is a signatory to the Australian Packaging Covenant Organisation (APCO) 2025 National Packaging Targets and a foundational member of the National Plastics and Recycling Scheme (NPRS). The NPRS is being developed by Australia's food and grocery manufacturing industry, with funding support from the federal government, to create a new advanced recycling industry in Australia, aiming to turn plastic packaging back into new food-grade packaging.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Industry associations, suppliers, customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Our businesses demonstrate their commitment to tackling plastic and packaging challenges by involvement with and support for a number of pacts and programmes, including the WRAP UK Plastics Pact and the Soft Plastic Recycling Scheme in New Zealand.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Since 2018, UK Grocery's businesses have been members of the UK Plastics Pact. Led by WRAP, the voluntary UK Plastics Pact commits signatories to eliminate problematic or unnecessary single-use packaging through redesign, innovation or alternative delivery models. The commitment requires food producers and other users of plastic materials to factor recyclability into the specification and design of their packaging, and the waste reprocessing sector to adapt to ensure that those materials that technically can be recycled easily are collected and taken for reprocessing. Similarly, George Weston Foods is a signatory to the Australian Packaging Covenant Organisation (APCO) 2025 National Packaging Targets and a foundational member of the National Plastics and Recycling Scheme (NPRS). The NPRS is being developed by Australia's food and grocery manufacturing industry, with funding support from the federal government, to create a new advanced recycling industry in Australia, aiming to turn plastic packaging back into new food-grade packaging.
[Add row]

(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

For the current and prior reporting years environment data is from all companies over which the Group has full operational control or has financial control but does not fully own. In addition relevant environmental data is included from joint ventures and associates where we do not have a majority shareholding but do have either joint control or significant influence.

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

For the current and prior reporting years environment data is from all companies over which the Group has full operational control or has financial control but does not fully own. In addition relevant environmental data is included from joint ventures and associates where we do not have a majority shareholding but do have either joint control or significant influence.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

For the current and prior reporting years environment data is from all companies over which the Group has full operational control or has financial control but does not fully own. In addition relevant environmental data is included from joint ventures and associates where we do not have a majority shareholding but do have either joint control or significant influence.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

For the current and prior reporting years environment data is from all companies over which the Group has full operational control or has financial control but does not fully own. In addition relevant environmental data is included from joint ventures and associates where we do not have a majority shareholding but do have either joint control or significant influence.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

For the current and prior reporting years environment data is from all companies over which the Group has full operational control or has financial control but does not fully own. In addition relevant environmental data is included from joint ventures and associates where we do not have a majority shareholding but do have either joint control or significant influence.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2006

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

☑ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol Agricultural Guidance: Interpreting the Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard for the Agricultural Sector

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

Scope 2 emissions are those from purchased electricity, heat or steam used on our sites. Scope 2 emissions are reported on both a location- and market-based approach in line with the GHG Scope 2 Guidance (WRI & WBCSD, 2015). Scope 2 location-based emissions reflect the average emissions intensity of grids from which the energy consumption occurs. This is our fifth year reporting our market-based scope 2 emissions and we continue to work with our businesses to continuously develop a structured and evidenced approach. Scope 2 market-based emissions are calculated using the emissions from the electricity that our businesses have purchased. Purchased renewable electricity, which is supported by appropriate evidence from the energy provider (i.e. renewable energy certificates, Guarantees of Origin or similar), and that meets the 'quality criteria' outlined in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, is converted to CO2e by applying

supplier-specific emission factors. Where supplier-provided emissions factors are not available, we have applied the specific residual mix factor. Where the residual mix factor is not available, we revert to the location-based grid average emission factor.
[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3227870.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 1 GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government relevant to the reporting year, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

925045.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions are those from purchased electricity, heat or steam used on our sites. Scope 2 location-based emissions reflect the average emissions intensity of grids from which the energy consumption occurs. We calculate and disclose our scope 2 location-based GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government relevant to the reporting year, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

782555.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 market-based emissions are calculated using the emissions from the electricity that our businesses have purchased. Purchased renewable electricity, which is supported by appropriate evidence from the energy provider (i.e. renewable energy certificates, Guarantees of Origin or similar), and that meets the 'quality criteria' outlined in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, is converted to CO2e by applying supplier-specific emission factors. Where supplier-provided emissions factors are not available, we have applied the specific residual mix factor. Where the residual mix factor is not available, we revert to the location-based grid average emission factor.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4771324.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark completed a baseline scope 3 inventory for the 2019 reporting year, with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for purchased goods and services. The following sub-categories are included for Primark's data: a) Goods for resale - fibres and other materials. b) Goods for resale - cut and sew data which accounts for emissions from processing of raw materials into final products. c) Goods for resale - other non-textile products related to the extraction of raw materials through to product finishing for footwear, footwear accessories and health & beauty. d) Goods and services not for resale which are necessary for business operations such as IT and business services. e) Packaging - the emissions account for the procurement of packaging materials for finished textile and non-textile Primark products. f) Water use - the consumption of water at sites operated by Primark including stores, offices and distribution centres. UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) 2019 factors were applied to the baseline year and supplemented by specific emission factors for the type of activity. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

123393.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2019, Primark completed significant work to identify its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for capital goods. Since 2020/21 Primark's scope 3 data has been independently assured by EY. Capital goods are those which enable the business to operate and which have an extended product life. The data deals with emissions relating to the construction, refit and refurbishment of Primark's stores including fixtures and fittings. Emission factors are sourced from the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) 2019 were applied to the baseline year. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

34904.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark completed a baseline scope 3 inventory for the 2019 reporting year, with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions from fuel-and-energy-related activities. UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) 2019 were applied to the baseline year. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

506663.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark completed a baseline scope 3 inventory for the 2019 reporting year, with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust. The data supplied by Primark covers emissions from its distribution network from country of origin to distribution centre, and distribution centre to store. UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) 2019 were applied to the baseline year. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4297.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark completed a baseline scope 3 inventory for the 2019 reporting year, with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions related to the disposal and treatment of waste produced in stores, offices and distribution centres. UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) 2019 were applied to the baseline year. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10573.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark completed a baseline scope 3 inventory for the 2019 reporting year, with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust which includes emissions from business travel. Primark maintains a complex global supply chain, managed from head offices in the UK and Ireland. There is office space within the Islip UK distribution centre and in-country teams working from locations in China and Bangladesh. Employees are often required to move between these sites and those of Primark's suppliers. This category includes the emissions from air and rail travel and other travel related emissions. The UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) 2019 were applied to calculate the baseline emissions A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not material.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not material.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For Primark, this category includes transport of product from point of sale to point of use. As Primark are a 'bricks and mortar' retailer only, this category consists of customer 'home to store' and 'store to home' travel only. Although we expect this category to be material, due to a lack of crucial primary data points, this category has been scoped out of Primark's baseline emissions calculations. This approach is optional, as outlined on page 103 of the GHG Protocol Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions which states that "a reporting company's scope 3 emissions from downstream transportation and distribution include the scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of transportation companies, distribution companies, retailers, and (optionally) customers". While it is possible to estimate emissions from shopping journeys on a national level, there exists a lack of publicly available data to allow accurate allocation of emissions to a particular retailer

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark products are finished consumer goods. No additional processing is required after handover of goods to Primark. This category is therefore out of scope.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

756260.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark completed a baseline scope 3 inventory for the 2019 reporting year, with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust which includes emissions from the use of sold products, from the point of sale to the point of disposal. Primark calculate the indirect emissions from the products they sell within the following product 'use phases': a) Wearing b) Washing c) Drying d) Ironing. UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) and supplemented by specific emission factors for the type of activity. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38591.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primark completed a baseline scope 3 inventory for the 2019 reporting year, with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust which includes emissions from the end-of-life treatment of sold products, such as recycling or waste to energy processes. Primark also include emissions from the disposal of its brown paper bags used by customers. Emission factors are sourced from the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) and supplemented by specific emission factors for the type of activity. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

While Primark maintains ownership and lease agreements on a number of buildings and retail units, these emissions are considered not material to the overall footprint..

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

07/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant.
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

2272146

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 1 GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in June 2022, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Our scope 1 emissions are from the combustion of fuels, operation of machinery and generation and use of renewables.

Past year 1

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

2408430

(7.6.2) End date

07/30/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 1 GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in July 2022, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Our scope 1 emissions are from the combustion of fuels, operation of machinery and generation and use of renewables.

Past year 2

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

2449570

(7.6.2) End date

07/30/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 1 GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in July 2021, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Our scope 1 emissions are from the combustion of fuels, operation of machinery and generation and use of renewables.

Past year 3

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

2796993

(7.6.2) End date

07/30/2020

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 1 GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in July 2021, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Our scope 1 emissions are from the combustion of fuels, operation of machinery and generation and use of renewables.
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

642666

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

634979

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 2 location-based GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in June 2022, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Scope 2 market-based emissions have been calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance on procured renewable energy.

Past year 1

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

698978

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

720065

(7.7.3) End date

07/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 2 location-based GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in July 2022, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Scope 2 market-based emissions have been calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance on procured renewable energy.

Past year 2

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

711372

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

777236

(7.7.3) End date

07/30/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 2 location-based GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in July 2021, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Scope 2 market-based emissions have been calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance on procured renewable energy.

Past year 3

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

758195

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

782555

(7.7.3) End date

07/30/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate and disclose our scope 2 location-based GHG emissions based on the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. We use carbon conversion factors published by the UK Government in July 2020, other internationally recognised sources, and bespoke factors based on laboratory calculations at selected locations. Scope 2 market-based emissions have been calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance on procured renewable energy.
[Fixed row]

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

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

5845000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Hybrid method

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

12

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for purchased goods and services. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. The following sub-categories are included for Primark's data: a) Goods for resale - fibres and other materials. b) Goods for resale - cut and sew data which is account for emissions from processing of raw materials into final products. c) Goods for resale - other non-textile products related to the extraction of raw materials through to product finishing for footwear, footwear accessories and health & beauty. d) Goods and services not for resale which are necessary for business operations such as IT and business services. e) Packaging - the emissions account for the procurement of packaging materials for finished textile and non-textile Primark products. f) Water use - the consumption of water at sites operated by Primark including stores, offices and distribution centres DEFRA 2012, 2014, 2021 and 2023 factors were applied and supplemented by custom emission factors based on averages for the type of activity (derived from The Higg Materials Sustainability Index version 2.0).. The "percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners" corresponds to the share of Tier 1 manufacturing suppliers. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

210000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for capital goods. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. Capital goods are those which enable the business to operate and which have an extended product life. The data deals with emissions relating to the construction, refit and refurbishment of Primark's stores including fixtures and fittings. Emission factors are sourced from the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) 2012. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

23000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for fuel and energy related activities not included in Scope 1 or 2. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

960226

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

The data supplied for Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution activities are for the ABF group. The data supplied by Primark covers emissions from its distribution network from country of origin to distribution centre, and distribution centre to store. For the rest of the ABF businesses, the data reported here includes all upstream and downstream third-party transport movements carried out by third parties for which we are responsible. The data reported only includes journeys fully dedicated to the transport of our goods or materials in which the third-party invoices us directly. We exclude journeys in a subcontracted mode of transport that is carrying other materials or goods for other customers in addition to our materials or goods. Examples of these non-dedicated transport movements are couriers, ferries, groupage operations and pallet networks. The data reported is the combustion of fuel in vehicles. Third party vehicle emissions are calculated using tonnes/km of movement and the latest DEFRA, or international equivalent emissions factors. We report emissions from third party journeys using information from suppliers and customers, and from estimates using the best of our operational knowledge. We recognise there are limitations with our current approach of gathering information and reporting the emissions from third party journeys and that, in some cases, the full journey is not always captured: for example, the journey of our goods or materials from customer distribution centre to final destination. As such, we are working with our businesses to improve third party transport data methodologies, aligned with The GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, with the aim to report more complete data in future years for Scope 3 Categories 4 and 9. Of the 960,226 tCO2e reported, 304,680 tCO2e is attributed to Primark's activities with data assured by EY. 655,545 tCO2e is attributed to the rest of the ABF group, calculated using transport data provided by the businesses and has been assured by EY.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for waste generated in operations. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted for other ABF businesses and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

5000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for business travel. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. Primark maintains a complex global supply chain, managed from head offices in the UK and Ireland. There is office space within the Islip UK distribution centre and in-country teams working from locations in China and Bangladesh. Employees are often required to move between these sites and those of Primark's suppliers. This category includes the emissions from air and rail travel and other travel related emissions. The UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) were applied to calculate the emissions. Air and rail data is provided by Primark and ABF third-party travel booking providers. Other travel related data on Primark's travel expenditure is obtained from internal accounts. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark).

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

For ABF, this category is likely to be small and not material when compared with our main emission sources. For Primark, this category is also considered out of scope as emissions are unlikely to be material in terms of its overall carbon footprint.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

ABF use the operational control approach and therefore include upstream leased assets in scope 1 and 2 reporting.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.5) Please explain

For Primark, this category is not applicable as Primark operates stores in which they are directly paying for the transportation of these goods and do not have downstream transportation through wholesalers. As Primark are a 'bricks and mortar' retailer only, this category consists of customer 'home to store' and 'store to home' travel only. Although we expect this category to be material, due to a lack of crucial primary data points, this category has been scoped out of Primark's baseline emissions calculations. For the rest of the ABF Group transport and distribution data is collected but not yet split between upstream and downstream movements. Each business will have differing scopes of downstream movements depending on their relationships with distribution companies retailers and customers classifying the point of sale and relevant data may not be available. For ABF all upstream and downstream third party transportation and distribution activities are captured in Category 4 Upstream transportation and distribution until further analysis enables this data to be separated and movements can be calculated for the distribution of sold products between ABF and the consumer with movements not paid for by ABF and in vehicles not owned by ABF. We are working with our businesses to improve third party transport data methodologies aligned with The GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain Scope 3 Standard with the aim to report more complete data in future years for Scope 3 Categories 4 and 9.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

While this category could be significant for ABF, we are not able to influence the emissions in relation to the processing of sold products so will not be focused on further work in this category. For Primark, this category is considered not material and is therefore out of scope for their own inventory. Primark's products are finished consumer goods with no additional processing after handover to the customer.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

588000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for indirect use phase emissions, please specify :Bespoke methodology based on product type

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for use of sold products. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. Primark calculate the indirect emissions from the products they sell within the following product 'use phases': a) Wearing b) Washing c) Drying d) Ironing. For ABF, this category is likely to be material at the Group level as a large proportion of our products such as bread and bakery foods, tea, animal feed, and bioethanol are consumed directly without further processing. All use phase calculations are based on internal sales data.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

40000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust, which included emissions for end of life treatment of sold products. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. Emission factors are sourced from the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA). A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark). Emissions calculations for product disposal and paper bag disposal are based on internal sales data.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

For ABF this category is likely to be small and not material when compared with our main emission sources particularly as we do not lease out a significant amount of our assets. For Primark this category is also considered out of scope as emissions are unlikely to be material in terms of its overall carbon footprint.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not have franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from our joint ventures where we have 40% or more investment or financial control are already included in the scopes 1 and 2 of our Group's emissions and therefore we are determining the boundary of the scope 3 Investments category for other associate companies or subsidiaries where there is a level of influence

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We are not aware of other upstream scope 3 emissions.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We are not aware of other downstream scope 3 emissions.
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

07/30/2022

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

5410196

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

85580

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

24808

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

928287

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

3288

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

2661

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

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

596171

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

37542

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust. The 2022/23 figures were assured by EY. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted for other ABF businesses, and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark) excluding Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution. The data supplied for Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution activities are for the ABF group. The data supplied by Primark covers emissions from its distribution network from country of origin to distribution centre, and distribution centre to store. For the rest of ABF businesses, the data reported here includes all upstream and downstream third-party transport movements that are dedicated to moving something for us including raw materials, ingredients, packaging, processing aids, waste, part processed materials or finished product. To date, ABF has not split out the data for upstream and downstream activities. Therefore the emissions for upstream transportation are over-reported. Our reported emissions include sea, air, road and rail transport. Calculations are based on data provided by supply chain logistics partners, with the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) applied to calculate the emissions.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

07/30/2021

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

3834886

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

106661

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

22406

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

835103

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

2357

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

6029

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

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

396746

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

23481

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust. The 2021/22 figures were assured by EY. A full scope 3 inventory has yet to be conducted by other ABF businesses, and independently assured, and therefore data reported here is just for the Retail division (Primark) excluding Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution. The data supplied for Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution activities are for the ABF group. The data supplied by Primark covers emissions from its distribution network from country of origin to distribution centre, and distribution centre to store. For the rest of ABF businesses, the data reported here includes all upstream and downstream third-party transport movements that are dedicated to moving something for us including raw materials, ingredients, packaging, processing aids, waste, part processed materials or finished product. To date, ABF has not split out the data for upstream and downstream activities. Therefore the emissions for upstream transportation are over-reported. Our reported emissions include sea, air, road and rail transport. Calculations are based on data provided by supply chain logistics partners, with the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) applied to calculate the emissions.

