Berry Global Group, Inc

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Contents

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:
☑ USD

(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

Berry Global Group, Inc. (NYSE:BERY), headquartered in Evansville, Indiana, is committed to its mission of 'Always Advancing to Protect What's Important,' and proudly partners with its customers to provide them with value-added protective solutions that are increasingly light-weighted and easier to recycle or reuse. The Company is a leading global supplier of a broad range of innovative rigid, flexible, and nonwoven products used every day within consumer and industrial end markets. Berry, a Fortune 500 company, has over 44,000 employees and generated almost 12.7 billion of pro forma net sales in fiscal year 2023, from operations that span over 240 manufacturing locations on five continents. For additional information, visit Berry's website at berryglobal.com. Data in this response aligns to our Fiscal Year, which ran from from October 2nd 2022 - September 30th, 2023. Our Energy and Greenhouse Gas emissions data is calendar normalized to a 1st October 2022 – 30th September 2023 reporting period in line with our external assurance process.
[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

09/29/2023

(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?

12664000000

(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

US08579W1036

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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Sweden
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Slovakia
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Romania
☑ Tunisia
☑ Colombia
☑ South Africa
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes, for all facilities	*We have over 240 facilities. If this information is desired, it should be requested outside of CDP.*

[Fixed row]

(1.8.1) Please provide all available geolocation data for your facilities.

	Comment
Row 1	*We have over 240 facilities. If this information is desired, it should be requested outside of CDP.*

[Add 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

☑ Downstream 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 2 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

As a global plastics manufacturer, our main area of focus upstream has historically been on the raw and direct materials required to manufacture our finished goods. Tier one, and many tier two suppliers have been mapped. Category Directors manage our critical materials and have approved a minimum of two sources to ensure continuity of supply. Each finished goods item has a Bill of Material (BOM) that links a customer sales order to the item, batch, and individual components that it is comprised from. These constituent components can be linked back to a purchase order and supplier. Category Directors have also been assigned to manage and map other vital areas such as transport and energy. Indirect areas, such as Engineering, Facilities Management and Outsourced Services, are part of our current supply chain value stream mapping program. This process will take some time to complete due to the scale of our business and the fact that supply chains are in a constant state of change. Berry Global has partnered with EcoVadis to support us with our supply chain ESG risk mapping. If EcoVadis determines that a supplier is high risk, their details are passed to the Legal and Compliance Team for review. Our aim is to support our suppliers to use best practice and to get them to pass this knowledge along our extended supply chain. Our downstream value chain mapping is more advanced. Our tier one customers have been mapped and tier two, through to end consumer may be known in certain circumstances. Category Sales Directors are in place and add value wherever possible. As our business also recycles plastic, we can offer circular products that are fully recyclable and contain validated post consumer recycled plastic in percentages determined by our customers. Our flagship recycling facility in Leamington Spa is capable of recycling more polypropylene than our European plants manufacture, offsetting our waste to landfill completely. Our long-term goal is to make our end-to-end supply chain as efficient and sustainable as possible, whilst mitigating risk. Work has started within our own facilities, in areas such as energy and water conservation, renewable energy initiatives and use of electric vehicles. Lean methodologies are being implemented in all plants. Our upstream supply chain mapping is in progress, and we continue to map and add value to our downstream supply chain through offering circular and sustainable products and solutions.

[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?

	Plastics mapping	Value chain stages covered in mapping
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Upstream value chain ☑ Downstream value chain

[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)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

Berry's environmental (Climate-related) time horizons (Short 0-3, Medium 4-6, Long 7) are intentionally longer than our financial planning periods (Short 0-1, Medium 2-3, Long 3) due to the complex and long-term nature of environmental challenges. Strategic environmental planning must account for significant but slow-moving changes, such as those presented by climate change and resource depletion. Longer time horizons are critical to managing risks associated with evolving regulations, longer payback periods for investments in sustainable technologies, and the acute and chronic physical risks associated with a changing climate. Longer environmental time horizons allow us to take a proactive approach to climate risk, ensuring that our business remains viable and responsible over the long term, while still aligning with our overall financial objectives.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

4

(2.1.3) To (years)