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

07/30/2020

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

4265101

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

110186

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

453399

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

790328

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

102288

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

7986

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

68104

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

444558

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

25641

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Primark completed significant work on identifying its material scope 3 emissions with their calculation methodology independently verified by The Carbon Trust. The 2020/21 figures were assured by EY. Primark's 2021 scope 3 data in the 2021 Responsibility Report page 25 were assured. The data supplied for Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution activities are for the ABF Group. The data supplied by Primark covers emissions from its distribution network from country of origin to distribution centre, and distribution centre to store. For the rest of ABF businesses, the data reported here includes all upstream and downstream third-party transport movements that are dedicated to moving something for us including raw materials, ingredients, packaging, processing aids, waste, part processed materials or finished product. To date, ABF has not split out the data for upstream and downstream activities. Therefore the emissions for upstream transportation are over-reported. Our reported emissions include sea, air, road and rail transport. Calculations are based on data provided by supply chain logistics partners, with the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (DEFRA) applied to calculate the emissions. The data supplied for Category 5: Waste generated in operations are for the ABF Group and represent the emissions related to the disposal and treatment of the waste produced in our direct operations. This waste includes hazardous and non-hazardous wastes, waste material which is reused, recycled or recovered and wastewater. The tonnage of waste generated is assured by EY. The data supplied for Category 7: Employee commuting are for the ABF Group with calculations and assumptions made for all business segments. Primark excluded employee commuting from their inventory due to materiality. The relevance or materiality of emissions from employee commuting is also likely to be insignificant for our group and when estimated, account for less than 1% of ABF's total emissions. However, we recognise that with over 100,000 employees worldwide there is still a considerable amount of employee commuting. As we have the raw data to calculate an estimate (using employee figures, national average commuting time and country emission factors from DEFRA 2019), we have reported this data.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

ABF_Responsibility_Report_2023.pdf.downloadasset.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

114-115

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

ABF_Responsibility_Report_2023.pdf.downloadasset.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

114-115

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

ABF_Responsibility_Report_2023.pdf.downloadasset.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

114-115

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
☑ Scope 3: Business travel
☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

ABF_Responsibility_Report_2023.pdf.downloadasset.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

114-115

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4750

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.15

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We report a 6% reduction in CO2 emissions (scope 1 and scope 2 location-based) from 3,107,403 tCO2 to 2,914,812 tCO2 between 2022 and 2023. Of the annual decrease in scope 1 and 2 emissions, 4,750 tCO2 is attributed to the change in renewable energy consumption. This is the use of wood and bagasse on-site to generate electricity for consumption as well as the consumption of self-generated energy from non-fuel renewable sources. Thus the percentage of reduction linked to change in output is (4,750/3,107,403)*100 0.15%. N.B: for all our calculations in this question, we use the scope 1 and scope 2 emissions reported last year to CDP (i.e. 3,107,403 tCO2) as the denominator, as recommended in the CDP guidance.*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

67882

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.18

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We report a 6% reduction in CO2 emissions (scope 1 and scope 2 location-based) from 3,107,403 tCO2 to 2,914,812 tCO2 between 2022 and 2023. Of the annual decrease in scope 1 and 2 emissions, 67,882 tCO2 is attributed to other emission reduction activities. These emissions savings are from initiatives across our business in the 2022/23 reporting year (as per 7.55.2, scope 1 and 2 emissions only, excluding any self-generated energy from non-fuel renewable sources such as solar PV). Thus the percentage of reduction linked to change in output is (67882/3,107,403)*100 2.18%. N.B: for all our calculations in this question, we use the scope 1 and scope 2 emissions reported last year to CDP (i.e. 3,107,403 tCO2) as the denominator, as recommended in the CDP guidance.*

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

29

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.001

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We report a 6% reduction in CO2 emissions (scope 1 and scope 2 location-based) from 3,107,403 tCO2 to 2,914,812 tCO2 between 2022 and 2023. Of the annual decrease in scope 1 and 2 emissions, 29 tCO2 is attributed to business divestments. Thus the percentage of reduction linked to change in output is (29/3,107,403)*100 0.001%. N.B: for all our calculations in this question, we use the scope 1 and scope 2 emissions reported last year to CDP (i.e. 3,107,403 tCO2) as the denominator, as recommended in the CDP guidance.*

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

719

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.023

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We report a 6% reduction in CO2 emissions (scope 1 and scope 2 location-based) from 3,107,403 tCO2 to 2,914,812 tCO2 between 2022 and 2023. Of the annual decrease in scope 1 and 2 emissions, 719 tCO2 is attributed to the acquisition of businesses within ABF's Agricultural, Grocery and Ingredients segments. Thus the percentage of reduction linked to change in output is (719/3,107,403)*100 0.023%. N.B: for all our calculations in this question, we use the scope 1 and scope 2 emissions reported last year to CDP (i.e. 3,107,403 tCO2) as the denominator, as recommended in the CDP guidance.*

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change.

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

We recognise that climate change represents a material risk throughout our businesses supply chains and poses challenges to some of our businesses. Many of our businesses rely on agricultural crops with complex supply chains. Long-term climate change will impact agricultural crops and workers while extreme weather events have the potential to cause disruption across value chains. In our assessment of climate-related business risks we recognise that the cumulative impacts of changes in weather and water availability could affect our operations at a Group level. However, the diversified and decentralised nature of the Group means that mitigation or adaptation strategies are considered and implemented by the individual businesses.

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change.

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.

(7.12.1.1) CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)

4260372

(7.12.1.2) Comment

This is a 10% increase compared with the prior year's biogenic emissions. The majority of the biogenic emissions come from bagasse, the renewable fibrous residue that remains after the extraction of juice from the crushed stalks of sugar cane which is used to generate renewable energy.
[Fixed row]

(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.13.1) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

CO2 emissions from land use management

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Process-based models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

We report the total emissions from our biogenic carbon within biofuel combustion (processing / manufacturing machinery) until further differentiation is made in our data.

CO2 removals from land use management

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Managed but not measured

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

We are managing soil and CO2 emissions on our own land, as required under relevant certification schemes. This does not involve the measurement and reporting of CO2 removals.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Managed but not measured

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

We are managing soil and CO2 emissions and sequestration on our own land, as required under relevant certification schemes.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

We collect data for fuels used in our own transport which includes land machinery and are reported in our aggregated scope 1 emissions. We do have data at the granular level for different fuel sources used in land machinery across our operations, however emissions from land machinery and processing/manufacturing machinery are not differentiated from our total biogenic carbon figure of 4,260,372 tonnes.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

4260372

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

These emissions relate to biogenic fuels including biomass, wood/wood waste, fuel crops and biogas used as fuels within our manufacturing operations and emissions from our yeast production processes. CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion in our processing and manufacturing are included in scope 1 emissions. Of the CO2 emissions from our biogenic carbon, 81% are emitted from the combustion of bagasse which is primarily used as a fuel source within our sugar processing and manufacturing. Therefore we report the total emissions from our biogenic carbon within this category until further differentiation is made in our data. To note: we use IPCC 2006 guidelines to create a custom emission factor using exact sugar cane yield tonnes and hectares burnt to determine CO2 emissions for burning plant remnants on our land.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Not measured separately

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

The emissions from biofuel combustion are captured and reported in our Group figures.
[Fixed row]

(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

Cotton

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not intend to calculate this data within the next two years

(7.14.7) Explain why you do not calculate GHG emissions for this commodity

Primark calculates GHG emissions from cotton as part of its absolute Scope 3 emissions, category 1, Purchased Goods and services. However, Primark currently does not publicly disclose emissions associated with individual materials.

Sugar

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Unit of production

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.32

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

This year we have seen a 13% decrease in our tCO2e per unit of production due to a reduction in our product tonnage for ABF Sugar. To calculate this figure, we accounted for all the scope 1 and 2 emissions related to sugar production, including emissions from the manufacturing facilities. The metric tonnes of product includes co- and by-products in addition to sugar tonnage. Our Sugar businesses report their GHG emissions data once a year to ABF using the group's environment data reporting system. From each site, data is collected from several inputs across agricultural activities (own land), transport, manufacturing process, and energy use. The site SHERQ (safety, health, environment, risk and quality) Manager is responsible for analysing, challenging and signing off the data. The SHERQ Manager also engages with the business level Finance team who conduct a review across business aggregated data before it is submitted to ABF Sugar's Finance team. Additional checks are conducted for the data across ABF Sugar before it is inputted to ABF's environment data system.

Tea

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, but we intend to calculate this data within the next two years

(7.14.7) Explain why you do not calculate GHG emissions for this commodity

Twinings is working with its suppliers to tackle emissions and reduce its carbon footprint. Working with an external consultancy, Twinings has developed a tailored tool for assessing the emissions footprint of tea gardens. It will enable Twinings to gather consistent and comparable data across its supply chain, from growing to manufacturing. A pilot is being conducted with key tea gardens and the tool will be gradually rolled out.

Wheat

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, but we intend to calculate this data within the next two years

(7.14.7) Explain why you do not calculate GHG emissions for this commodity

Many of our businesses are in the process of calculating their wider Scope 3 emissions, focusing initially on their supply chains. Over the past year, a divisional project team was established to oversee the implementation of new data systems specifically focused on Scope 3 emissions, to ensure all UK Grocery businesses can report assured Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions data by the end of 2025. Where businesses already know the categories of their most significant Scope 3 emissions, they have initiated discussions with key suppliers to find supply chain-wide interventions that can be delivered at scale and pace. Other businesses within ABF, who are also sourcing wheat, are establishing their Scope 3 emissions.
[Fixed row]

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

2188361

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

29863

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

53921

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14891

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8809

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8809

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

60656

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

112869

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

112869

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1261

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

777

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

390

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1501

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

662

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2808

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

14009

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3073

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10336

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

5791

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

925

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1182

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1895

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

95

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

247343

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

78171

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

78171

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1216

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1560

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

20

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

419

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1840

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

2287

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

69

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

303

Ecuador

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

48

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

48

Eswatini

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

76809

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

5100

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

5100

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

896

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

6687

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

11978

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3722

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1859

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

884

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

34962

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

25899

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

31727

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9996

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

13628

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

13628

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1945

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8660

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4297

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

43240

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

7317

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

9862

Malawi

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

69156

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

23306

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

23306

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

794

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1722

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1722

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6968

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

19588

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

9394

Mozambique

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11555

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

911

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

911

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1314

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

10166

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

7181

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7138

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3327

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3327

Pakistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

797

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

980

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

980

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

556

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1079

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1079

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

9

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

9

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1963

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

11396

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

15429

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2779

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3363

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

136

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

111

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

14

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

14

Slovakia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

17

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

13

Slovenia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

206

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

436

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

277412

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

44499

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

44499

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

138576

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

19581

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

16119

Sri Lanka

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

183

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

183

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

9

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3631

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

511

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

76

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13395

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8095

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8095

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4495

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8587

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8587

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1053413

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

91735

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

108321

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36245

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

6868

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

6868

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57876

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

61901

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

61362

Uruguay

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

4

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

19

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

5329

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

5302

Zambia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

75913

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

22746

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

22746
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division
☑ By activity

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

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Grocery*	*208167*
Row 2	*Sugar*	*1804684*
Row 3	*Agriculture*	*59696*
Row 4	*Ingredients*	*178420*
Row 5	*Retail*	*21179*

[Add row]

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Processing and manufacturing in our direct operations*	*2010072*
Row 2	*Agricultural activities on our own land*	*189080*
Row 3	*Transport and distribution in our control*	*72994*

[Add row]

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.18.1) Select the form(s) in which you are reporting your agricultural/forestry emissions.

Select from:

☑ Total emissions

(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.

Row 1

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2199152

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

☑ Process-based models

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

For the majority of manufacturing emissions we use international and national sources for factors such as DEFRA. For a minority of emissions from processing and manufacturing, we use production activity-specific factors that take into account local conditions. These include ethanol manufacture and bread baking. We also include here our agricultural processes which were differentiated in previous CDP responses. Over 99% of our agricultural emissions are those from growing our own sugar cane and sugar beet crops and harvesting them including the burning of the cane crops to remove cane leaves just before they are harvested. We also include data for GHG emissions from intensive livestock farming activities which are due to enteric fermentation and the production on site of crops such as peas and corn for pig feed.

Row 2

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Distribution

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

72994

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

We use DEFRA 2022 emission factors for our transport and distribution activities.

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By activity

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

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Grocery*	*205016*	*229492*
Row 2	*Sugar*	*128001*	*136381*
Row 3	*Agriculture*	*22627*	*34823*
Row 4	*Ingredients*	*187867*	*158422*
Row 5	*Retail*	*99155*	*75860*

[Add row]

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Processing and manufacturing.This includes manufacturing sites and associated distribution centres, warehouses and offices.*	*543512*	*559118*
Row 2	*Retail stores and associated distribution centres, warehouses and offices.*	*99155*	*75860*

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2272146

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

642666

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

634979

(7.22.4) Please explain

ABF reports full GHG emissions from those activities for which we are responsible. This applies to all companies over which the Group has full operational control or has financial control but does not fully own, and from joint ventures and associates where we do not have a majority shareholding but do have either joint control or significant influence.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

All entities are reported within our consolidated accounting group.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate, agriculture, owned transport and the on-site treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for Illovo

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

547089

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

The main sources of scope 1 emissions for Illovo are on-site energy and from agricultural activities.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing business unit level data for Illovo and therefore an allocation method has not been required.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

N/A

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for Illovo

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

103430

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Illovo's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing business unit level data for Illovo and therefore an allocation method has not been required.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

N/A

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for British Sugar

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

678750

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

The main sources of scope 1 emissions for British Sugar are on-site energy and on-site wastewater treatment.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing business unit level data for British Sugar and therefore an allocation method has not been required.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

N/A

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for British Sugar

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4411

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

British Sugar's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing business unit level data for British Sugar and therefore an allocation method has not been required.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

N/A

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate, agriculture, owned transport and the on-site treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for Primark

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

21179

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

The main source of scope 1 emissions for Primark are on-site energy.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Primark has completed a scope 1 inventory for the reporting year, assured by EY and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 91

Row 15

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for Primark

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

99155

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Primark's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Primark has completed a scope 2 inventory for the reporting year, assured by EY and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 91

Row 16

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply
☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for Primark

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

7019000

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Primark's scope 3 emissions are mainly from purchased goods and services.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Primark has completed a scope 3 inventory for the reporting year, assured by EY and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 92

Row 17

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate, agriculture, owned transport and the on-site treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 18

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 19

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for British Sugar.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

678750

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

The main sources of scope 1 emissions for British Sugar are on-site energy and on-site wastewater treatment.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing business unit level data for British Sugar and therefore an allocation method has not been required.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

N/A

Row 20

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Reporting business-unit level data for British Sugar.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4411

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

British Sugar's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing business unit level data for British Sugar and therefore an allocation method has not been required.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

N/A

Row 21

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate, agriculture, owned transport and the on-site treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 22

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 23

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate agriculture owned transport and the onsite treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 24

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Row 25

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate agriculture owned transport and the onsite treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 26

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 27

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate agriculture owned transport and the onsite treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 28

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 29

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate agriculture owned transport and the onsite treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 30

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 31

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2272146

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 1 emissions are mainly from the energy we generate agriculture owned transport and the onsite treatment of wastewater. Also included are the emissions from our production processes such as bread baking and ethanol production.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19

Row 32

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :We are providing ABF group level data and therefore no allocation of emissions.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

642666

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

ABF's scope 2 emissions are mainly from imported electricity consumption.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

We are providing ABF Group level data and therefore no assumptions are made regarding the allocation of data or identification of GHG source.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

ABF Responsibility Report page 19
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

Some of our businesses and sites are able to allocate emissions to different customers. In these cases, they work with their customers to identify the relevant emissions and provide information which is considered valuable to the commercial relationship. To conduct this approach across all of the group's businesses, customers, geographies and product lines would be very costly and therefore it is managed on a case-by-case basis depending on the nature of the commercial relationship. For example, British Sugar completes an annual Carbon Footprint Analysis with The Carbon Trust.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(7.28.4) Explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Where required as part of our relationship with specific customers, our businesses have invested in building the capability to allocate emissions to these customers. Allocating emissions to other product lines or customers would be viable if it is considered to have value to the commercial relationship.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1097036

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

7512758

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

8609794

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

541354

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1300827

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1842181

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

47785

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

136547

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

184332

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

2840

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

2840

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1689015

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

8950131

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

10639146
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Sustainable biomass refers to bagasse. As bagasse is categorised as a feedstock according to CDP guidance it is excluded here.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

241402

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

241402

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We capture the consumption of biogas at a total Group level.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

855634

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

855634

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We capture the consumption of wood at a total Group level.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1290227

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

1290227

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We capture the consumption of coal at a total Group level. Our sugar businesses in the UK, Eswatini and South Africa consume limited coal to fuel boilers.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

151639

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

151639

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We capture the consumption of gas oil and heavy gas oil at a total Group level.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5665707

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

5665707

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We capture the consumption of natural gas at a total Group level.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

405184

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

405184

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We capture the consumption of coke, diesel, kerosene, LPG, and petrol at a Group level.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

8609794

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

8609794

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We capture the consumption of all fuels excluding feedstocks at a Group level.
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

12552825

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

11643337

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

12552825

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

11643337

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Biomass, wind, hydropower, solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

196662

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ REGO

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

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in the UK have purchased REGOs to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

22161

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Green Power Certificate

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Germany have purchased Green Power Certificates to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Biomass, wind, hydropower, solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

56537

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Brazil have purchased I-RECs to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

25603

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Supplier certification under Mexican law

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

Select from:

☑ Mexico

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Mexico have purchased renewable energy sourced from wind to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

7992

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Renewable Energy Redemption Certificate (Colombia)

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

Select from:

☑ Colombia

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Colombia have purchased renewable energy sourced from hydropower to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Chile

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4057

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**RENOVA (Registered in Chile)

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

Select from:

☑ Chile

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Chile have purchased RENOVA's to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind & hydropower

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

36261

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Canada

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Canada have purchased renewable energy sourced from primarily from wind and hydropower to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

6849

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Italy

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Italy have purchased renewable energy sourced to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Austria

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2462

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**REC

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

Select from:

☑ Austria

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Austria have purchased renewable energy sourced to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4361

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**REC

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

Select from:

☑ Belgium

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Belgium have purchased renewable energy sourced to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ France

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

29694

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :REC

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

Select from:

☑ France

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in France have purchased renewable energy sourced to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

25601

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**REC

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

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Netherlands have purchased renewable energy sourced to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

22354

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Republic of Ireland have purchased renewable energy sourced to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2599

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Switzerland have purchased hydropower to cover part of its electricity consumption during the reporting period.

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Not specified

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

34668

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Spain

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our operations in Spain have purchased renewable energy sourced to cover part of the electricity consumption during the reporting period.
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

30586.73

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

30586.73

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

160165.1

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

254.8

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

160419.90

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4964.41

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1673.48

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

6637.89

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8801.02

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

8801.02

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

56687.37

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

47392.25

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

104079.62

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

42924.5

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

42924.50

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4271.98

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4271.98

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

108144.53

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

60959.32

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

169103.85

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8095.66

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

8095.66

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4158.94

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4158.94

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

572.79

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

572.79

Ecuador

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

316.55

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

316.55

Eswatini

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14230.91

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

14230.91

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29180

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

21391.21

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

50571.21

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

32106.29

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

186.19

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

32292.48

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

68553.98

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

17943.66

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

86497.64

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

18768.52

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

18768.52

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29892.77

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

29892.77

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

28448.27

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

635.65

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

29083.92

Malawi

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

65029.27

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

65029.27

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2589.55

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2589.55

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

49253.47

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

103.59

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

49357.06

Mozambique

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10674.74

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

10674.74

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

27896.66

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1929.23

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

29825.89

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

27139.87

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

27139.87

Pakistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2793.66

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2793.66

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5338.07

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

5338.07

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13.52

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

13.52

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

18132.66

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

74.52

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

18207.18

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11964.99

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

11964.99

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

392.57

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

392.57

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

35.56

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

35.56

Slovakia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

68.71

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

68.71

Slovenia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

649.65

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

399.35

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1049.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

47511.04

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

47511.04

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

101664.76

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1053.39

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

102718.15

Sri Lanka

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

299.18

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

299.18

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

120

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

120.00

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6239.29

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

6239.29

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17389.02

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

17389.02

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19836.61

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

19836.61

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

473986.94

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

131.23

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

440.82

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

474558.99

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17244.33

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

17244.33

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

135498.17

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

661.05

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

26525.22

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

162684.44

Uruguay

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

308.23

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

308.23

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

60.18

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

60.18

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6752.6

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

5416.67

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

12169.27

Zambia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

142427.16

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

142427.16
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.000148

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

2914812

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

19750000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

19

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

The 19% decrease in tCO2e against annual revenue is driven by a 6% decrease in scopes 1 and 2 whilst total revenue has increased by 16%. Overall, the Group sources 58% of its energy from renewable sources.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

88461

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Tonnes of hazardous and non-hazardous waste

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

N/A

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

4

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

We report here total hazardous and non-hazardous waste as a climate-related metric. This year these waste streams decreased by 4% compared with the prior year in which we reported 92,419 tonnes. In total, ABF generated 520,618 tonnes of waste in 2022/23, of which 83% was sent for recycling or other beneficial use. Our

businesses continue to focus on reusing waste materials where possible. This year, 11% of all our factories achieved zero waste to landfill and 37% recycled or reused 95% or more of their total generated waste.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

21182607

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

MWh

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

N/A

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

1

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

As energy use is one of our main environmental impacts and is a significant cost coupled with fluctuations in the price of fuels, it remains a key focus for the effective management of our businesses. They explore changes to their energy mix and ways of generating their own energy, and a number have invested in combined heat and power plants (CHP) and cycle gas turbines. Of the total energy consumed this year, 58% came from renewable sources, a proportion which has increased

incrementally over the last five years. In 2023, our total energy consumption was 21,183 GWh, a 1% increase compared with 2022. Our Sugar businesses were responsible for consuming 82% of that total, or 17,468 GWh, which is a 2% increase compared with the prior year. Of their total energy consumed in the year, 66% was from renewable sources. Our Sugar businesses have continually improved energy use over the last decade and have made significant reductions in energy used. The businesses continue to seek energy efficiencies and to do more with every unit of energy consumed. For example, as well as producing both core sugar products and a range of speciality sugars, the advanced sugar manufacturing sites produce more than 24 co-products including molasses, animal feed and bioethanol. Furthermore, they exported 850 GWh of surplus energy generated on their sites to their local grids or other organisations. Of the total energy consumed across the Group this year, 58% came from renewable sources mainly generated on our sites. The majority of this, at 86%, comes from bagasse, with 7% from wood, 4% from imported electricity, 2% from biogas generated on-site and 1% from imported steam and on-site renewables. Bagasse is the residual fibre that remains after the extraction of juice from the crushed stalks of sugar cane. Illovo Sugar Africa has a very efficient system of using the bagasse to generate steam and electricity to power their factories. The other sources of renewable energy that we report are the on-site use of wood, biogas and solar and purchased renewable energy from national grids.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ Absolute target

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

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

ABF Sugar NT NZ FLAG Approval Letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

12/22/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

07/30/2018

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

2313564

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

234164

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

0.000

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

2547728.000

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

07/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

52

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

1222909.440

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

1804684

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

128001

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

1932685.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

46.42

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Near term targets energy and industrial: ABF Sugar commits to reduce its absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 52.1% by 2030 from a 2018 base year. ABF Sugar also commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, capital goods, fuel- and energy-related activities, upstream

transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, employee commuting and downstream transportation and distribution by 30% within the same timeframe. The target boundary includes biogenic land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

ABF Sugar is committed to reducing scope 1 and 2 emissions by 52% from a 2018 baseline by 2030. It is in the process of validating its reduction targets for scope 1, 2 GHG emissions with the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi).

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

ABF Sugar's transition plan explains the activities planned to ensure they meet their commitment. ABF Sugar has categorised existing and new plans and projects into three timeframes: 1. Short term (present to 2025): Focus on improving efficiency and reducing operational GHG emissions investing in energy efficiency with the aim of reducing energy consumption and eliminating coal. 2. Medium term (2026 to 2030): Targeting key sites and pairing them with key technological resources. 3. Long term (beyond 2030): Focusing on employing low emission technologies managing climate-related risks across the value chain and partnering to innovate at factories across the business. There are assumptions on low emission technologies for hydrocarbons and government regulations surrounding biogas that underpin these goals. The above short and medium-term goals have been identified to achieve ABF Sugars 2030 commitments which are set in line with SBTi. ABF Sugar's emissions reduction target has been validated by the SBTi in 2023.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Primark NT Approval Letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/15/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel

☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

07/30/2019

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

20602

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

139841

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4771324

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

123393

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

34904

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

506663

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4297

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

10573

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

756260

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

38591

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

6246005.000

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

6406448.000

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

07/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

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

3203224.000

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

21179

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

99155

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

5845000

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

210000

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

23000

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

305000

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3000

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

5000

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

588000

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

40000

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7019000.000

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

7139334.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

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

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-22.88

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Primark has committed to reducing its absolute scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 50% by 2030 from a 2018/19 base year. This year, Primark has also had its science-based target validated by the SBTi. At present, Primark has not included residual emissions neutralisation ("carbon offsetting") in its transition planning. However, in alignment with industry standards, for its long-term ambition Primark will need to develop an approach to neutralising the residual emissions that will not be abated through its emissions reduction strategy.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Primark has committed to reducing absolute scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 50% by 2030 from a 2018/19 base year. This year Primark has also had its science-based target validated by the SBTi.

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

Primark has defined a roadmap to realise the SBTi ambitions, focusing on key emissions hotspots across Scope 1, 2 and 3 for the short and medium term, defined as up to 2025 and 2030 respectively. Long-term goals are yet to be defined. Development of technology and innovations gaps in the market are constraints in defining long-term goals. Key priority areas for action were identified on the basis of the influence and materiality of emissions categories, assessed from the base year of 2018. These are Scope 1 and 2 emissions, where the business has stronger influence, and the most significant Scope 3 categories in terms of absolute emissions. For Scope 1 and 2 emissions, short term goals focus on maintaining ISO50001 certification for all stores, offices, and distribution centres and developing appropriate regional pathways for heat decarbonisation in Primark properties. Medium term goals are to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 50% by 2030, from a 2018/2019 baseline year. For Scope 3, Primark's short term goals include the following: Launch an energy efficiency programme, engaging and supporting suppliers' manufacturing facilities on energy demand reduction; Launch a renewable energy programme, engaging and supporting suppliers' manufacturing facilities on sourcing low carbon and renewable energy; Optimise inbound transport modes to balance emissions, cost, and time and; Strengthen the durability of Primark's clothes by 2025. Medium term goals for Scope 3 include developing all clothes to be recyclable by design by 2027; Developing all clothes from recycled or sustainably sourced materials by 2030; to further regenerative agricultural practices used in the Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme. Finally, Primark aims to eliminate single-use plastics and all non-clothing waste by 2027. This year, there has been an overall increase of 11% in carbon emissions across the value chain against Primark's baseline year 2018/19. This is the result of an increased volume of material used to produce the products sold over that period. In the short term, this trend is likely to continue, but there will be a decline as Primark increases the use of more sustainably sourced materials across its product range and once the energy programmes being rolled out across the supply chain begin to deliver at scale

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 3

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 3

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ No, but we anticipate setting one in the next two years

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/19/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

07/30/2015

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

125311

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

95339

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

0.000

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

220650.000

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

07/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

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

110325.000

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

74931

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

35111

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

110042.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

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

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.26

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our UK Grocery businesses are targeting a 50 percent reduction across all three scopes by 2030, against a 2015 baseline. This is aligned with the Courtauld Commitment convened by the sustainability organisation WRAP to reduce emissions. The Courtauld Commitment 2030, of which our UK Grocery businesses are signatories, is aligned with the SBTi objective to reduce GHG emissions by 50% by 2030 across the entire UK food chain. This target is related to the activities of UK Grocery businesses and covers 100% of all relevant activities within scopes 1 & 2 only. This target does not include scope 3 emissions.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Our UK Grocery businesses are targeting a 50 percent reduction across all three scopes by 2030, against a 2015 baseline. This is aligned with the Courtauld Commitment convened by the sustainability organisation WRAP to reduce emissions. The Courtauld Commitment 2030, of which our UK Grocery businesses are signatories, is aligned with the SBTi objective to reduce GHG emissions by 50% by 2030 across the entire UK food chain.

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

Driven by operational structure changes, investment in renewable energy and ongoing capital investment in more efficient equipment across the division, our UK Grocery businesses have delivered a 40% reduction in scope 1 GHG emissions between 2015 and 2023, and a reduction of 63% in scope 2 emissions. The progress to date has been achieved by each of the UK Grocery businesses focusing on its own operations and implementing many small initiatives or projects. These practices are part of well-established continuous improvement programmes, and the current trajectory gives us confidence in meeting the target for scope 1. With scope 2, there are several solar projects in progress which coupled with grid mix improvements will help to meet this this target. The reduction in scope 3 emissions required to deliver the commitment will be more challenging given the fragmented nature of UK Grocery supply chains and the complexity associated with capturing accurate management data. Over the past year, a divisional project team was established to oversee the implementation of new data systems specifically focused on scope 3 emissions, to ensure all UK Grocery businesses can report assured scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions data by the end of 2025. Where businesses already know the categories of their most significant scope 3 emissions, they have initiated discussions with key suppliers to find supply chain-wide interventions that can be delivered at scale and pace.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other climate-related targets

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*8*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*177*	*483000*
Implementation commenced	*7*	*275*
Implemented	*12*	*97784*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Solar PV

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

6500

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2023, AB Mauri further increased its use of renewable energy in its operations. Alongside buying from third-party suppliers, AB Mauri produce renewable energy on-site from biogas and, increasingly, through installing solar panels at sites. This year, AB Mauri has made progress towards utilising 100% renewable energy across its operations with an increasing number of sites purchasing renewable energy from external suppliers. The yeast site in Chiplun, India, has entered a multi-year contract to source electricity from a nearby solar farm and is estimated to save over 6,500 tCO2e/annum compared with electricity from the local power grid. The project involved an innovative structure, with the business in India taking an ownership stake in the solar farm together with a Power Purchase Agreement, guaranteeing the plant a significant amount of zero carbon, renewable energy.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Biogas

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

650

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Mandatory

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

14230900

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

AB Mauri invests in water treatment technologies to ensure that the water it returns to the environment is safe and compliant with local standards. In some cases a byproduct of water treatment can also be a source of energy. The business has recently completed a new wastewater treatment installation paired with a biogas cogeneration plant at its site in Pederneiras Brazil. This will produce electrical and thermal energy from steam and hot water. The biogas results from a wastewater treatment process known as anaerobic digestion. It also has a facility where it treats this biogas to a quality where it can be used as a fuel source and a cogeneration plant where the treated biogas is transformed into energy. The new plant generates renewable energy equivalent to over 30% of the plant's consumption.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Other, please specify **:**Steam supply to manufacturing site from the nearby waste to energy plant

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

2774

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Mandatory

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

107000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In January 2023 the existing coal fired boiler at AB Agri Anshan (China) was replaced with a steam supply from the nearby waste to energy plant. As a result of this change AB Agri has no coal or oil fired steam boilers on any of its sites.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solar PV

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

2906

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

540000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2500000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Tip Top Bakeries, part of George Weston Foods, operates 16 bakeries across Australia and New Zealand. It aims to source 50% of its electricity from renewables by 2025 through the direct installation of solar arrays at its locations, and by negotiating renewable energy purchasing agreements. In Australia, the business has completed solar installations at its sites at Sydney Chullora, Bendigo, Truganina Victoria Depot, Dry Creek South Australia and Carrara Gold Coast Queensland.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

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

15000

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

4000000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

504000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Primark's Energy Policy confirms Primark's commitment to reducing the impact it has on the environment. Energy management & the continual improvement in energy performance are key pillars of this commitment. Primark identified the Building Management System (BMS) strategies in its UK & ROI stores were not configured for optimal energy efficiency. Primark established an Energy Bureau responsible for implementing efficient BMS strategies & monitoring energy consumption. Primark commenced this five-year energy-saving programme in May 2021. As part of the rollout, its partners completed a site visit to a large selection of UK stores to optimise the operating strategy of Primark's BMS. These stores were then connected to the central Primark Energy Bureau where energy consumption is monitored, managed and reported by the Bureau's partners. Since 2021, 179 stores have been included in this programme. The emissions savings delivered as part of the initiative amount to approximately 11% of Primark's electricity consumption with the figure expected to rise when gas consumption is factored in. The initiative is aligned with Primark Cares' commitments and will enable the business to monitor the reduction of its operational environmental impact. The investment figure reported in the prior year was a one-off capital cost & does not consider the projected operational costs over the five-year programme. Reported annual monetary savings are the annual average savings across programme duration

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

☑ Supplier engagement

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

19368

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods & services

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

485950

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

261199

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 1-2 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Textile manufacturing is traditionally energy, water and chemicals-intensive and as a result of high global demand, many mills operate to produce fabric or yarn for multiple customers around the world. A dyeing mill, located in Anhui Province, China, supplies dyed yarn for a number of different Primark sock suppliers. Like many facilities of this type, it needs water, chemicals and energy to process raw materials and create yarn. Primark worked with the Apparel Impact Institute (Aii) to run workshops to familiarise the mill management team with the Clean by Design (CbD) initiative, which provides guidance to identify, fund, scale and measure solutions for reducing environmental footprints in textile manufacturing. Following on from these workshops, the mill was assessed by Aii and supported to develop an action plan to implement improved practices across its operations. As a result of wide-ranging changes in its processes, the mill improved its environmental impact. The investment figure provided covers the join investment made by Primark and the mill to co-fund the investigation activities and business case development performed by Aii

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solar PV

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

210

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

349000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1823000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

As part of the Climate Change Agreement (CCA) process, Twinings is committed to investing in energy efficient processes or technology that reduces the amount of energy it uses. The key objective is to achieve a significant reduction in energy usage and cost. Installing solar panels is one of a series of recommendations made to Twinings as a result of 3 energy surveys carried out in the last 18 months. Solar panels installed at Twining's Andover site in the UK will reduce imported energy with energy generated from the panels used to power the site. To achieve the most beneficial return on investment, Twinings maximised available roof space at Andover by installing a 1.41Mw system

Row 8

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Process optimization

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

64

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

During 2023 our UK Grocery businesses completed various projects that it expects will result in CO2e savings. AB World Foods implemented a compressed air detection loss system new air knife glass jar drier and a new efficient water heating system to reduce legionella risk.

Row 9

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Cooling technology

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

2430

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)
☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

900000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2007000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

The Trigeneration energy reduction project in Twinings factory in Swarzędz, Poland generates energy from natural gas and cooling for air-conditioning in the production hall. The environmental impacts includes a reduction of approximately 2,430 tCO2e (subject to production volumes), turbine efficiency coefficiency of 44% and a reduction in cooling energy consumption.

Row 10

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solar PV

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

693

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

289000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1986000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

The Twinings supply centre in Swarzędz Poland installed solar PV panels. Instability of the electricity market caused large price fluctuations which made it necessary for the site to investigate and invest in alternative sources of electricity supply such as solar PV. The installation will lower the costs of electricity bills and reduce CO2 emissions.