6

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

Berry's environmental (Climate-related) time horizons (Short 0-3, Medium 4-6, Long 7) are intentionally longer than our financial planning periods (Short 0-1, Medium 2-3, Long 3) due to the complex and long-term nature of environmental challenges. Strategic environmental planning must account for significant but slow-moving changes, such as those presented by climate change and resource depletion. Longer time horizons are critical to managing risks associated with evolving regulations, longer payback periods for investments in sustainable technologies, and the acute and chronic physical risks associated with a changing climate. Longer environmental time horizons allow us to take a proactive approach to climate risk, ensuring that our business remains viable and responsible over the long term, while still aligning with our overall financial objectives.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

7

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Berry's environmental (Climate-related) time horizons (Short 0-3, Medium 4-6, Long 7) are intentionally longer than our financial planning periods (Short 0-1, Medium 2-3, Long 3) due to the complex and long-term nature of environmental challenges. Strategic environmental planning must account for significant but slow-moving changes, such as those presented by climate change and resource depletion. Longer time horizons are critical to managing risks associated with evolving regulations, longer payback periods for investments in sustainable technologies, and the acute and chronic physical risks associated with a changing climate. Longer environmental time horizons allow us to take a proactive approach to climate risk, ensuring that our business remains viable and responsible over the long term, while still aligning with our overall financial objectives.

[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

☑ Water

☑ Plastics

(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

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End of life management

(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
☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management
☑ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
☑ Enterprise Risk Management
☑ Internal company methods

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Drought
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

☑ Heat waves

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Temperature variability

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Leaching of hazardous substances from plastics

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Increased levels of macro or microplastic leakage to air, soil, freshwater and/or marine bodies

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Increased pricing of water

☑ Changes to national legislation

☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

☑ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of recycled or renewable content

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

☑ 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)

☑ Stigmatization of sector

Technology

☑ Transition to reusable products

☑ Transition to recyclable plastic products

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

☑ Transition to increasing recycled content
☑ Transition to increasing renewable content
☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies
☑ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

Liability
☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers

(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 Berry Global Enterprise Risk Assessment (ERA) is completed on an annual basis. The ERA identifies risk through a number of processes. A questionnaire is sent to the Berry Global Board of Directors, the Berry senior executive team, and approximately 200 employees, representing a mix of job functions and locations, across the organisation to identify and assess risks. Members of the Berry Global Board of Directors and the Berry senior executive team are interviewed to identify risks they perceive as being applicable to the business. These interviews are conducted across a number of geographies and functional areas such as legal, division leads, purchasing, sustainability etc. in order to obtain results representative of the global operations of Berry. The information from both of these risk identification processes is then gathered in to a central database and the risks are categorized in to a number of themes (approx. 15) such as supply chain (upstream), production (direct operations), infrastructure and external market forces (downstream). Each risk identified is rated based on the risk impact (insignificant to catastrophic), the likelihood of occurrence (unlikely to almost certain) and speed of onset (short-term to long-term). Each of the ratings are associated with a risk score, the higher the impact, likelihood, or speed of onset the higher the risk score for each risk identified. An example of climate-related physical risks identified through the Berry Global risk process is a natural disaster which results in the destruction of company facilities and production capabilities. For Berry Global this risk is higher and more likely in areas which are more susceptible to natural disasters such as India (cyclones and floods), parts of the United States (tornadoes, hurricanes, flooding) and China *(flooding, droughts, typhoons, and earthquakes) where Berry Global operations are located. An example of a climate-related transitional risk identified through the Berry Global risk process is the change in consumer perception of plastics due to the negative perception of plastics impact on the environment which is driving a market shift towards non-plastic packaging. As Berry Global is one of the world's largest manufacturers of plastic packaging this risk could have significant strategic and financial impact. The top 5 risk themes are then extracted from the risk database, transcribed in to a report that details the inherent risk and key mitigation activities. This report is submitted to the audit committee and the board for appropriate mitigation plans to be actioned against the most significant risks identified by the process."*

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(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

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End of life management

(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:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