Row 11

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Machine/equipment replacement

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

46964

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

900000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

29000000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Since communicating its 2030 commitments, ABF Sugar has delivered a number of projects to support the transition to a low-carbon economy, including the replacement and upgrading of machinery. A list of projects and their carbon savings are as follows; 1.Bury cossette quality improvement: Slicer machines were replaced with newer models allowing for higher quality cossette and lower water usage leading in turn to less process water for sugar extraction and lower evaporation demand. This has led to a 2% decrease in carbon emissions (20,242 tCO2e). 2.Newark heater; Several new heaters have facilitated improved heat transfer and improved energy performance, leading to a 0.2% decrease in carbon emissions (1,758 tCO2e). 3.Cantley process safety – heavy fuel oil elimination: A switch from heavy fuel oil to natural gas at this site, leading to a 0.1% decrease in carbon emissions (1,422 tCO2e). 4.Bury St Edmunds hot gas generator dryer: Modifications made to dryers have allowed them to run on natural gas instead of coal, leading to a 1% decrease in carbon emissions (9,833 tCO2e). 5.Newark decalcification: Calcium was removed from thin juice to prevent evaporator scaling. This enables evaporators to operate more energy efficiently, leading to a 0.3% decrease in carbon emissions (3,302 tCO2e). 6.Wissington gas turbine performance recovery: Gas turbine performance has been improved, leading to a 1% decrease in carbon emissions (10,407 tCO2e).

Row 12

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solar PV

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

225

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Solar panels were installed on the roof of the AB Mauri, Cordoba site in August 2022 to provide electricity directly to the plant's operations.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

N/A

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

N/A

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

N/A

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

N/A

Row 6

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Emission reduction activities need to meet the standard business investment criteria.
[Add row]

(7.67) Do you implement agriculture or forest management practices on your own land with a climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefit?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.67.1) Specify the agricultural or forest management practice(s) implemented on your own land with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits and provide a corresponding emissions figure, if known.

Row 1

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP7

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Permanent soil cover (including cover crops)

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Cover crops used in arable rotation have demonstrated they can improve the physical structure of the soil as well as improve soil biology and chemistry nutrients. As an example of cover cropping, Illovo Nakambala in Zambia planted sun hemp ahead of cane planting in the Autumn. This promotes organic matter improves soil structure enables a reduction in fertiliser usage and promotes the longterm organic matter in the soil. The impact is a higher yielding cane crop and healthier soil Benefits are expected each year as the cover crops are rotated.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

CO2e savings not yet calculated.

Row 3

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Biodiversity considerations

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Maintenance of pockets of natural vegetation within Illovo's estates act as refuges and ecological green corridors for indigenous fauna and flora resulting in increased biodiversity and minimisation of land use change. As an example a 400hectare reserve known as Nyala Park in Malawi has been set aside within the Illovo Nchalo estate boundary and is maintained with species of the original flora and fauna of the Shire Valley. Ubombo Sugar in Eswatini manages the private Mhlosinga Nature Reserve including the Van Eck Dam Sitting on 1108 hectares of land the reserve supports game birds reptiles and fish. Illovo continues to manage and develop the

areas with positive outcomes. The Nyala Park and Mhlosinga Nature Reserve boast a rich diversity of fauna consisting of healthy populations of mammals reptiles and birds. Certain areas continue to mix cattle with wildlife. The flora encompasses grasslands riverine bush savannah and thornveld. Recreational facilities are offered at some of the reserves so that staff and communities can enjoy the areas in a responsible way. Benefits are expected each year as the Nyala Park matures.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

CO2e savings not yet calculated.

Row 4

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Low tillage and residue management

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Zambia Sugar's Nakambala sugar cane estate launched a pilot to trial a new farming system to improve resource stewardship improve yields and agricultural profitability on 2000 hectares. Key components of the system include an innovative replanting schedule minimal tillage upgraded drainage and irrigation systems to ensure that more drop gets to the crop precise application of fertilisers with more greencover manures and GPS assisted vehicles which travel efficiently to reduce the disturbance of the soil and save fuel. Less replanting means the system substantially reduces costs and less disturbance protects natural resources such as soil and water.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Emission reductions (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

CO2e savings not yet calculated.
[Add row]

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Row 1

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Agroforestry

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Through the Jordans Farm Partnership (JFP), Jordans Cereals, a brand in our UK Grocery division, pays 34 British farmers a premium for their oats, wheat and barley, in return for contractually committing at least 10% of their land to support biodiversity. Jordans has worked with its farmers to promote biodiversity on their land since 1985. The latest iteration of their farm sustainability standard was launched in 2016, requiring farmers to be independently audited and certified against the Linking Environment And Farming (LEAF) Marque Standard, which specifies a range of sustainable farm management practices, including the provision of biodiversity habitat aligned with the post-2020 biodiversity framework. As an enhancement to the habitat management criteria specified within the LEAF Marque Standard, all farmers within the Jordans Farm Partnership are required to work directly with specialist farm advisory experts from UK based NGO 'The Wildlife Trust' to implement a bespoke wildlife management programme on their farm. During the reporting year the standards were applied on c.15,900 hectares of UK farmland, of which over 26% was managed as habitat for wildlife biodiversity. In addition to a minimum of 10% of farm's land being committed to biodiversity,5% (roughly half of that required under the contract) must be managed according to or equivalent to those listed in the UK Government's Countryside Stewardship Scheme (CSS) Wild Pollinator and Farm Wildlife Package (WPFWP) to provide year-round habitat (food, nest sites and shelter for insects and overwintering bird species). The remaining 5% of the 10% contractually specified should be managed according to a bespoke landscape plan with habitat regeneration initiatives specific to that farm; this activity is completed in collaboration with The Wildlife Trust farm advisors. The standard also stipulates criteria for the management of field boundaries, ponds, watercourses and woodland. In addition, the participating farms are measured on the efficiency of their production processes and required to meet the general sustainable farm management criteria specified under the LEAF Marque's Integrated Farm Management approach. This includes specific provision for the management of soil quality and agrochemicals..

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Procurement

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Each year Jordans and the Jordans Farm Partnership (JFP) partners host a farmer meeting to share best practice and discuss common challenges. A governance meeting is held twice a year with an opportunity for the partners to ensure the ongoing relevance of the partnership, identify future risks and opportunities as well as discuss topics of common interest. A quarterly tracking meeting is held between the partners to ensure farms are in compliance with the standards. Jordans has directly raised awareness of these environmental practices among its network of selected farmers. Furthermore, Jordans pays a contractual premium to its growers more than standard oats and the farms benefit from access to additional subsidies and grants for ecosystem services.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Other, please specify :Soil management and association carbon sequestration

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP10

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Crop rotation

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Cover crops used in arable rotation have demonstrated they can improve the physical structure of the soil as well as improve soil biology and chemistry nutrients. Sugar beet is an essential crop for many farmers and often plays a vital role in soil and crop health in arable farm rotation. Sugar beet acts as a break crop in the rotation meaning it provides a break or a rest from the more intensively farmed cereal crops that dominate most arable rotations. Having sugar beet as a break crop also reduces the need for pesticides. Sugar beet provides a large amount of organic material returned to the soil by the tops of the sugar beet after harvesting and it also helps build up soil carbon and organic matter reserves an essential part to the healthy functioning of the soil and ecosystem.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Growers for Azucarera and British Sugar are using the SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) tool to drive continuous improvement in on-farm sustainability practices. The tool can be used to assess operations or to benchmark against a standard that is already being used in the field such as Red Tractor in the UK.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 3

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Rice management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Our UK Grocery business Westmill Foods participated in a three-year Water and Productivity Project (WAPRO) in Punjab Pakistan which promotes the standards of the UN Sustainable Rice Platform (UNSRP) of which Westmill was a founding participant and board member. Westmill and project partner Galaxy Rice continued to fund and run the project after the original WAPRO project ended in 2021. Galaxy Rice provide training in SRP techniques and has trained 800 basmati rice farmers since 2018 with the aim to reach 1,200 by 2025. In 2022 Westmill purchased 7,900 tonnes of more sustainable rice and plans to increase the proportion of rice it sources through the project in future years with the project extended to 2025. By the end of the 2022/23 reporting year impressive results had been achieved 30% reduction in water use, 13% increase in yields, 24% increase in net incomes & 48% reduction in GHG emissions.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Operational

☑ Procurement

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Westmill Foods encourages implementation by providing funding for the training by collaborating with its partner Galaxy Rice and by purchasing more sustainable rice. The aim of these initiatives is that rice growing becomes more sustainable and profitable for farmers.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 4

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP8

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Our UK Grocery business, Jordans, helps finance a partnership with local NGO CIPCA (Bolivian Centre for Research and Promotion of Small farmers) to support the Brazil nut supply chain in the area around Riberalta, Bolivia. Brazil nuts can only be wild harvested from the Amazon rainforest, as Brazil trees are entirely dependent upon forest pollinators to fruit. The crop provides a valuable income to the local community and plays an important role in conserving the Amazon rainforest in Bolivia. Through the programme, essential forest conservation was undertaken including the growing of 47,500 Brazil nut saplings across an area, previously estimated to cover 121,000 hectares of forest. (7.68.1.4) Your role in the

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

By working with CIPCA, Jordans is creating tree nurseries, facilitating trail clean ups, providing health education and training around how to keep Brazil nut trees and their forests healthy. This is part of a broader initiative to make the Amazon Rainforest economically viable and prevent deforestation.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 5

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Biodiversity considerations

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Allied Mills is undertaking a Wheat Sustainability Supply Project, where a select group of farmers supplying Allied Mills adopt agricultural techniques that aim to improve soil quality and health,and include land practices that support wildlife. The project was developed in partnership with Frontier, ABF's joint venture business, and with the Jordans Farm Partnership. Participating farmers receive a premium grain price in return. The project stipulates crop rotation and minimal tillage to build up organic matter within the soil and increase fertility. In 2021 the Allied Mills contracted specialist consultancy Downforce Technologies to undertake satellite image analysis of the pilot programme to establish the impact of the management trials on soil carbon sequestration. Allied Mills are now in the final year of this project and have agreed to extend the trial for another year with a view to continuing until harvest 27/28. It's envisaged that 10k mt pa of wheat under the project protocol will be available for milling. The past four years have been a very good example of needing to take a holistic approach to this type of programme with the full spectrum of sustainability pillars of economic, environmental and social issues impacting the programme, including the Covid 19 Pandemic, Ukraine war, the cost of energy and fertiliser and records being broken for rainfall and high temperatures. The first set of KPIs are due at the end of the 2024 harvest. However, early data suggests that despite the issues above, yields have exceeded regional comparisons. In 2023, the average Allied Mills' yield for tonnes per hector (t/ha) was 9, where as the DEFRA regional average yield (T/ha) was 8.1.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Procurement

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Farmers must establish a recognised stewardship scheme with at least 5% of farmed land managed for wildlife habitats. The project is designed to enhance the UK wheat industry's broader understanding of sustainable farm management practices. It is relatively new, and Allied Mills is in the initial stages of capturing and analysing the data. However, the early indications are positive, and the yield benefits over the past four years will be of great assistance in persuading farmers to adopt new methods if the other KPIs, including carbon emission reductions, also show improvements.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)
☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)
☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 6

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP7

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:
☑ Fertilizer management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

The Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme (PSCP) equips smallholder farmers with essential skills to drive the adoption of more sustainable agriculture practices. These include practices to improve yields, reduce chemical inputs, such as pesticides and fertilisers, and improve farmer incomes. Primark started the programme in India in collaboration with agronomic experts CottonConnect and the Self Employed Women's Association (SEWA). The PSCP subsequently expanded to Pakistan and Bangladesh where it also works with local partners – Rural Education and Economic Development Society (Reeds) in Pakistan and Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha (TMSS) in Bangladesh. As at the end of July 2023 299,388 farmers have received training in the Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme. Compared to a set of controlled farmers not within the PSCP, from 2019 to 2022 farmers trained within the PSCP have seen their cotton yields increase by an average of 8% and their chemical inputs reduce by 26% for chemical pesticides and 35% for chemical fertilisers. Primark has committed that the PSCP will use more regenerative agricultural practices by 2030. As progress towards this commitment, 3,000 PSCP farmers are participating in a three-year pilot on regenerative practices in India, Bangladesh and Pakistan. The pilot has shown that the optimal approach needs to be localised to farmers' needs and their surroundings. For example, the pilots have found a variation in adoption of practices such as use of farmyard manure. In India, adoption of this practice is generally lower than in Pakistan and Bangladesh due to differences in livestock ownership in the three countries. In India, Primark found a greater use of natural inputs into farming, as women farmers worked together to produce agri-inputs collectively, making these inputs easier to access at a village level. There were other practices that programme farmers found challenging to

adopt across the three countries, such as minimum tillage or zero tillage and green mulching. With guidance from the International Cotton Advisory Committee, Primark has been working with CottonConnect to assess the results from the pilot and the level of changes that PSCP farmers are willing and able to make.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Primark has directly raised awareness of sustainable agricultural practices among its network of farmers enrolled in PSCP. In 2023, 46% of its cotton clothing units sold contained cotton that was either organic, recycled or sourced from PSCP, up from 27% at the launch of Primark Cares. The programme has enabled Primark to increase the amount of sustainable cotton available for its products, while also creating a more transparent cotton supply chain.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 7

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

The South African-based World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in partnership with the Noodsberg Cane Growers Association and supported by Illovos South Africa Noodsberg sugar factory and refinery was instrumental in the development of a Sustainable Sugar Cane Farm Management system for growers termed SUSFARMS. SUSFARMS is a methodology which develops better farm management practices in the cane sugar industry bringing environmental social and economic benefits. The use of SUSFARMS sustainability methodology for evaluating agronomic practices is encouraged.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Illovo South Africa part of ABF Sugar engages with sugarcane growers on sustainable farming practices based on the SUSFARMS methodology.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69) Do you know if any of the management practices implemented on your own land disclosed in 7.67.1 have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.69.1) Provide details on those management practices that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation and on your management response.

Row 1

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP4

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Soil

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Illovo Sugar implemented a reduced tillage project at Kilombero, Tanzania in 2019, and has recently commenced a similar project at Nchalo, Malawi. Reduced tillage practices are frequently recommended as a way to reduce soil erosion and increase soil productivity. Previously at Kilombero, the method adopted used six tillage practices while the current method uses four tillage practices. A future anticipated method will use three tillage practices with the addition of land-forming. This methodology will also bring about benefits to general soil structure and microbial health which in turn can reduce the reliance on large amounts of artificial fertilizers. Although the use of fertilizers will remain necessary, it can be reduced and what is used, is assimilated into the plants better and more efficiently.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

No response implemented as no negative impacts caused by this management practice were identified.

Row 3

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Maintenance of pockets of natural vegetation within Illovo's estates act as refuges and ecological green corridors for indigenous fauna and flora resulting in increased biodiversity and minimisation of land use change. As an example, a 400-hectare reserve known as Nyala Park in Malawi has been set aside within the Illovo Nchalo estate boundary and is maintained with species of the original flora and fauna of the Shire Valley. Illovo Ubombo Sugar in Eswatini manages the private Mhlosinga Nature Reserve, including the Van Eck Dam. Sitting on 1,108 hectares of land, the reserve supports game, birds, reptiles and fish. Illovo continues to manage and develop the areas with positive outcomes;• Nyala Park and Mhlosinga Nature Reserve boast a rich diversity of fauna consisting of healthy populations of mammals, reptiles and birds.• Certain areas continue to mix cattle with wildlife• The flora encompasses grasslands, riverine bush, savannah and thornveld• Recreational facilities are offered at some of the reserves so that staff and communities can enjoy the areas in a responsible way.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

No response implemented as no negative impacts caused by this management practice were identified.

Row 4

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP7

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Cover cropping in Illovo Nakambala in Zambia of plant sun hemp ahead of cane planting in the Autumn. This promotes organic matter improves soil structure enables a reduction in fertiliser usage and promotes the longterm organic matter in the soil. The impact is a higher yielding cane crop and healthier soil.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

No response implemented as no negative impacts caused by this management practice were identified.
[Add row]

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Biodiversity
☑ Soil
☑ Water
☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Jordans Cereals, a brand in our UK Grocery division, was one of the first brands in the UK to differentiate on the basis of its values and has supported wildlife in its UK farm supply chain since 1985. The Jordans Farm Partnership (JFP) was created in 2016 and represents a unique collaboration between The Wildlife Trusts, Linking Environment and Farming (LEAF), The Royal Countryside Fund (formerly The Prince's Countryside Fund) and 34 British farms supplying oats, wheat and barley. Each farm has contractually committed at least 10% of their land to supporting biodiversity, half of which is aimed at attracting pollinators through wildflower areas. The farmers are also required to cut hedges only once every two years to protect nesting habitats, essential shelter and food sources, such as wild berries. In 2023, farmers growing oats for Jordans Cereals provided more than 4,200 hectares of land for farmland wildlife including barn owls, brown hares, corn buntings and vital pollinating insects like bees. These are some of the wild places they have created or maintained: - 990ha (PY 756ha) woodland; - 175 (PY 155) ponds; - 776km (PY 760km) hedgerows to grow and spill over which, as well as providing shelter, deliver a wonderful source of nectar and pollen when the hedgerows are flowering; - 548ha (PY550ha) flower rich field margins to help provide reliable and abundant supplies of pollen and nectar; - 140km (PY 147km) waterways. Managing land for bees and pollinators can also help support a whole host of other wildlife. By recreating habitat and connecting areas of habitats on their farms with the wider countryside, the farmers in the JFP are helping establish a mix of connected habitats.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Jordans Cereals, a brand in our UK Grocery division, was one of the first brands in the UK to differentiate on the basis of its values and has supported wildlife in its UK farm supply chain since 1985. The Jordans Farm Partnership (JFP) was created in 2016 and represents a unique collaboration between The Wildlife Trusts, Linking Environment and Farming (LEAF), The Royal Countryside Fund (formerly The Prince's Countryside Fund) and 34 British farms supplying oats, wheat and barley. Contracted farmers within the Jordans Farm Partnership are paid a premium for their grain. In return, they agree to manage at least 10% of their land for the benefit of wildlife. At the end of FY2023 that proportion was an average of 26% of the total farmland managed under the Partnership of around 15,000 hectares. That's a total farm area equivalent to around 7% of the total UK farmland used to grow oats. Jordans Cereals has taken a similar approach in the almond industry in California. It supports the Seeds for Bees programme, which provides wildflower seeds for ground cover in almond orchards. The ground cover provides forage for pollinators and boosts soil health along with water infiltration to improve crop resilience. Jordans Cereals' contribution to the programme provides ground cover equivalent to the total area of orchards required to supply its almonds that are used in their products. JDR contribution covers 220 hectares which is equivalent to 6000 tonnes.

Row 2

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP10

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Cover crops used in arable rotation have demonstrated they can improve the physical structure of the soil as well as improve soil biology and chemistry (nutrients). Sugar beet is an essential crop for many ABF sugar farmers and often plays a vital role in soil and crop health in arable farm rotation. Sugar beet acts as a 'break' crop in the rotation, meaning it provides a break or a rest from the more intensively farmed cereal crops that dominate most arable rotations. Having sugar beet as a break crop also reduces the need for pesticides. Sugar beet provides a large amount of organic material returned to the soil by the tops of the sugar beet after harvesting, and it also helps build up soil carbon and organic matter reserves - an essential part to the healthy functioning of the soil and ecosystem.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

No response implemented as no negative impacts identified.

Row 3

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP7

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Primark's Sustainable Cotton Programme (PSCP) trains smallholder farmers to help them reduce their use of water, chemical pesticides and chemical fertilisers, while helping to improve their livelihoods through lower input costs and higher yields. It operates in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Primark developed the programme and launched the first pilot in India in 2013 in collaboration with agronomic experts, Cotton Connect, and the grassroots organisation, the Self-Employed Women's Association, with the aim of reducing its impact on the environment, improving the livelihoods of farmers and changing the way the business sources its cotton. Up to the end of July 2023, Primark has successfully trained 299,388 farmers in more sustainable farming methods across India, Bangladesh and Pakistan (the number includes farmers that are currently being trained and those that have completed training under the programme). Cotton farmers receive multi-year training to address an over dependence on chemical fertilizers and pesticides in order to reduce the environmental impact of their cotton farming. Equipping smallholder farmers with the knowledge and means to grow cotton using more sustainable farming methods has also resulted in improved cotton yields. On average, farmers in the programme use 26% less chemical pesticides and 35% less chemical fertilisers with a 8% increase in yield. Percentages are in comparison with control farmers. Average results are from the Primark Sustainable Cotton Programme in India, 2019-2022. Primark has directly raised awareness of sustainable agricultural practices among its network of farmers enrolled in PSCP. In 2023, 46% of Primark's cotton clothing units sold contained cotton that was either organic, recycled or sourced from PSCP, up from 27% at the launch of Primark Cares. The programme has enabled Primark to increase the amount of sustainable cotton available for its products, while also creating a more transparent cotton supply chain.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

No response implemented as no negative impacts identified.

Row 4

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP8

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Our Grocery business Jordans helps finance a partnership with local NGO CIPCA Bolivian Centre for Research and Promotion of Small farmers to support the Brazil nut supply chain in the area around Riberalta, Bolivia. Brazil nuts can only be wild harvested from the Amazon rainforest as Brazil trees are entirely dependent upon forest pollinators to fruit. The crop provides a valuable income to the local community and plays a role in conserving the Amazon rainforest in Bolivia. Through the programme, essential forest conservation was undertaken including the planting of 35,000 Brazil nut saplings across an area of 121,000 hectares of forest. By working with CIPCA, we create tree nurseries facilitate trail clean ups, provide health education and training around how to keep Brazil nut trees and their forests healthy. This is part of a broader initiative to make the Amazon Rainforest economically viable and prevent deforestation.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

No response implemented as no negative impacts identified.

Row 6

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Our UK Grocery business Westmill Foods participated in a three-year Water and Productivity Project (WAPRO) in Punjab, Pakistan, which promotes the standards of the UN Sustainable Rice Platform (UNSRP), of which Westmill was a founding participant and board member. Westmill and project partner Galaxy Rice continued to fund and run the project after the original WAPRO project ended in 2201. Galaxy Rice provide training in SRP techniques and has trained 800 basmati rice farmers since 2018 with the aim to reach 1,200 by 2025. In 2022, Westmill purchased 7,900 tonnes of the sustainable rice and plans to increase the proportion of rice it sources through the project in future years, with the project extended to 2025. By the end of the 2022/23 reporting year impressive results had been achieved: • 30% reduction in water use • 13% increase in yields • 24% increase in net incomes • 48% reduction in GHG emissions

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

No response implemented as no negative impacts identified.

Row 7

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Allied Mills is undertaking a Wheat Sustainability Supply Project, where a select group of farmers supplying the business adopt agricultural techniques that improve soil quality and health, and land practices that support wildlife. The project was developed in partnership with Frontier, ABF's joint venture business, and with the Jordans Farm Partnership. Participating farmers receive a premium grain price in return. The project stipulates crop rotation and minimal tillage to build up organic matter within the soil and increase fertility. Farmers must establish a recognised stewardship scheme with at least 5% of farmed land managed for wildlife habitats. The project is designed to enhance the UK wheat industry's broader understanding of sustainable farm management practices.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

No response implemented as no negative impacts identified.

Row 8

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP2

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Biodiversity
☑ Soil
☑ Water
☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

SUSFARMS which originated in South Africa is a methodology which develops better farm management practices in the cane sugar industry bringing environmental, social and economic benefits. SUSFARMS is a farming system designed to encourage sustainable sugarcane production through the implementation of better management practices (BMPs). These BMPs are designed to reduce negative impacts on the environment, comply with legislation, maintain a high level of social responsibility and assist in ensuring financial sustainability. More than 400 commercial farmers have committed to the implementation of SUSFARMS and the programme has received widespread industry and government support.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

No response implemented as no negative impacts identified.
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Enzymes

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

AB Enzymes' ECOPULP cellulase enzymes can contribute to energy consumption reduction during paper refining making the process energy efficient compared to processing without the addition of ECOPULP. The addition of ECOPULP cellulase enzymes to a non-integrated paper mill production over a 72 hour period demonstrated immediate production benefits on the paper fibre by causing changes that forced a 20% reduction in refining energy. This equates to a reduction of electricity consumption by approximately 40 kWh for processing of 1 tonne of pulp.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Third party methodology leveraged for internal calculations

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

per product tonne

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Cellulase enzymes are responsible for the degradation of cellulose structures, which are a major component of plant cell walls and thus wood pulp, the primary material in paper making.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

15.6

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

AB Enzymes' calculations focus on the potential emission savings from reduced energy consumption. Based on real-time experience, the business observed an average energy saving of 20% after using our enzyme in refining processes in a paper mill. AB Enzymes then looked into the country specific average CO2e emissions for a given year which depends on the energy mix of the country. Taking this number for the European market AB Enzymes could equate a potential carbon saving of 15.6 kg CO2e /kWh for 1 tonne of enzyme treated pulp compared to unrelated pulp in a paper refining process. The percentages reported for "% Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year" refer to AB Enzymes only and are not related to the ABF Group.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.03

Row 2

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☑ Other, please specify **:**Enzymes

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

The addition of specialist enzymes produced by AB Enzymes enables clothes to be washed at 30C just as effectively as at 40C. This reduces electricity consumption by around 260 kWh per 1000 washes compared to when using an average detergent.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Third party methodology

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

per 1,000 washes

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Enzymes in detergents make it possible to wash at even lower temperatures than is usual today. This is a hypothetical avoidance by following the one click down approach wash one temperature level lower and thereby decreasing the average washing temperature.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

0.1

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

AB Enzymes' calculations focus on the potential emission savings from reduced energy consumption, an average detergent used and washing machine type with 164 washing cycles per household per year assumed in the DACH region. Use of AB Enzymes' BIOTOUCH results in an average reduction of 13 degrees Celsius in washing temperatures compared to when using an average detergent. This equates to a reduction of 258 kWh electricity required for the use phase of washing laundry, leading to 119kg of avoided emissions per 1,000 washing cycles. It is difficult to translate this energy efficiency gain into carbon averted at a global level because of the wide variations in the fuel mix used for power generation in different countries. For example, in Germany, Austria and Switzerland a 260 kWh efficiency gain equates to around 119kg of CO2e averted. In India, where coal predominates, that same efficiency gain equates to around 230kg of CO2e averted. The percentages reported for "% Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year" refer to AB Enzymes only and are not related to the ABF Group.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.03

Row 3

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Biofuels

☑ Anaerobic digestor

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

AB Agri built its first Anaerobic Digestion (AD) plant in 2013 in the UK. Anaerobic digestion is the breakdown of organic matter without oxygen to produce flammable gases. These gasses can be burnt in an engine to produce heat and electricity, or cleaned up and used in the same way as natural gas, to heat our homes and cook our food. The plant can take 60,000t of blended food and green waste per annum. It is a gas to grid plant, enabling methane to be injected directly into the gas network for maximum carbon efficiency. The plant processes the majority of organic waste produced by the AB Agri plants in the UK, and organic waste produced by other UK based ABF businesses. All of the gas produced by the AD plant is directed straight to the National Grid and equates to 69% of the usage of the ABN mills, part of the AB Agri business. The level of production at the AD plant has fallen because of poor availability of feedstocks and prolonged outage of the gas compressors on site.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.04

Row 5

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☑ Other, please specify :Renewable energy - bagasse

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Bagasse, a dry, fibrous co-product from sugar cane, provides a substantial renewable energy source for combined heat and power (CHP), replacing fossil fuel sources such as coal and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Electricity is exported by three ABF Sugar sites including Ubombo inEswatini. Ubombo has a license granted by the Eswatini Energy Regulatory Authority (EERA) to supply power to the country's national grid through energy generation at the mill. The site supplies approximately 5% of the electricity capacity of the national grid. The sale of this clean renewable energy has directly enabled the Eswatini Electricity Company (EEC) to reduce its scope 1 emissions and consequently, its customers' scope 2 emissions. Power exported to the Eswatini Electricity Company, the sole supplier of electricity to the country, has been consistently above the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) obligations since commissioning. Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) reported below refers to the revenue generated by our Illovo sugar businesses in Eswatinii.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.03

Row 6

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Biofuels

☑ Bioethanol

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

ABF first invested in Vivergo, which produces bioethanol, around 10 years ago, when the use of E10 petrol (fuel with up to 10% bioethanol content) was first emerging in Europe. Today, blending bioethanol with petrol to reduce vehicle emissions is a key aspect of many governments' GHG reduction strategies.Vivergo has invested to expand its operations, creating the largest bioethanol plant in the UK – capable of processing around 1 million tonnes of UK feed wheat, grown for animal consumption and not for use in food.One of Vivergo's main co-products from production of bioethanol is protein for animal feed, so at peak capacity it will be the largest single-source animal feed supplier in the UK.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Internal methodology

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

CO2 emissions from cars

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

At full capacity, Vivergo would produce an estimated 420 million litres of bioethanol annually.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

500000

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

When blended with petrol to E10 standards this will reduce total UK vehicle emissions by around 500,000 tonnes of CO2e every year.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.8

Row 7

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Biofuels

☑ Bioethanol

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Bioethanol is a co-product of our sugar beet processing operations and provides an additional income stream for our sugar businesses. As one of the UK's leading agri-processors with an interest in innovative new technology, British Sugar began production of bioethanol in September 2007. At British Sugar's Wissington site, the first plant to manufacture bioethanol in the UK, the sugar biorefinery produces 55,000 tonnes of bioethanol annually from the residual sugar syrup products from sugar beet processing.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.3

Row 8

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Enzymes

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

At the final stages of cotton production the fabric goes through a process known as biopolishing which cleans the surface and removes fluff. For many years that process involved immersing the fabric in water heated to 50C. AB Enzymes provides manufacturers with an alternative that is more energy efficient. The process

involves the use of cold cellulase enzymes to achieve the same biopolishing quality in water heated to only 30C. This reduces energy consumption by around 350 kWh for every tonne of fabric processed compared to untreated biopolishing processes. This potential saving is particularly significant given that the main countries in which these textiles are processed are China, India and Pakistan all still heavily reliant on coal to run power stations. Consequently, the gains from this enzyme-based process could translate into a large reduction in GHG emissions.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Internal methodology developed with a Climate Partner

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Per 1,000 kg bio-polished cotton

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

As mentioned, final stages of cotton production, the fabric goes through a process known as 'bio-polishing' which cleans the surface and removes fluff. For many years, that process involved immersing the fabric in water heated to 50C. AB Enzymes provides manufacturers with an alternative that is more energy efficient. The process involves the use of cold cellulase enzymes to achieve the same bio-polishing quality in water heated to only 30C.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

0.4

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

Our calculations focus on potential emission savings achieved by using enzymes to lower the process temperature by 20C, resulting in a reduction of energy by 350 kWh/t (from electricity for hot water preparation). Calculation done for South-East Asia.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.02

Row 9

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**NovaPro – Alternative to soya for animal feed

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

In 2018 AB Agri launched NovaPro a product derived from rapeseed once the seed has been crushed for oil. NovaPro has been proven to perform as well as soya in dairy cow diets and has the benefit of being a coproduct. More than 40000 tonnes of NovaPro are now supplied to UK farms per year saving more than 130000 tonnes CO2e compared with an equivalent South American soya-based diet.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**GFLI baseline data for South American Soya

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Tonne of product

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

South American Soya GFLI value 4501.24 kgCO2e/t based on 50/50 Argentinian/Brazilian value. Lifecycle of the rapeseed was sourced from Agri Footprint.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

3.981

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

The difference between the carbon footprint of a tonne of soya and a tonne of NovaPro. The South American soya GFLI value 4501 kg CO2e/t of feed - NovaPro 520 kg CO2e per tonne 3981 kg CO2e per tonne difference (7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.002
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits canceled by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:
☑ Clean cookstove distribution

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Twinings has worked with Climate Impact Partners to support projects that increase access to clean cookstoves in Kenya. This project, through avoiding/reducing fuel consumption, has helped Twinings to offset its carbon emissions while delivering benefits to local communities in of its key supply chain geographies. Access to an

efficient cookstove can reduce day-to-day emissions. Ethanol stoves burn cleanly and use a renewable biofuel that can be created from waste like sugar cane pulp. Carbon finance is used to subsidise the upfront price of stoves to a level that is affordable for local households.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

3100

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2020

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ Gold Standard

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Standardized Approaches

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ No risk of reversal

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**No leakage emissions expected.

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

This project contributes directly in achieving the SDGs 1,3&7 in addition to SDG 13 as required by Principle-1 of GS4GG. Environmental Benefits: Reduction in firewood consumption and emission of greenhouse gases, forest and biodiversity conservation (SDG 13).

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

N/A

Row 2

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Clean cookstove distribution

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Twinings has worked with Climate Impact Partners to support projects that increase access to clean cookstoves in Kenya. This project, through avoiding/reducing fuel consumption, has helped Twinings to offset its carbon emissions while delivering benefits to local communities in of its key supply chain geographies. Access to an efficient cookstove can reduce day-to-day emissions. Ethanol stoves burn cleanly and use a renewable biofuel that can be created from waste like sugar cane pulp. Carbon finance is used to subsidise the upfront price of stoves to a level that is affordable for local households.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

111

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2019

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ Gold Standard

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Standardized Approaches

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ No risk of reversal

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**No leakage emissions expected.

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

This project contributes directly in achieving the SDGs 1,3&7 in addition to SDG 13 as required by Principle-1 of GS4GG. Environmental Benefits: Reduction in firewood consumption and emission of greenhouse gases, forest and biodiversity conservation (SDG 13).

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

N/A

Row 3

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Hydro

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

This project in Yingjiang County, Dehong Autonomous Prefecture, Yunnan Province, China is a hydropower station with 14MW (9MW5MW) installed capacity. Clean electricity from this project displaces electricity that would otherwise be generated by burning fossil fuels. In addition to reducing emissions, renewable energy projects like this one support Affordable and Clean Energy (SDG 7).

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

3100

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2016

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ CDM (Clean Development Mechanism)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Investment analysis

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ No risk of reversal

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**No leakage emissions expected.

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The standard requires the project to conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment Report which outlined key environmental impacts such as air, noise, waste water and solid waste pollution.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

N/A
[Add row]

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Timber products

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Specific product lines

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Within our disclosure on timber, we exclude from scope items 1-4: (1) Small spend consumables such as head office stationery, one-off purchases such as office furniture, retail display units and some marketing point of sale material. (2) Timber consumed with pallet use (3) Consumables such as pallet labels (4) Information regarding man-made cellulosic fibres (MMCF) made from wood.

(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Data is not available

(8.1.1.5) Primary reason why data is not available for your disclosed commodity

Select from:

☑ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☑ No, the volume excluded is unknown

(8.1.1.10) Please explain

(1) Small spend consumables such as head office stationery, one-off purchases such as head office furniture and some marketing point of sale material. The percentage spend relating to these items is not material and is a small proportion of the total global packaging consumption and spend. (2) We do not capture timber consumed with pallet use (be it virgin/white pallets or re-used pallets used in pooling arrangements with recognised third party providers). (3) We cannot guarantee consumables such as pallet labels will be reported in their entirety though the percentage of spend relating to these items will be negligible as a percentage of total global packaging consumption and spend. (4) We are not yet disclosing information regarding man-made cellulosic fibres (MMCF) made from wood. For Primark, MMCF represents circa 5% of their materials mix. Primark are committed to buying materials and products from sustainable and traceable sources in its supply chain. As a full evaluation of MMCF has not been completed, we are not yet in a position to disclose any information.
[Add row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Timber products	*103570*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*103570*
Palm oil	*41102*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*41102*
Soy	*`Numeric input [must be between [0 - 999999999999]*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*`Numeric input [must be between [0 - 999999999999]*

[Fixed row]

(8.2.1) Provide details on any soy embedded in animal products sourced by your organization.