☑ Drought

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

☑ Heat waves

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

Chronic physical

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Water stress

☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

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

☑ Stigmatization of sector

Technology

☑ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

☑ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

In addition to and contributory to the Enterprise Risk Assessment, an annual carbon risk assessment and physical risk assessment are also performed, covering our direct operations, and upstream and downstream value chain, and covering all time horizons. The Berry Global GHG inventory is used to estimate the current portion of energy costs due to carbon taxes, emissions trading schemes etc. based on the latest regulatory information. Forward looking carbon risk is then estimated based on a variety of scenarios using different carbon prices, geographies and time horizons. For the purposes of this assessment a substantive financial impact would be one that increases costs significantly above typical inflation. Alongside these measures, risk is identified and assessed continually across the company through the use of live dashboards that monitor energy use and GHG emissions based on usage data. Monitoring of data in this way allows a more frequent response to risks and opportunities than the annual Enterprise Risk Assessment. Both the Enterprise Risk Assessment and our supplementary carbon risk assessment identify risks based on speed of onset, in-line with the time horizons definitions, covering short-, medium-, and long-term risk.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ 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

☑ End of life management

(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

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ EcoVadis

Other

☑ Desk-based research
☑ External consultants
☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis
☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Drought
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress
☑ Change in land-use
☑ Groundwater depletion
☑ Declining water quality
☑ Declining ecosystem services
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Leaching of hazardous substances from plastics
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Increased levels of macro or microplastic leakage to air, soil, freshwater and/or marine bodies

Policy

☑ Increased pricing of water
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
☑ Lack of globally accepted and harmonized definitions
☑ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of recycled or renewable content
☑ Changing customer behavior
☑ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

Reputation
☑ Exclusion of vulnerable and marginalized stakeholders (e.g., informal workers)
☑ Impact on human health
☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level
☑ Stigmatization of sector

Technology
☑ Transition to reusable products
☑ Transition to recyclable plastic products
☑ Transition to increasing recycled content
☑ Transition to increasing renewable content
☑ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources
☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems
☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
☑ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

Liability
☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We recently completed a Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) for the first time to comprehensively identify, assess, and manage our environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. The DMA approach allows us to view sustainability from two critical perspectives: financial materiality and impact materiality. From the financial perspective, we are able to assess how environmental factors, such as climate change, water availability, plastics, and biodiversity loss, directly influence our operations and financial performance. Simultaneously, from an impact materiality standpoint, we analyze how our operations affect the environment, understanding our impact from factors such as emissions, water usage, and plastic waste generation. By recognizing both how the environment influences us and how we influence it, we are able to better identify and assess our material impacts and dependencies, and furthermore those areas where our business might face risks or uncover opportunities for innovation and improvement.

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(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

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:
☑ Full

(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:
☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply
☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools
☑ WRI Aqueduct

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

☑ Heat waves

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

☑ Sea level rise

☑ Groundwater depletion

☑ Declining water quality

☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability

Policy

☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies

☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes

Market

☑ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

Reputation

☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

☑ Stigmatization of sector

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Water utilities at a local level

☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

All facilities are considered within our full assessment, and we use the WRI Aqueduct tool to encompass the full current water-related risks based on each sites geography, and future water risk for 2030 and 2040 under a "business as usual" pathway scenario. WRI Aqueduct tool's 13 risk indicators are all used to shape our analysis of the water-risk pressures on our facilities, and this is combined with an analysis of each facilities water risk requirements; water risk relating to water quantity or availability can be heightened at facilities that are using greater volumes of water. We use the risk classification outlined in the WRI aqueduct tool - if a site is considered high risk or greater in any of the 13 risk indicators they are considered high risk under our methodology - and highest risk sites are identified where their internal water use further increases risk. In addition we also verify with operational leadership that all of our sites meet minimum WASH expectations to eliminate contextual risks relating to sanitation. Where specific water issues have been identified at a facility level, the facility works with the local governance, regulators and communities to manage those issues. At a group level our water risk management process focuses on the effect of water risk on our direct facilities, and the effect this would have on our customers, employees and investors. Where specific water issues have been identified at a facility level, the facility works with the local governance, regulators and communities to manage those issues. As a result of our risk-management process, facility managers and divisional leaders for high risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at site level on how best to manage this potential risk. These plans are focused around implementing best-practice improvements for water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics, and those that have an above-average water intensity are classified as highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate in detail the current water requirements of the facility and identify projects to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities, to further prioritize efficiency improvement efforts and mitigate water-related risk on the facility and the surrounding community.
[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