Soy

(8.2.1.1) Disclosure of embedded soy

Select from:

☑ All of our embedded soy volume is excluded from our disclosure as reported in 8.1.1

(8.2.1.2) Description of embedded soy use and soy tiers

We have subsidiary companies that use meat, dairy, eggs, and other animal products as ingredients, but the embedded soy elements have not been quantified to date.
[Fixed row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Finland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Papua New Guinea

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Honduras

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Australia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Canada

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Chile

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ China

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ France

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ India

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Ireland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Italy

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ New Zealand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Peru

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Poland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Spain

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Sri Lanka

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Australia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Canada

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Chile

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ China

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ France

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ India

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Italy

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ New Zealand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Paraguay

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Poland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Spain

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Australia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Austria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Bangladesh

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Cambodia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Canada

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Chile

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ China

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. In many cases, details such as material country and state of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Czechia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Denmark

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Ecuador

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Eswatini

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ France

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ India

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Ireland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Italy

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Malawi

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mozambique

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ New Zealand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Peru

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Poland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Portugal

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Slovenia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Spain

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Sri Lanka

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Tunisia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United Republic of Tanzania

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Uruguay

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Zambia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks. Often, details such as the country and state of origin of the materials are known because they are available in product specifications and vendor audit checks.
[Add row]

(8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Timber products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

(8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

ABF does not have a Group-wide policy on deforestation. We operate a devolved operating model across our five business segments of Grocery, Sugar, Agriculture, Ingredients and Retail and believe the best way to create enduring value involves setting objectives from the bottom up rather than the top down. We make

operational decisions locally, because in our experience decisions are most successful when made and owned by the people with the best understanding of their customers and markets. Our Grocery businesses support the principles of the New York Declaration on Forests and of SDG 15 (Life on Land). They recognise that deforestation and the loss of high conservation value areas caused by human activities and climate change presents real challenges both now and into the future. Primark, which uses man-made cellulosic fibres such as viscose to make its products and also purchases packaging, paper, and solid wood, published its policy for the responsible sourcing of wood and wood-derived fibres in 2022. Primark has also been a partner of the not-for-profit environmental organisation, Canopy, since 2022; the organisation uses the combined leverage of the hundreds of fashion brands which have signed its pledge to influence viscose producers towards better practice. Canopy also works on the development of next-generation fibres and collaborates with brands to help them bring lower-impact fabric alternatives to customers.

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

(8.7.6) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.7.7) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year

More than half of ABF's consumption for what we deem to be secondary or transit packaging (corrugated containers) is recycled material. We have a commitment to use more recycled material and less overall material when designing and sourcing packaging-both of which offer, in addition to the sustainability benefit, a cost saving benefit to the organisation. Material and cost reduction targets are set each year as appropriate by individual businesses. Four questions that typically come into play within our category and source plans for packaging are (i) how can we reduce the overall content of packaging required, (ii) can we eliminate that requirement altogether, (iii) can we look at returnable forms of packaging, (iv) can we use lower impact or recycled materials.

Palm oil

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business division

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

Soy

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business division

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity
[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Palm oil

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

For definitions of Forests and Deforestation AB Agri refers to the Accountability Framework Initiative. Deforestation - Loss of natural forest as a result of: i) conversion to agriculture or other non-forest land use; ii) conversion to a tree plantation; or iii) severe and sustained degradation. AB Agri's deforestation statement related to their forest-commodities is available via the link below: https://www.abagri.com/ab-agri-position-statement-deforestation

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ No cutoff date

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2025

Soy

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

For definitions of Forests and Deforestation AB Agri refers to the Accountability Framework Initiative. Deforestation - Loss of natural forest as a result of: i) conversion to agriculture or other non-forest land use; ii) conversion to a tree plantation; or iii) severe and sustained degradation. AB Agri's deforestation statement related to their forest-commodities is available via the link below: https://www.abagri.com/ab-agri-position-statement-deforestation

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ No cutoff date

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:
☑ 2025
[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:
☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:
☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2015

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2006

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2023

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, no alignment after assessment

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

ABF has been a member of the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) since 2010, with some subsidiary companies holding membership from 2006. We have numerous businesses who have secured RSPO Supply Chain Certification for their facilities and are therefore using sustainably certified input materials. The majority of palm related consumption within ABF comes through palm derivatives or products containing palm related products at 73% of our Group consumption of all palm input. Where the consumption of these palm derivatives cannot be supplied with physically certified material, due to the complexity of the supply chains involved, ABF committed to cover such consumption by Book & Claim to support the production of sustainable palm oil. In 2015, ABF first covered 100% of non-physically certified material via the Book & Claim supply chain option. This has been repeated year on year for all palm related consumption since 2015. Our percentage of physically certified sustainable palm is at 34% of our annual consumption being supplied as RSPO segregated or RSPO mass balance inputs. This progress has meant that 100% of the palm input used across Europe for all our branded grocery businesses are sourced via physically certified sustainable inputs. Our challenge remains in stimulating demand for physically certified palm inputs in our animal feed businesses and in particular geographies where sustainable credentials are not a defined requirement from our customer base. In addition to the progress detailed above, ABF now has 36 individual facilities that has achieved RSPO Supply Chain Certification for the supply of physical certified sustainable palm products across numerous geographies from UK, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, China, Brazil and USA.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

ABF has been a member of the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) since 2010, with some subsidiary companies holding membership from 2006. We have numerous businesses who have secured RSPO Supply Chain Certification for their facilities and are therefore using sustainably certified input materials. The majority of palm related consumption within ABF comes through palm derivatives or products containing palm related products at 73% of our Group consumption of all palm input. Where the consumption of these palm derivatives cannot be supplied with physically certified material, due to the complexity of the supply chains involved, ABF committed to cover such consumption by Book & Claim to support the production of sustainable palm oil. In 2015, ABF first covered 100% of non-physically certified material via the Book & Claim supply chain option. This has been repeated year on year for all palm related consumption since 2015. Our percentage of physically certified sustainable palm is at 34% of our annual consumption being supplied as RSPO segregated or RSPO mass balance inputs. This progress has meant that 100% of the palm input used across Europe for all our branded grocery businesses are sourced via physically certified sustainable inputs. Our challenge remains in stimulating demand for physically certified palm inputs in our animal feed businesses and in particular geographies where sustainable credentials are not a defined requirement from our customer base. In addition to the progress detailed above, ABF now has 36 individual facilities that has achieved RSPO Supply Chain

Certification for the supply of physical certified sustainable palm products across numerous geographies from UK, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, China, Brazil and USA.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

See other sectons.

Soy

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

01/01/2020

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

37

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

64

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

42.86

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, no alignment after assessment

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

AB Agri has committed that by 2025 all palm oil and soya usage will be certificated, supporting zero deforestation responsible sourcing schemes.

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

By the end of 2022/23, 64% of the soya products AB Agri bought worldwide were certificated to the FEFAC benchmark for responsibly sourced soya. This is a significant increase compared to 37% in 2020. This improvement has been further supported by its China team, which has worked hard over the last 12 months to have 15% of its soya meal certificated by schemes that meet the FEFAC benchmark.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

N/A
[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Timber products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to establish one within the next two years

(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

In many cases, details such as material country of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks. This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. In the case of paper, businesses may stipulate the brand they require as part of their buying specification in which case the Tier 2 supply chain is known. In some circumstances and for certain supply chains, we have visibility to mill and forest level information but this is not available across all sources.

Palm oil

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to establish one within the next two years

(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

In many cases, details such as material country of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks. This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested.

Soy

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to establish one within the next two years

(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

In many cases, details such as material country of origin are known due to the detail available from product specifications and vendor audit checks. This information could be obtained from suppliers if requested. In some circumstances, we have visibility to farm level information but this is not available across all sources. [Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

ABF does not have a Group-wide process for assessing DF/DCF status. We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Responsibility for setting ESG targets and commitments is devolved to our individual businesses. We believe it is the leaders of the businesses - those who are closest to ESG risks and opportunities - who are best placed to take the right approach based on their deep

understanding of the relevant issues and circumstances. Our businesses make operational decisions locally because in our experience decisions are most successful when made and owned by the people with the best understanding of their customers and markets.

Palm oil

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

ABF does not have a Group-wide process for assessing DF/DCF status. We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Responsibility for setting ESG targets and commitments is devolved to our individual businesses. We believe it is the leaders of the businesses – those who are closest to ESG risks and opportunities – who are best placed to take the right approach based on their deep understanding of the relevant issues and circumstances. We make operational decisions locally, because in our experience decisions are most successful when made and owned by the people with the best understanding of their customers and markets

Soy

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

ABF does not have a Group-wide process for assessing DF/DCF status. We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Responsibility for setting ESG targets and commitments is devolved to our individual businesses. We believe it is the leaders of the businesses – those who are closest to ESG risks and opportunities – who are best placed to take the right approach based on their deep understanding of the relevant issues and circumstances. We make operational decisions locally, because in our experience decisions are most successful when made and owned by the people with the best understanding of their customers and markets.
[Fixed row]

(8.9.2) Provide details of third-party certification schemes not providing full DF/DCF assurance.

Timber products

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify **:**FSC, PEFC

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

0

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ No

(8.9.2.4) Comment

We do not measure this data at Group level.

Palm oil

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify **:**All RSPO volumes across the four recognised RSPO Supply Chain schemes (IP, SG, MB, B&C)

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ No

(8.9.2.4) Comment

ABF Group membership and RSPO ACOP result in annual reporting of all RSPO volumes across the four recognised RSPO Supply Chain schemes.

(8.9.2.5) Certification documentation

Associated_British_Foods_plc_ACOP2023.pdf

Soy

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify **:**Certifications benchmarked as responsibly sourced soya by FEFAC

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

64

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ No

(8.9.2.4) Comment

By the end of 2022/23, 64% of the soya products AB Agri bought worldwide were certificated to the FEFAC benchmark for responsibly sourced soya (The percentage for the reporting year is estimated based on actual volume purchased in calendar year 2022). The percentage disclosed refers to AB Agri only.
[Add row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

(8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Responsibility for ESG targets and commitments is devolved to our individual businesses. We believe it is the leaders of the businesses – those who are closest to ESG risks and opportunities – who are best placed to take the right approach based on their deep understanding of the relevant issues and circumstances. We make operational decisions locally, because in our experience decisions are most successful when made and owned by the people with the best understanding of their customers and markets.

Palm oil

(8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

(8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Responsibility for ESG targets and commitments is devolved to our individual businesses. We believe it is the leaders of the businesses – those who are closest to ESG risks and opportunities – who are best placed to take the right approach based on their deep understanding of the relevant issues and circumstances. We make operational decisions locally, because in our experience decisions are most successful when made and owned by the people with the best understanding of their customers and markets.

Soy

(8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

(8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We are a highly decentralised Group with many diverse and devolved operating businesses that are empowered to make their own decisions. Responsibility for ESG targets and commitments is devolved to our individual businesses. We believe it is the leaders of the businesses – those who are closest to ESG risks and opportunities – who are best placed to take the right approach based on their deep understanding of the relevant issues and circumstances. We make operational decisions locally, because in our experience decisions are most successful when made and owned by the people with the best understanding of their customers and markets.
[Fixed row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes.

Palm oil

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Maintaining 100% combination of book & claim & mass balance RSPO trace.

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

100

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Involvement in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

ABF has been a member of the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) since 2010, with some subsidiary companies holding membership from 2006. We have numerous businesses who have secured RSPO Supply Chain Certification for their facilities and are therefore using sustainably certified input materials.

Soy

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :increase % of certificated Soy to the FEFAC benchmark for responsibly sourced soya

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

64

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Involvement in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

AB Agri is an active member of the European Feed Manufacturers' Federation (FEFAC) Sustainability Committee, which introduced soya sourcing guidelines in October 2015, as well as the Agricultural Industries Confederation Sustainability Committee and the UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy. By the end of 2022/23, 64% of the soya products AB Agri bought worldwide were certificated to the FEFAC benchmark for responsibly sourced soya. This is a significant increase compared to 37% in 2020. This improvement has been further supported by its China team, which has worked hard over the last 12 months to have 15% of its soya meal certificated by schemes that meet the FEFAC benchmark. As of September 2023, all its South American maize and maize co-products have been certificated to a minimum book and claim standard. All information reported for this action refer to AB Agri only. AB Agri accounts for approximately 9% of total Group revenue.
[Add row]

(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.

	Third-party certification scheme adopted	Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Unknown
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Unknown
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Unknown

[Fixed row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

Timber products

(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated

Select from:

☑ No, and do not plan to do so in the next two years

(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Many of our businesses are in the process of calculating their wider Scope 3 emissions, focusing initially on their supply chains. This will allow us to understand key material commodities and enable our businesses to prioritise upstream engagement with supply actors to address associated GHG emissions.

Palm oil

(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated

Select from:

☑ No, and do not plan to do so in the next two years

(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Many of our businesses are in the process of calculating their wider Scope 3 emissions, focusing initially on their supply chains. This will allow us to understand key material commodities and enable our businesses to prioritise upstream engagement with supply actors to address associated GHG emissions.

Soy

(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated

Select from:

☑ No, and do not plan to do so in the next two years

(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Many of our businesses are in the process of calculating their wider Scope 3 emissions, focusing initially on their supply chains. This will allow us to understand key material commodities and enable our businesses to prioritise upstream engagement with supply actors to address associated GHG emissions.
[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:
☑ Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply
☑ Labor rights
☑ Land use rights
☑ Third parties' rights
☑ Environmental protection
☑ Human rights protected under international law
☑ Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations
☑ The principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), including as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply
☑ Certification
☑ Supplier self-declaration

(8.14.4) Indicate if you collect data regarding compliance with the Brazilian Forest Code

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to collect data on this indicator within the next two years

(8.14.5) Please explain

Suppliers are expected to be compliant with ABF's Supplier Code of Conduct which details expectations of suppliers in this regard. The majority of ABF's divisions will be impacted by EUDR to some degree. The EU Deforestation Regulation, which entered into force in June 2023 and will apply after December 2024, will restrict certain forest risk commodities (including palm oil and soy) from being placed on the EU market where they have led to deforestation or forest degradation, or have not been produced in compliance with the laws of the country of production. This requires implementation of new supply chain practices across global markets. For example, AB Agri is working closely with external bodies such as FEFAC, with suppliers and customers, and with its purchasing and commercial teams to build knowledge, capability and develop enhanced processes across its supply chains.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

(8.15.1) Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ No, we do not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(8.15.2) Primary reason for not engaging in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)

(8.15.3) Explain why your organization does not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

While landscape and jurisdictional level approaches are considered important, this is not a current business priority. We recognise this will require significant resource to collaborate with other stakeholders and will need careful planning.
[Fixed row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply
☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply
☑ Involved in industry platforms
☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:
☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

ABF has been a member of the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) since 2010, with some subsidiary companies holding membership from 2006. We have numerous businesses who have secured RSPO Supply Chain Certification for their facilities and are therefore using sustainably certified input materials. The majority of palm related consumption within ABF comes through palm derivatives or products containing palm related products at 73% of our Group consumption of all palm input. Where the consumption of these palm derivatives cannot be supplied with physically certified material, due to the complexity of the supply chains involved, ABF committed to cover such consumption by Book & Claim to support the production of sustainable palm oil. In 2015, ABF first covered 100% of non-physically certified material via the Book & Claim supply chain option. This has been repeated year on year for all palm related consumption since 2015. Our percentage of physically certified sustainable palm sits at 34% of our annual consumption now being supplied as RSPO segregated or RSPO mass balance inputs. This progress has meant that 100% of the palm input used across Europe for all our grocery businesses is sourced via physically certified sustainable inputs. Our challenge remains in stimulating demand for physically certified palm inputs in our animal feed businesses and in particular geographies where sustainable credentials are not a defined requirement from our customer base. In addition to the progress detailed above, ABF now has 36 individual facilities that have achieved RSPO Supply Chain Certification for the supply of physical certified sustainable palm products across numerous geographies from UK, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, China, Brazil and USA.

Row 2

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

AB Agri is an active member of the European Feed Manufacturers' Federation (FEFAC) Sustainability Committee, which introduced soya sourcing guidelines in October 2015, as well as the Agricultural Industries Confederation Sustainability Committee and the UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy. To the end of our 2023 financial year, 64% of the soya products AB Agri bought worldwide were certificated to the FEFAC benchmark for responsibly sourced soya. This is a significant increase compared to 37% in 2020. This improvement has been further supported by its China team, which has worked hard over the last 12 months to have 15% of its soya meal certificated by schemes that meet the FEFAC benchmark. One of the first multistakeholder groups committed to increasing the availability of responsibly produced soy was the Round Table on Responsible Soy. AB Agri had been an active member of the RTRS since 2010, although more recently stepped away to acknowledge that there are a number of well-run schemes available. As a key member of both the Agricultural Industries Confederation (AIC) and the European Feed Compounders Association (FEFAC) AB Agri are directly involved in designing mass market solutions for sourcing responsible soy with the introduction of the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines. The FEFAC Guidelines offer an achievable model that encourages producers to continually improve and validate their sustainability credentials, thereby improving the understanding of sustainable soy imported into Europe. Through continued active membership of the FEFAC Sustainability Committee, AB Agri has contributed to the first revision of these FEFAC Soya Sourcing Guidelines whereby some previous desired criteria have become required and new additional desired criteria have been introduced. There is now also transparency as to which schemes can be considered zero deforestation from stated cut off dates. Our staff members contribute as active members of the AIC Sustainability Committee. AB Agri is also a member of the government backed multi-stakeholder UK Soya Round Table and its Steering Group. The work of this group has contributed to a significant increase in the requirement for responsibly sourced soya in the UK market which is still growing. AB Mauri UK has maintained its 'BM Trada Responsibly Sourced' accreditation and worked to explore local sources of sustainable soy supply - including a new source of soy supply in the UK.

Row 3

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Many of our Grocery businesses use OPRL (On Pack Recycling Labels) which inform consumers how to dispose of packaging correctly. Primary packaging in Primark, such as card hangers, require FSC certification and where possible they contain 100% recycled content and its bags are 100% FSC certified /100% recycled content. Another example is related to our Westmill Foods business, which involves the sourcing of Paper & Board. These materials will be obtained from suppliers that meet the requirements set by the Forestry Stewardship Council (FSC) or, if FSC-certified sources are not available, from the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC). Currently, 95% of Westmill's Paper & Board is either FSC certified or sourced from other sustainable practices. The goal is to ensure that 100% of Westmill's Paper & Board is sourced this way by 2025. For FSC-certified products, we are collaborating with our packaging suppliers to incorporate recycled content wherever possible. All virgin paper and board materials, whether certified or uncertified, will be obtained from sustainably managed temperate forests, with the supplier providing proof of chain of custody.

Row 4

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Primark is also a partner of not-for-profit environmental organisation, Canopy, since 2022. Canopy's mission is to protect the world's forests, species and climate, and to help advance frontline community rights. Primark continues to work alongside other fashion brands through the CanopyStyle initiative, which aims to transition fashion supply chains away from using ancient and endangered forest material and bring lower-impact fabric alternatives to customers. Primark aims to source a greater proportion of man-made cellulosic fibre products made from innovative fibre sources, reduce its reliance on 'virgin' paper and packaging, and reduce paper waste. Primark also joined Canopy's Pack4Good initiative, which is working to ensure companies move away from forests to use more eco-friendly, low-impact paper packaging options and reduce dependency on virgin wood-derived packaging.
[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Agroforestry

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement to soil health

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Through the Jordans Farm Partnership (JFP), Jordans Cereals, a brand of our Grocery business, pays 34 British farmers a premium for their oats, wheat and barley, in return for contractually committing at least 10% of their land to support biodiversity. Jordans has worked with its farmers to promote biodiversity on their land since 1985. The latest iteration of their farm sustainability standard was launched in 2016, requiring farmers to be independently audited and certified against the Linking Environment And Farming (LEAF) Marque Standard, which specifies a range of sustainable farm management practices, including the provision of biodiversity habitat aligned with the post-2020 biodiversity framework. As an enhancement to the habitat management criteria specified within the LEAF Marque Standard, all farmers within the Jordans Farm Partnership are required to work directly with specialist farm advisory experts from the UK-based NGO 'The Wildlife Trust' to implement a bespoke wildlife management programme on their farm. During the reporting year the standards were applied on c.15,900 hectares of UK farmland, of which over 26% was managed as habitat for wildlife biodiversity.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2016

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2024

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

15900

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

15900

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

100000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement to soil health

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practice

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Farmers who operate under this scheme are contractually required to dedicate at least 10% of their land to wildlife preservation. 5% of the farmed land (roughly half of that required under the contract) must be managed according to or equivalent to those listed in the UK Government's Countryside Stewardship Scheme (CSS) Wild Pollinator and Farm Wildlife Package (WPFWP) to provide year-round habitat (food, nest sites and shelter for insects and overwintering bird species). The remaining 5% of the 10% contractually specified should be managed according to a bespoke landscape plan with habitat regeneration initiatives specific to that farm, this activity is completed in collaboration with The Wildlife Trust farm advisors. The standard also stipulates criteria for the management of field boundaries, ponds, watercourses and woodland. In addition, the participating farms are measured on the efficiency of their production processes and required to meet the general sustainable farm management criteria specified under the LEAF Marque, Integrated Farm Management, protocol. This includes specific provision for the management of soil quality and agrochemicals.In 2023, farmers growing oats for Jordans Cereals provided more than 4,200 hectares of land for farmland wildlife including barn owls, brown hares, corn buntings and vital pollinating insects like bees. Managing land for bees and pollinators can also help support a whole host of other wildlife. By recreating habitat and connecting areas of habitats on their farms with the wider countryside, the farmers in the JFP are helping establish a mix of connected habitats.

Row 2

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Forest ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement of standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

☑ Securing continued supply of agricultural commodities

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Our Grocery business, Jordans, helps finance a partnership with local NGO CIPCA (Bolivian Centre for Research and Promotion of Small farmers) to support the Brazil nut supply chain in the area around Riberalta, Bolivia. Brazil nuts can only be wild harvested from the Amazon rainforest, as Brazil trees are entirely dependent upon forest pollinators to fruit. The crop provides a valuable income to the local community and plays an important role in conserving the Amazon rainforest in Bolivia. Through the programme, essential forest conservation was undertaken including the growing of 47,500 Brazil nut saplings across an area, previously estimated to cover 121,000 hectares of forest.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2019

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2024

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

121000

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

121000

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

15000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement of standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

By working with CIPCA, Jordans create tree nurseries, facilitate trail clean ups, provide health education and training around how to keep Brazil nut trees and their forests healthy. This is part of a broader initiative to make the Amazon Rainforest economically viable and prevent deforestation.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

At ABF, we measure water withdrawals for compliance and reporting purposes at all of our operational sites, including sugar mills, manufacturing plants, factories, distribution centers, offices, and retail stores. The methods of measuring water withdrawals vary from site to site and include the use of water meters, pump records, and municipal metering.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All ABF businesses are responsible for reporting their site data for water withdrawal on an annual basis to ABF. This data is reviewed by ABF and independently assured by a third party (EY). It is used to assess operational performance and support activities like water conservation, legal compliance, and agricultural management. For instance, British Sugar uses various processes to monitor water abstraction based on the source. Environmental specialists monitor groundwater pump records, meter calibration, and abstraction licenses. Municipal water usage is measured using water meters and reconciled with invoice data by the Finance department. Surface water, cooling water, and effluent data are input into the data system, which is reviewed by the wastewater specialist.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

At ABF, each site not only reports total volumes of abstracted water, but also provides the volume of water abstracted from different sources: groundwater, municipal, surface water, and other. The methods of measuring water withdrawals from each source may differ from site to site, but they typically include the use of water meters, pump records, and municipal metering.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All ABF businesses are responsible for reporting their site data for water withdrawal on an annual basis to ABF. This data is reviewed by ABF and independently assured by a third party (EY). It is used to assess operational performance and support activities like water conservation, legal compliance, and agricultural management. Our facilities also monitor this data to make their own management decisions and ensure compliance with local permits. For example, all ABF Sugar businesses monitor 100% of their water sources for direct operations to assess the sustainability of their supply and ensure legal compliance.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Even though the quality of the water withdrawn is not critical for Illovo because the water is treated on-site to meet the required standards for consumption and various process uses, Illovo still performs a comprehensive analysis of the water quality, including metals and biological components, both upstream and downstream at each of its sites. In South Africa, this testing occurs monthly, while in Tanzania, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, and eSwatini, the testing is conducted quarterly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water quality is extremely important for the majority of our factories, offices and stores both for operational use and for drinking. We also use water for other purposes such as irrigation, cooling in factory processes and equipment cleaning. While the quality of water for these uses is not as crucial as for drinking we still monitor and manage it because water quality directly affects our ability to operate efficiently and comes with associated costs.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

ABF sites report the volume of water discharge to regulators as part of their water discharge permits. The methods of measuring water discharges vary from site to site, but includes the use of flow meters, pump records, and discharge permits.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All ABF businesses are responsible for reporting their site data for the volume of effluent discharged on an annual basis to ABF. This data is reviewed by ABF and independently verified by a third party (EY). It is used to assess operational performance and support activities like water conservation, legal compliance, and

agricultural management. For instance, Illovo's water strategy aims to reduce wastewater by increasing water reuse and recycling. Water discharge is monitored at all of Illovo's facilities to identify recycling opportunities.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

All ABF operational sites are required to report annually to ABF the volume of wastewater discharged to third parties, as fresh surface water, to groundwater or as brackish water. The methods of measurement of water discharges by destinations vary from site to site but include the use of flow meters, pump records as well as discharge permits.

(9.2.4) Please explain

At ABF we report the volume of water discharge and destination to regulators as part of their water discharge permits from all of our operational sites including sugar mills, manufacturing plants, factories, distribution centres, offices and retail stores. In addition to fulfilling legal requirements, this data helps our sites monitor and minimise their impact on the surrounding natural and social environments. The information is verified by ABF and independently assured by EY.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

ABF sites measure, monitor and maintain records for water discharges by treatment method for operational reasons and for regulatory purposes. Although ABF does not require this information to be reported to the group, if the data were required, it can be obtained from the individual business records. The majority of our sites measure this KPI at least annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

ABF sites return as much water as possible to natural watercourses by treating the wastewater on-site or by using municipal treatment plants. For Illovo the monitoring of water discharged by treatment method is important as this water is either recycled back into the mill or reused for irrigation. Consequently, this aspect is monitored at 100% of Illovo's facilities.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

ABF sites operate within and comply with a regulatory water and wastewater framework. Our sites regularly measure and monitor the quality of their water discharge to ensure legal compliance and minimal impact on the surrounding environments. For example, at British Sugar, the COD values of treated wastewater are measured and samples for BOD are also taken and measured regularly. The majority of our sites measure this KPI at least annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Illovo sites test the quality of water discharge through weekly samples, in line with the permits that govern water use. Where the permit does not prescribe frequency for water discharge quality testing, Illovo has implemented weekly testing as a minimum standard. This testing includes a full spectrum analysis including metal and biological parameters. Although Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) is not a legal parameter at most Illovo sites, Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) is. Accordingly, COD is included in the testing parameters.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Although emissions to water of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides and other priority substances are relevant for some of our sites, ABF does not require this information to be reported to the group. If the data were required, it can be obtained from the individual business records. For example, at ABF Sugar's Bury St Edmunds site, total phosphate and total oxidised nitrogen are measured weekly. AB Mauri measures emissions to water as required by law. The measurement of these and other emissions is determined by local regulatory requirements in all the jurisdictions in which we operate. Some sites have their own in-house laboratories, while others utilize a third party laboratory accredited by the local regulatory authorities. Plants are subject to ad-hoc, unplanned audits by regulatory authorities.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

ABF sites operate within and comply with a regulatory water and wastewater framework. As such, certain sites will regularly measure and monitor the temperature of their water discharges to ensure legal compliance and minimal impact on the surrounding natural and social environments. The majority of our sites measure this KPI at least annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

For example, our Illovo sites test the quality of water discharge according to samples taken on a weekly basis and in line with the permits that govern the water use. Where the permit does not prescribe the frequency for water discharge quality testing, Illovo has implemented a weekly testing parameter as a minimum standard. This testing includes a full spectrum analysis including metal and biological parameters. Although the temperature of the discharge water is not governed by the permits, the Illovo standard prescribes a three-degree variation. If the discharge temperature is three degrees above the abstracted water temperature, it is considered a pollution load.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Monitoring water consumption is material for sugar businesses as, crop dependent, a large percentage of water entering the site comes from the raw material and used in the processes in our factories in preference to using fresh water. Therefore, ABF Sugar facilities constantly monitor their total water footprints.

(9.2.4) Please explain

For the reporting year, ABF did not require our businesses to report their water consumption to the Group. However, a large proportion of our businesses collect this data to assist with their own management decisions.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

ABF sites measure, monitor and maintain records for water recycled reused for operational reasons. This year across the Group 25% of the water abstracted was reused before being returned to watercourses.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Reused water is mainly utilised by Illovo & George Weston Foods. This water was used more than once before being discharged therefore reducing the need to withdraw fresh water. The water is treated before being used mainly for irrigation, land spreading or vehicle washing. AB Mauri utilises reverse osmosis membranes to recover high quality water from process effluent for use in site utilities; additional disinfection steps are incorporated into the treatment train to facilitate the use of this recovered water in other production areas.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

All ABF companies provide appropriate water and sanitation facilities for our employees and contractors. As part of our publicly available Supplier Code of Conduct, we have a commitment that 'workers shall…be given access to clean toilet facilities and potable water.'

(9.2.4) Please explain

Illovo's sugar estates provide many of their employees with basic amenities, for example, Illovo Nchalo in Malawi houses 2,000 employees and their families. Water supply and domestic effluent are managed by Illovo as part of this accommodation provision. In Zambia, Illovo provides potable water to a population of more than 16,000 people on the estate.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

859925

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

This year, we abstracted 860 million m3 of water for use in our operations. This is an increase of 8% compared with 2022. Most of the water used by our businesses is sourced from water occurring naturally on the earth's surface, such as rivers and lakes, as well as man-made dams. Our sites are regulated by water permits or licences and they withdraw water within their agreed limits. As Illovo, within our Sugar segment, accounts for 97% of the Group's total water withdrawn in our own operations, we note the Group's increase in water abstraction is driven by Illovo's 19% increase in tonnes of product this year. All Illovo sites across southern Africa continue to focus on water stewardship activities including upgrades to water canals around the sugar estates to minimise evaporation, the installation of more flow meters to improve monitoring of water used for irrigation, investigations into the use of more boreholes to reduce reliance on municipal water, and communication campaigns to raise awareness about water conservation. As many of our sugar businesses are reliant on abstracted water as opposed to rainfed water, we anticipate that our total withdrawals will remain relatively constant and will only increase in the event of less rainfall. ABF uses the following approach when determining the comparative thresholds: Much higher: 10% Higher: 5% but -10% Much lower:

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

120017

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

This year 120 million m3 of wastewater left our sites for final disposal via sewerage systems or was treated and then discharged to receiving watercourses. For sites where this is appropriate within their operations, water is used more than once before being discharged which reduces their need to withdraw fresh water.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

739909

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Our water consumption figure for our own operations is calculated at group level by subtracting the total volume of water discharged from the total volume of water withdrawn. This year there was an 11% increase in water consumption compared with 2022. At a business level, water consumption figures are calculated based on a number of variances such as water availability within crop. This level of detailed information is not currently collated at Group level.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

826262

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

96.09

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

17 out of 732 of our operating sites, representing 2% of our company-wide facilities and 27% of global production, have been identified as facilities within regions of water stress/scarcity. Among these, 10 facilities are from Illovo, which is part of ABF Sugar. ABF Sugar is responsible for a large portion of the water used across the Group, accounting for 97% of the total water abstracted. Almost all of this water is used for crop irrigation within Illovo, which is the Group's largest user of water. The increase in the percentage of water withdrawn from water-stressed areas compared to the previous year is a result of the increase in water abstraction at two or three of Illovo's estates where water is used for irrigation. In 2024, we conducted a high-level desktop assessment of water scarcity across our global operations, to compliment the work already being driven at a business-level in this area. As part of our assessment, we combined the use of two separate external tools, WRI Aqueduct and WWF Water Risk Filter. We took a three-stage assessment approach. • Assessment stage 1 – All offices, factories, laboratories, stores and distribution centre locations were input to Aqueduct which primarily assesses water scarcity risk based on location, irrespective of site water usage. The tool presents the results on a scale of Low to Extremely High. • Assessment stage 2 - Where the Aqueduct tool indicated sites as having High or Extremely High risk (based on location), and any sites with water usage over 100,000m3 per year (irrespective of location), those sites were then input to the WWF Water Risk Filter, which enables site operational factors, such as water usage, to be considered as part of the assessment. A site is considered as 'water stressed' where the Water Scarcity risk score is equal to/greater than 'High risk', being 3.4 (the risk score ranges from 1 to 5). We identified the sites operating within areas of water stress where the Aqueduct Baseline Water Stress risk score is 40% or higher and the WWF Water Scarcity risk score is equal to or greater than 3. We also considered sites with a WWF Water Scarcity risk score of 2.6: 'Medium Risk'. • Assessment stage 3 – We shared the results with the businesses which operate the identified sites, to compliment and

feed into the range of tools and methodologies already used by our businesses to understand their operational water risks and the stress levels of the basins in which they operate. Our relevant businesses remain accountable for any mitigating actions as a result of this high-level Group assessment. Our businesses operating in other water basins continue to address water risk as relevant to their operations and local catchment requirements. ABF uses the following approach when determining the comparative thresholds: • Much higher: 10% • Higher: 5% but -10% • Much lower:
[Fixed row]

(9.2.5) What proportion of the produced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Sugar

(9.2.5.1) The proportion of this commodity produced in areas with water stress is known

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.2.5.2) % of total agricultural commodity produced in areas with water stress

Select from:
☑ 51-75

(9.2.5.3) Please explain

To obtain this figure, we have used data supplied by our ABF Sugar sites for their total product tonnage, including co-products and by-products which includes molasses, animal feed, agricultural fertilizer and topsoil. The amount of product output is then calculated from the sites identified as located in water stress areas. This is in line with the amount of sugar and co-/by- product output from areas of water stress when compared with last year. Other methodologies and internationally recognised water stress tools are used internally which provide more detailed results.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Cotton

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ No, but we intend to obtain this data within the next two years

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

This year, Primark initiated the development of its 2030 Water Impact and Stewardship Strategy. The goal of the strategy, initially focused on the supply chain, will be to improve the management of water, reduce its water footprint and to reduce the negative impact of water usage on hydrological systems, ecosystems and human health. To enable these goals, it is committed to working with suppliers to improve water efficiency and to recycle water where possible. It is also committed to collective action, working with other brands and trade associations to address shared water challenges. Primark is a signatory of WRAP's Textiles 2030, which has the collective target to reduce the aggregate water footprint of new products sold by 30% by 2030. In 2023, Primark commissioned an independent third party to undertake a detailed water footprint assessment across its supply chain. This will be used in combination with previously conducted water risk assessments, to build a water action plan to underpin the strategy. Water risks and challenges vary depending on geographical location. This year, Primark mapped its strategic tier one and tier two supplier factories to assess the likelihood of water risks materialising. Primark's water use footprint is also driven by raw material cultivation, primarily from cotton. Through its longstanding PSCP, Primark is training and influencing farming practices to improve resource efficiency.