We recently completed a Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) for the first time to comprehensively identify, assess, and manage our environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. The DMA approach allows us to view sustainability from two critical perspectives: financial materiality and impact materiality. From the financial perspective, we are able to assess how environmental factors, such as climate change, water availability, plastics, and biodiversity loss, directly influence our operations and financial performance. Simultaneously, from an impact materiality standpoint, we analyze how our operations affect the environment, understanding our impact from factors such as emissions, water usage, and plastic waste generation. By recognizing both how the environment influences us and how we influence it, we are able to better identify and assess our material impacts and dependencies, and furthermore those areas where our business might face risks or uncover opportunities for innovation and improvement. Through the DMA, the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are assessed by examining how these factors influence one another and how they collectively affect both our financial performance and its environmental footprint. The DMA recognizes that environmental dependencies can drive business risks and opportunities, which in turn are directly linked to the company's environmental impacts.
[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

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

All facilities are considered within our full assessment, and we use the WRI Aqueduct tool to encompass the full current water-related risks based on each sites geography, and future water risk for 2030 and 2040 under a "business as usual" pathway scenario. WRI Aqueduct tool's 13 risk indicators are all used to shape our analysis of the water-risk pressures on our facilities, and this is combined with an analysis of each facilities water risk requirements; water risk relating to water quantity or availability can be heightened at facilities that are using greater volumes of water. We use the risk classification outlined in the WRI aqueduct tool - if a site is considered high risk or greater in any of the 13 risk indicators they are considered high risk under our methodology - and highest risk sites are identified where their internal water use further increases risk.

(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:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Berry Global defines substantive financial and strategic impact through a scale of impact that ranges from insignificant to catastrophic as set out below. Substantive financial and strategic impact are those that are considered significant and above. Insignificant: Consequences can be readily absorbed under normal operating conditions • 10% on pre-tax earnings • Imminent cash-flow problems • Loss of key alliances • Sustained serious loss in market share

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:
☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply
☑ Frequency of effect occurring
☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs
☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Berry Global defines substantive financial and strategic impact through a scale of impact that ranges from insignificant to catastrophic as set out below. Substantive financial and strategic impact are those that are considered significant and above. Insignificant: Consequences can be readily absorbed under normal operating conditions • 10% on pre-tax earnings • Imminent cash-flow problems • Loss of key alliances • Sustained serious loss in market share
[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?

	Identification and classification of potential water pollutants	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ No, we do not identify and classify our potential water pollutants	*We do not have systems in place at group level to identify, classify and report on our potential water pollutants*

[Fixed 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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, only within our direct operations

(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

While the production of resin is more water intensive than converting plastic resin, we have multiple key suppliers all over the world, which reduces our risk at any given location. Further, resin suppliers are typically located next to large bodies of water to ensure availability. which reduces the potential impact of baseline water stress and drought.

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

[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:

☑ Risk1

(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

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Italy

☑ Canada

☑ France

☑ Mexico

☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Sweden
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Slovakia
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Romania
☑ Tunisia
☑ Colombia
☑ South Africa
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In order to meet globally defined GHG Emissions targets, as defined by the Paris Agreement, radical changes in emissions regulation is expected, with current pricing regulation on carbon considered unsustainable and expected to rise. Based on scenario analysis, under a NZE Scenario, a worst-case scenario of 120/Ton CO2e Carbon tax could be implemented by 2030. Berry Global operates over 240 manufacturing sites globally across a number of different countries, using 4.6 million MWh of energy annually and has an annual Scope 1 & 2 CO2e footprint of 1.73 million MT. Current Carbon pricing regulation across our business is averaged at 13.2/MT. Due to our large emissions footprint, a rise from an average of 13.2/MT to 120/MT by 2030, means we would be subject to significant risk of increased costs in our direct operations relating to these emissions, and the energy that we purchase, if we became in-scope of this pricing. This increase in price is expected to be far higher than the typical price of inflation, and therefore for the purpose of this analysis, it is considered to have a substantive financial impact on every facility that currently uses non renewable-energy, and a medium magnitude on our business as a whole.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] 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:

☑ High

(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

Berry Global has committed to net-zero by 2050, with an SBti approved, short-term target of a 25% reduction in Scope 12 emissions by 2025 from a 2019 baseline. In-line to achiveing net-zero, we would be working towards a 50% reduction by 2030 from a 2019 baseline. Although we expect to be on-track to hit these goals as part of our net zero strategy, under a worst-case scenario we can assume no further reduction in GHG Emissions from our 2022 total of 1.73 million MT CO2e.

(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)

184800000

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

184800000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

To calculate the potential Impact figure under this worst-case scenario we have calculated the difference between current carbon taxes in regions that we operate, and the anticipation of an average Carbon Tax of 120 USD/MT CO2e in 2030 under NZE Scenario. We have sites in many different regions; some sites lie in areas that have already implemented a carbon pricing structure, while others operate in jurisdictions that do not currently have carbon pricing. The average current Carbon

*Price across regions we operate in is 13.2/MT. This results in an increased medium-term risk in 2030 of 195 million USD annually. 1.73 million MT CO2e * 13.2/MT 22.8 million current 1.73 million MT CO2e * 120/MT 207.6 million in 2030. Difference 184.8 million USD.*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Other infrastructure, technology and spending, please specify **:**Increased Procurement of Renewable Energy

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

15440000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*Based on our 2023 Fiscal year Scope 1 emissions of 144,025 MT CO2e, and a current cost to offset these emissions of 30 USD/MT CO2e, we estimate the annual cost of offsetting these emissions to be 5.04 million USD. 144,025*304.32 million USD Based on our 2023 Fiscal Scope 2 electricity usage of 4,621,397 MWh, and an average REC price of 2.3USD per MWh in NA, 0.95 USD per MWh in China and 3 USD per MWh in ROW, we estimate the annual cost of purchasing 100% renewable electricity to be 11.12 million USD. (2,521,942*2.3)(1,573,621*3)(220,541*0.95)11.12 million USD. This gives the total response as 15.44 million USD 4.32 m11.12 m 15.44 million USD*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Under a worse-case scenario, assuming no further reduction in GHG Emissions from energy efficiency projects or production optimization, we would need to realize the long-term risk opportunity of mitigating carbon taxes in 2030 through the offset of our direct use of energy onsite; our Scope 1 emissions, and through the purchase renewable energy certificates to eliminate Scope 2 emissions.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(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

☑ China

☑ Canada

☑ Belgium

☑ Germany

☑ Thailand

☑ Netherlands

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Multiple River Basins, including San Gabriel, Leie, Schledt, Black, Santa Ana, Yangtze, Lake Tail Hu, Raritan, Meuse, Rhine, Saluda, Duck, Rocky, South Yadkin, Aqua Fria, Lingshan Wan, Manatee, Chao Phraya Delta, and St Lawrence

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

As outlined in our water risk strategy, we annually use the WRI aqueduct tool to analyse and identify sites that are considered "high or extremely high risk" in overall water risk, or "extremely high risk" in a number of other categories, and cross reference those sites against those that are above average in either total annual water withdrawals, or water intensity. Using this metric we have identified sites where water usage is material to their operations in regions where water stress is more prevalent. At these facilities there is a greater risk that changes in water availability, whether physically or mandated, would have a substantive effect on their ability to operate at full capacity.

(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:

☑ About as likely as not

(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

In the event of reduced water availability due to water stress, the potential financial impact has been estimated based on closure of up to 50% to 100% of the facilities production processes.Total loss of water availability could impact the full reporting profit for each site.

(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)

500000

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

5000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Depending on the size of the site affected, and the scale of the water availability issue, the expected range would be from around 500,000, if a smaller site was partially affected, to 5,000,000 if a large facility was completely affected.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Other policies or plans, please specify **:**Water management plans and energy efficiency projects

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Water management plans can be developed within the bandwidth of existing resources and employees. As a result of a water management plan being developed, additional costs may be required to reduce a sites' dependency on water.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Sites must develop individual water risk strategies through consultation with the water risk team. Ultimately, water risk is one of many factors that could affect where we produce our goods. As an example, where a substantive risk has been identified at a site it may make sense to move production from this to another site with low water risk. That would have to be balanced vs. other factors such as available technologies to significantly reduce water consumption.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(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:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Italy

☑ Spain

☑ Brazil

☑ Sweden

☑ Belgium

☑ Czechia

☑ Denmark

☑ Estonia

☑ Slovakia

☑ Thailand

☑ Argentina

☑ Netherlands

☑ Philippines

☑ Canada

☑ France

☑ Mexico

☑ Norway

☑ Poland

☑ Finland

☑ Germany

☑ Romania

☑ Tunisia

☑ Colombia

☑ South Africa

☑ Russian Federation

☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina

☑ United States of America

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In order to meet globally defined GHG Emissions targets, as defined by the Paris Agreement, radical changes in emissions regulation is expected, with current pricing regulation on carbon considered unsustainable and expected to rise. Based on scenario analysis, under a NZE Scenario, a worst-case scenario of 120/Ton CO2e Carbon tax could be implemented by 2030. Berry calculates the emissions footprint of its value chain annually, with 5,641,992 MT CO2e attributed to our purchase of *goods and services in 2023. Due to this large emissions requirements to produce the products we purchase, an average carbon tax of 120/MT by 2030, means there is significant risk of increased costs to our indirect operations relating to the increased costs to our suppliers to produce these products, which ultimately could be passed down the supply chain as a risk for Berry Global related to increased raw material costs. Berry Global facilities with raw material suppliers exposed to increased/new carbon prices are expected to have raw material cost increases above typical inflation, which for the purposes of this analysis, is considered a substantive financial impact for facilities, and a high magnitude on our business as a whole.*

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] 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:

☑ High

(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

Berry's primary raw material is resin and represents one of our highest costs. If our resin suppliers experience cost increases to produce that resin due to increase carbon pricing, they would attempt to pass those increases on to us. Berry Global has committed to net-zero by 2050, with an SBti approved, short-term target of a 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2025 from a 2019 baseline. In-line to achieving net-zero, we would be working towards a 50% reduction by 2030 from a 2019 baseline. Although we expect to be on-track to hit these goals as part of our net zero strategy, under a worst-case scenario we can assume no further reduction in GHG Emissions relating to purchased resin from our 2023 total of 4.28 million MT CO2e.

(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)

514000000

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

514000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*To calculate the potential Impact figure under this worst-case scenario we have calculated the potential cost if all carbon tax increases are passed on to us, with an anticipation of an average Carbon Tax of 120 USD/MT CO2e in 2030 under NZE Scenario. This results in an increased long-term risk in 2030 of 514 million USD annually, based on the assumptions listed above. 4.28 million MT CO2e *120 USD/ MT 514 million USD*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with customers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

There is 0 USD additional cost to managing these risks using the methods outlined in the description of response, as all work is completed within the bandwidth of existing resources and employees.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Historically, we have been able to successfully manage the impact of higher raw material costs by increasing our selling prices. Sales contracts have cost pass-through clauses wherever possible. Furthermore, we continually strive to lightweight our products, which reduces our exposure to raw material risks, and leads to *additional cost savings. Additionally, we meet with our critical resin suppliers on a quarterly basis to drive them to reduce their emissions, through energy efficiency and the procurement of renewable energy to replace conventional energy sources. This would therefore reduce the impact of carbon pricing on their business, and associated cost impacts passed on to us. Over the last 10 years we have seen emissions factors associated with resin production falling substantially; US produced PP has fallen 18% over a 10 year period for example. If this trend continues, it will mitigate a large portion of the Potential Impact Figure.*

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

(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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Sweden
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Romania

☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Slovakia
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ Tunisia
☑ Colombia
☑ South Africa
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

As the world shifts to a low-carbon economy and consumers become more aware and educated about climate change, it has the potential to negatively impact consumers' view of fossil fuels and cause them to move away from the purchase of products that utilize fossil fuels in their manufacture. The primary raw material of Berry is polymer resin derived from fossil fuels, therefore posing a risk to the products that Berry manufactures as Berry's customers may change their purchasing behavior as a result of changes in perception of packaging. The CPI & CPNA divisions of Berry manufacture fast moving consumer goods packaging where numerous other substrates are available from competitors that could be perceived as more environmentally conscious materials, despite the fact that plastic packaging often has a lower carbon footprint than alternative materials. In FY 2023, products in CPI & CPNA derived from fossil fuels represented approximately 55% of Berry sales, so if even a small percentage of revenue was lost due to a chance in consumer perception, the risk to the company is therefore significant, with high magnitude.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:
☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

(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:
☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(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

As identified by studies such as by the UK and European Plastics Pacts, consumer perception of packaging's sustainability will be a key driver in he long-term, over the next 10 years. While Berry has strategies in place to continually progress the sustainablilty credentials of our product portfolio, in some cases other material substrates may still be considered by consumers as more sustainable, and therefore there is potential to have a decrease in revenue. The CPI & CPNA divisions of Berry manufacture fast moving consumer goods packaging where numerous other substrates are available from competitors that could be perceived as more environmentally conscious materials, despite the fact that plastic packaging often has a lower carbon footprint than alternative materials. We have therefore estimated the risk of a potential loss of 1% of total sales of CPNA and CPI division in the long-term.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

71500000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

71500000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

A 1% loss in company sales from these divisions due to decreased demand for Berry products the inherent financial risk should we fail to notice or fail to take action, would be in the order of magnitude of 71.5 million USD, as their total combined revenue is 7.15 billion USD. If loss of sales was higher than 1% due to decreased demand, then the financial impact would be higher and more significant.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with customers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

There is 0 USD additional cost to managing these risks. All the methods outlined in the description of response are done within the bandwidth of existing resources or included in activities that would be done anyway, such as marketing the benefits of our products and participating in trade associations that represent us on a broad range of issues.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As part of our double materiality assessment, we assess key customers on their long-term vision for their products and then engage with them to realize that vision. We would therefore not be blindsided by a large-scale shift. We also regularly monitor market trends, based on both external research, internal consumer research, and ultimately sales data - we would be one of the first to know if the market was shifting away from plastics. Additionally, we work with customers to educate them on the benefits of plastics and our products. We also work in our communities as well as with trade associations to educate end-consumers on the benefits of plastics.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Other acute physical risk, please specify **:**Other, please specify (Sum of all potential acute physical risks, which, in the locations we operate, are namely; flooding, drought, and storm/hurricane impacts.)

(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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Sweden
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Slovakia
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Romania
☑ Tunisia
☑ Colombia
☑ South Africa
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Berry Global operates in some geographic regions that are at acute physical climate risk from extreme weather events such as flooding e.g. mainland European manufacturing facilities, drought e.g. African manufacturing facilities, or storm/hurricane impacts e.g. South East USA. Specific examples to our business would be impacts from Hurricane Laura in 2020, which led to property damage and business interruption, as well as interruption due to resin delivery shortage. Another example is Storm Uri in 2021 which also lead to CBI, business interruption and property damage. In many cases where this risk is apparent, whether it be on our direct manufacturing facilities, our suppliers, or the transportation of our products, some continuity of supply can be maintained by transferring business to alternative Berry sites, reducing the risk.

(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

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(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

Any loss of business due to extreme weather events would adversely affect profit, depending on the size of the event and the number of sites that are affected. Excluding deductibles, the impact of Hurricane Laura in 2020 lead to an total insurance claims over over 10 million USD for business interruption & property damage, CBI, and incremental costs - relating to a resin shortage. The impact of Winter Storm Uri in 2021 on our business sat in the region of between 10 million USD and 20 million USD.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

2000000

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

20000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on the data above, we can estimate that the potential upper limit impact on our business as a result of each extreme weather event lies around 20 million USD, as the two examples above represent the largest Impact an extreme weather event has had on our business over the last 10 years. There have been a number of smaller-impact extreme weather events over the last 10 years where costs have been in the region of 2-5million USD, so 2million USD will be used as a lower limit. We anticipate on average, one extreme weather event per annum, based on historical data, so for this excerise, we submit a Pontential Impact range of 2-20 million USD p.a.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Increase insurance coverage

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The primary method to manage this risk is through insurance. Potential insurance deductibles for each extreme weather invent lie in the region of 1 million USD for business interruption, property insurance and other incremental costs. This is the minimum cost to any response to mitigate the impact of an extreme event that has a substantial affect on our business. Additionally we pay annual premiums for this insurance which are not included in our Cost of Response figure.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The primary method to manage this risk is through insurance. Potential insurance deductibles for each extreme weather invent lie in the region of 1 million USD for business interruption, property insurance and other incremental costs. This is the minimum cost to any response to mitigate the impact of an extreme event that has a substantial affect on our business. Additionally we pay annual premiums for this insurance which are not included in our Cost of Response figure.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(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

☑ Belgium

☑ Germany

☑ Poland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The effects of climate change and greenhouse gases production are leading to the potential introduction of new regulatory changes addressing the causes of climate change, including mandates on plastic packaging and the circular economy. Future recyclability mandates may allow only plastic products that are designed for recycling. Designing for recyclability is now an essential part of any new pack development, particularly as we are seeing legislation moving toward the requirement to have recyclability at scale. For example, the current proposal of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive from the European Commission that is now under review proposes a requirement to allow only packaging that is designed for recyclability by 2030. As a result of these developments, food companies are now looking for alternative materials that can offer the same benefits as PVC film but demonstrate an improved environmental profile. If we are unable to adapt and design reformulated products that are considered recyclable, then there is significant risk of losing that business. The loss of our PVC film business in Europe would have a low magnitude impact overall.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

(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:

☑ Very likely

(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

The current proposal of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive from the European Commission that is now under review proposes a requirement to allow only packaging that is designed for recyclability by 2030. As a result of these developments, food companies are now looking for alternative materials that can offer the same benefits as PVC film but demonstrate an improved environmental profile. If we are unable to adapt and design reformulated products that are considered recyclable, then there is significant risk of losing that business. Our PVC film business in Europe, which is considered unrecyclable under potential incoming mandates, is between 3 – 4 million dollars per annum. The business accounts for over 50% of one sites' total business, and could mean site closure if the business was lost.

(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)

3000000

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

4000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our PVC film business in Europe, which is considered unrecyclable under potential incoming mandates, is between 3 – 4 million dollars per annum. The business accounts for over 50% of one sites' total business, and could mean site closure if the business was lost.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Take action to switch to plastic which is recyclable in practice and at scale

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

3500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The primary method to manage this risk is through development of a new, recyclable, alternative solution. This requires research and development spend and the purchase of new lines for production. For development of a replacement for this business, we estimate this will require one-off costs of 500,000 in R&D and around 3,000,000 in new equipment. Once in place, additional extra costs will be negligible.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The primary method to manage this risk is through development of a new, recyclable, alternative solution. This requires research and development spend and the purchase of new lines for production. For development of a replacement for this business, we estimate this will require one-off costs of 500,000 in R&D and around 3,000,000 in new equipment. Once in place, additional extra costs will be negligible.

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:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Philippines

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Laguna de Bay

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In addition to the identified water stress identified by WRI aqueduct tool, the tool can also be used to assess extremely high water quantity risk; risk of flooding on site, causing disruption to production and possible costs for prevention and repairs. In the event on a full flood this could cause site closure for an extended period, up to a full reporting period.

(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:

☑ About as likely as not

(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

The potential financial impact of flooding has been estimated based on the complete closure of the site due to the flooding, losing a full years reporting profit. The impact could total the full reporting profit for the site.

(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)

1000000

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

5000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The potential financial impact of flooding has been estimated based on the complete closure of the site due to the flooding, losing a full years reporting profit. The impact could total the full reporting profit for the site.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Develop flood emergency plans

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

100000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

It is hard to provide estimates of the response strategy at costs for each site as it includes variety of elements including flood insurance, which are part of site operational costs defined on local basis. We estimate he response to require around 100,000 of investment.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Emergency and continuity procedures for businesses are held locally. Sites have established protocols and procedures to ensure business continuity in the event of a major incident.
[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)

774300000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

20000000

(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

These figures represent the total vulnerability based just on the risks we have identified and disclosed in question 3.1.1

Water

(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)

10000000

(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

These figures represent the total vulnerability based just on the risks we have identified and disclosed in question 3.1.1
[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

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify :San Gabriel

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

France

☑ Other, please specify **:**Leie

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Belgium

☑ Other, please specify :Schledt

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Black

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Santa Ana

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify **:**Lake Tail Hu

(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

2

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Raritan

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Netherlands

☑ Meuse

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 10

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

☑ Rhine

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify :Saluda

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 12

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Duck

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 13

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Rocky

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 14

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :South Yadkin

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 15

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Aqua