Sugar

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

Our sugar businesses work closely with their sugar suppliers and therefore they know the basins from which their suppliers source water for irrigation. At an ABF Sugar level, we are working with our individual businesses to consolidate and harmonise this information, noting that various tools are used to identify water stress basins, and then validate the findings. However, as the majority of sugar beet and cane is sourced from local farmers we have made the assumption that the percentage of sugar sourced from areas of water stress is equivalent to the percentage of sugar produced in areas with water stress.

Tea

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ No, but we intend to obtain this data within the next two years

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

As part of its Sourced with Care programme, Twinings is also working with Solidaridad, a civil society organisation with over 50 years of experience in developing solutions to make supply chains more sustainable and communities more resilient. Together, they are piloting an innovative nature-based project which aims to implement more regenerative agriculture practices, including agroforestry. The pilot started in September 2023 in Argentina, it will cover 100 farmers, and will produce a manual for regenerative agriculture practices for tea production, with a view to replicating this in other regions

Wheat

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ No, we do not have this data and have no plans to obtain it

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

Since less than 10% of our Group revenue depends on wheat, we haven't conducted a water stress assessment on this commodity. As a result, we don't have a group-wide percentage for the amount of wheat coming from water-stressed areas. However, our relevant businesses are aware of the water risks in their supply chain and address these through tailored approaches. Allied Mills, a business within the UK Grocery division and which also supplies ABF companies and other bakeries with milled flour and semolina, ensures all the UK wheat it sources is Red Tractor Assured.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

832218

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Fresh surface water is ABF's most significant source of water and includes water from wetlands, rivers and lakes. These sources are monitored at a site level to ensure that withdrawals are in line with extraction permits. The total volume of surface water is obtained from direct measurement and is reported by the local teams to ABF on an annual basis. The data is verified by ABF and assured by EY.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2003

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

The 2.7% reduction is in line with production activities across sites.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

16917

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

This year we report a 5% reduction that is linked to the closure of a particular site.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

N/A

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Produced or entrained water is monitored and measured by our relevant businesses. The data is not collated at Group level.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

8787

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

This year we report a 9% reduction that is in part due to a major water conservation project that focused on reducing the amount of non-contact cooling water used at one site as well as other water efficiency initiatives.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

104903

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our sites annually report to ABF the volume of water they discharge by destination. The volume of water discharged by destination is verified by ABF and assured by EY. The data provided here is based on sourced data provided by our sites.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1149

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our sites annually report to ABF the volume of water they discharge by destination. The volume of water discharged by destination is verified by ABF and assured by EY. The data disclosed here is based on sourced data provided by our sites.We report a 28% reduction in the volume of water discharged as brackish surface water or seawater, in part due to an increase in the reuse of water at one of our Illovo sites.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3320

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our sites annually report to ABF the volume of water they discharge by destination. The volume of water discharged by destination is verified by ABF and assured by EY. The data disclosed here is based on sourced data provided by our sites.The data provided here is based on sourced data provided by our sites. This year we report a 16% reduction that is linked to the closure of a particular site.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

10644

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our sites annually report to ABF the volume of water they discharge by destination. The volume of water discharged by destination is verified by ABF and assured by EY. The data disclosed here is based on sourced data provided by our sites. This year we report a 1% increase in the volume of water discharged to third party destinations in line with production volumes at various sites.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Tertiary treatment is relevant for the majority of our sites and is monitored and managed at the site level. ABF does not collate this data from our sites.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Secondary treatment is relevant for many of our sites and is monitored and managed at the site level. ABF does not collate this data from our sites.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Primary treatment is relevant for some of our sites and is monitored and managed at the site level. ABF does not collate this data from our sites.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

ABF does not discharge to the natural environment without treatment.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge to a third party without treatment is relevant for some of our sites and is monitored and managed at the site level. ABF does not collate this data from our sites.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Other methods of discharge may be relevant for some of our sites and is monitored and managed at the site level. ABF does not collate this data from our sites. [Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

17

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

17 out of 732 of our operating sites, representing 2% of our company-wide facilities and 27% of global production, have been identified as being exposed to water risks with facilities within regions of water stress. These facilities have been identified using the WRI Aqueduct tool, WWF Water Risk Filter and an operational lens. The impact of site-level water risks at the Group level is low and unlikely to meet the material financial impact threshold of 66 million or have a strategic impact. At an aggregated level, the sites consolidated within a division may meet the ABF financial threshold of 66 million or be considered a potential strategic risk based on reputational issues. The term 'facility' for water risk assessment covers ABF's direct operations which includes factories, warehouses, distribution centres, retail space and offices.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

In 2023, Primark commissioned an independent third party to undertake a detailed water footprint assessment across its supply chain. This will be used in combination with previously conducted water risk assessments, to build a water action plan to underpin the strategy. Water risks and challenges vary depending on geographical location. This year, Primark mapped its strategic tier one and tier two supplier factories to assess the likelihood of water risks materialising. Primark's water use footprint is also driven by raw material cultivation, primarily from cotton. Through its longstanding PSCP, Primark is training farmers on farming practices to improve resource efficiency.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mgeni

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-30.063594

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.778772

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

250

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

34

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

217

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

250

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Zero discharge effluent site. The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Zambia

☑ Zambezi

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-15.83244

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

27.779939

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

253287

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

250782

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

2506

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

89402

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

89402

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

163885

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Ebro

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

42.689979

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-2.948964

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

80

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

77

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

2

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

178

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

178

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-99

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Malawi

☑ Zambezi

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-12.56667

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

34.149999

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

85718

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

85718

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

85718

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

There is zero effluent at this site. The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Eswatini

☑ Maputo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-26.78217

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

31.93823

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

213987

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

213987

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

623

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

623

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

213363

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mgeni

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-30.408871

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.677118

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1893

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1680

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

27

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

186

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

628

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

628

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1266

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mgeni

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-29.945489

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.95923

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

890

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

890

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1031

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1031

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-141

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Douro

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.99133

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-5.67635

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

52

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

28

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

24

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

54

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

54

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-2

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Other, please specify **:**Guadalete

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

36.666479

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-6.13227

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

514

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

503

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

11

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

259

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

259

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

255

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Douro

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

42.30236

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-5.90259

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

49

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

46

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

3

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

168

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

168

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-119

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Malawi

☑ Other, please specify :Shire

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-16.263459

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

34.86889

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

193372

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

193372

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

303

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

303

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

193069

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain
☑ Douro

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.516967

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-5.385943

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

39

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

23

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

16

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

127

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

127

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-88

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.095

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

114.42373

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United Republic of Tanzania

☑ Rufiji

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-7.86171

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

36.890639

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

74635

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

74635

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

917

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

917

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

73718

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mgeni

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-29.355757

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.524081

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

371

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

371

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

151

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

151

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

219

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mgeni

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-29.288183

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

31.153856

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

233

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

233

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

233

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Murray - Darling

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.050637

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

144.208165

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

478

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

478

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

383

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

383

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

95

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The water consumption data reported here is a simple calculation of withdrawal minus discharge. It does not take into account site-level measurements which may include evaporation, water incorporated in crops or controlled water storage.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

ABF sites operate within and comply with their local regulatory water requirements. As such, sites regularly measure and monitor the quality of their water withdrawn to meet legal compliance, as a minimum. In many cases sites receive visits from local government bodies as part of their regulatory environmental checks. ABF does not seek independent verification of the quality of water withdrawn because this is managed at a local site level.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

ABF sites operate within and comply with their local regulatory water and wastewater requirements. As such, sites regularly measure and monitor the quality of their water discharges to meet legal compliance, as a minimum. In many cases sites receive visits from local government bodies as part of their regulatory environmental checks. ABF does not seek independent verification of the treatment of water discharges because this is managed at a local site level.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

ABF sites operate within and comply with their local regulatory water and wastewater requirements. As such, sites regularly measure and monitor the quality of their water discharges to meet legal compliance, as a minimum. In many cases sites receive visits from local government bodies as part of their regulatory environmental checks. The quality of water discharge by standard water quality parameters is considered as part of the Group's environmental compliance audit programme. If the compliance audit programme identifies issues these are reported at a divisional level, and at Group level if deemed material. Actions to address any identified issues are implemented by the site.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

For the reporting year, ABF did not require the sites to report their water consumption. However, a large proportion of our businesses collect this data to assist with their own management decisions.
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ We do not have this data but we intend to collect it within two years

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	19750000000	*22967.12*	*Our businesses are working towards increasing water efficiency through activities implemented at site level.*

[Fixed row]

(9.8) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you produce.

	Water intensity information for this produced commodity is collected/calculated	Please explain
Sugar	*Select from:* ☑ No, not currently but we intend to collect/calculate this data within the next two years	*We collect and calculate the water intensity of our sugar at an individual business level.*

[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

Cotton

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ No, not currently and we have no plans to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.6) Please explain

This year, Primark initiated the development of its 2030 Water Impact and Stewardship Strategy. The goal of the strategy, initially focused on the supply chain, will be to improve the management of water, reduce its water footprint and to reduce the negative impact of water usage on hydrological systems, ecosystems and human health. To enable these goals, it is committed to working with suppliers to improve water efficiency and to recycle water where possible. It is also committed to collective action, working with other brands and trade associations to address shared water challenges. Primark is a signatory of WRAP's Textiles 2030, which has the collective target to reduce the aggregate water footprint of new products sold by 30% by 2030. In 2023, Primark commissioned an independent third party to undertake a detailed water footprint assessment across its supply chain. This will be used in combination with previously conducted water risk assessments, to build a water action plan to underpin the strategy. Water risks and challenges vary depending on geographical location. This year, Primark mapped its strategic tier one and tier two supplier factories to assess the likelihood of water risks materialising. Primark's water use footprint is also driven by raw material cultivation, primarily from cotton. Through its longstanding PSCP, Primark is training and influencing farming practices to improve resource efficiency.

Sugar

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ No, not currently and we have no plans to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.6) Please explain

We collect and calculate the water intensity of our sugar at an individual business level, not at the Group level.

Tea

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ No, not currently but we intend to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.6) Please explain

As part of its Sourced with Care programme, Twinings is also working with Solidaridad, a civil society organisation with over 50 years of experience in developing solutions to make supply chains more sustainable and communities more resilient. Together, they are piloting an innovative nature-based project which aims to implement more regenerative agriculture practices, including agroforestry. The pilot started in September 2023 in Argentina, it will cover 100 farmers, and will produce a manual for regenerative agriculture practices for tea production, with a view to replicating this in other regions

Wheat

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ No, not currently and we have no plans to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.6) Please explain

Since less than 10% of our Group revenue depends on wheat. We are not planning to calculate the water intensity of wheat at a Group level in the next two years. [Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern for Authorisation above 0.1% by weight (EU Regulation)

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Don't know

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

ABF has a dedicated health, safety and environment (HSE) team with the technical skills and expertise to identify, assess, and manage products containing substances classified as hazardous by regulatory authorities. Additionally, ABF's businesses take the environmental impact of supplier factories seriously. For example, Primark is committed to supporting its suppliers with the tools and guidance needed to use chemicals safely. It has regional environmental teams across strategic sourcing regions, which engage directly with suppliers' facilities to provide awareness and training in relation to chemical management. This includes requirements for facilities to compile and submit chemical inventories so that Primark can assess their usage of chemicals in reference to the Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC) Manufacturing RSL. In 2022, 175 of its key wet processors generated ZDHC InCheck reports.

Row 2

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern (UK Regulation)

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Don't know

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

ABF has a dedicated health, safety and environment (HSE) team with the technical skills and expertise to identify, assess, and manage products containing substances classified as hazardous by regulatory authorities. Additionally, ABF's businesses take the environmental impact of supplier factories seriously. For example, Primark is committed to supporting its suppliers with the tools and guidance needed to use chemicals safely. It has regional environmental teams across strategic sourcing regions, which engage directly with suppliers' facilities to provide awareness and training in relation to chemical management. This includes requirements for facilities to compile and submit chemical inventories so that Primark can assess their usage of chemicals in reference to the Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC) Manufacturing RSL. In 2022, 175 of its key wet processors generated ZDHC InCheck reports.
[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

In June 2021 Primark launched Cradle to Cradle (C2C) Certified Gold certified mom-fit denim jeans. The Cradle to Cradle Certified Product Standard is a set of globally recognised criteria for safe, more sustainable products with a lower impact on the planet.

(9.14.4) Please explain

These jeans were Primark's most sustainably made yet. They were made from 100% organic cotton, produced using less water and energy, made to last and designed to be recycled. C2C Certified Gold jeans are made using methods that preserve and use less water.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water pollution	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*ABF has not set a target relating to water pollution.*
Water withdrawals	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*ABF has not set a target relating to Water, Sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) services.*
Other	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water consumption

☑ Reduction in total water consumption

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

03/31/2018

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2018

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

805107263

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

563575084

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

837885053

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-14

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

ABF Sugar's businesses are committed to reducing water abstraction as well as using water more effectively in the field and factory. Water is predominantly used for growing the crop on its Illovo estates. ABF Sugar set a 2030 commitment to reduce the water footprint by 30% from its 2018 baseline.

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

This year the division has concentrated activities on accuracy of water measurement and investment in irrigation efficiency. Since its 2018 baseline year, ABF Sugar has increased water abstraction by 4%. However, each business has a clear target to reduce water usage as part of its environmental plans in their five-year strategy. In 2023, the businesses reused 26% of the total abstracted water before it was returned to a watercourse. For example, Azucarera is leveraging innovative and smart technology to harness the sun. Working alongside the Research Association for Sugar Beet Crop Improvement (AIMCRA), it has installed more than 80 sustainable watering systems. The structures extract water from an underground well, powered entirely by solar energy. They have reduced water consumption by 20%, representing an annual saving of 1.6 million m3 of water. By replacing a less-efficient diesel-powered system, Azucarera has saved around 28,000 litres of diesel per year.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Illovo has a long-standing performance improvement programme focused on optimising water use. The business takes a strategic approach to water efficiency across its estate with continuous investment in enhanced irrigation systems. Illovo has programmes in place to address the three main areas where savings can be made: bulk water losses, infield losses and accurate scheduling of irrigation events. It has completed a study this year to audit all bulk water abstraction locations and has completed the process of metering 50% of all abstraction sites, with the rest to be completed in 2024.
[Add row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water management

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ State and benefit indicators

[Fixed row]

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

Legally protected areas

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

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

ABF have not assessed at Group level whether any of its activities are located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity. As a decentralised Group, we do not have a group-wide strategy on biodiversity, as our business model empowers each of our businesses, that are closest to the risks and opportunities, to take the best approach based on local circumstances. We have long understood the connection between biodiversity, natural eco-system health and business performance. The large majority of our revenues are derived from what we, and our suppliers, grow and harvest from the soil, including cotton, the primary fibre used to make Primark's products. Prioritising local biodiversity exemplifies ways in which agriculture can work with, rather than against, nature. Ultimately, the farmers in our businesses supply chains and our businesses themselves benefit because thriving biodiversity underpins key resources such as soil and water quality as well as the pollination of crops.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

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

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

ABF have not assessed at Group level whether any of its activities are located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity. As a decentralised Group, we do not have a group-wide strategy on biodiversity, as our business model empowers each of our businesses, that are closest to the risks and opportunities, to take the best approach based on local circumstances. We have long understood the connection between biodiversity, natural eco-system health and business performance. The large majority of our revenues are derived from what we, and our suppliers, grow and harvest from the soil, including cotton, the primary fibre used to make Primark's products. Prioritising local biodiversity exemplifies ways in which agriculture can work with, rather than against, nature. Ultimately, the farmers in our businesses supply chains and our businesses themselves benefit because thriving biodiversity underpins key resources such as soil and water quality as well as the pollination of crops.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

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

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

ABF have not assessed at Group level whether any of its activities are located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity. As a decentralised Group, we do not have a group-wide strategy on biodiversity, as our business model empowers each of our businesses, that are closest to the risks and opportunities, to take the best approach based on local circumstances. We have long understood the connection between biodiversity, natural eco-system health and business performance. The large majority of our revenues are derived from what we, and our suppliers, grow and harvest from the soil, including cotton, the primary fibre used to make Primark's products. Prioritising local biodiversity exemplifies ways in which agriculture can work with, rather than against, nature. Ultimately, the farmers in our businesses supply chains and our businesses themselves benefit because thriving biodiversity underpins key resources such as soil and water quality as well as the pollination of crops.

Ramsar sites

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

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

ABF have not assessed at Group level whether any of its activities are located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity.

Key Biodiversity Areas

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

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

ABF have not assessed at Group level whether any of its activities are located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity.

Other areas important for biodiversity

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

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

ABF have not assessed at Group level whether any of its activities are located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity. As a decentralised Group, we do not have a group-wide strategy on biodiversity, as our business model empowers each of our businesses, that are closest to the risks and opportunities, to take the best approach based on local circumstances. We have long understood the connection between biodiversity, natural eco-system health and business performance. The large majority of our revenues are derived from what we, and our suppliers, grow and harvest from the soil, including cotton, the primary fibre used to make Primark's products. Prioritising local biodiversity exemplifies ways in which agriculture can work with, rather than against, nature. Ultimately, the farmers in our businesses supply chains and our businesses themselves benefit because thriving biodiversity underpins key resources such as soil and water quality as well as the pollination of crops.
[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

☑ Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling generation

☑ Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

☑ Waste data

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

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

Environment, Health and Safety data is independently assured by Ernst & Young (EY) against the International Federation of Accountants' International Standard on Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information – known as ISAE 3000 (Revised). EY has provided independent limited assurance over the 29 environment and safety key performance indicators (KPIs) for the year ended 31 July 2023. Pleas see pages 114-119 of the attached Responsibility Report 2023.

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

abf-responsibility-report-2023.pdf.downloadasset.pdf
[Add row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Director of Legal Services and Company Secretary who reviews all ESG aspects.

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Other C-Suite Officer

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute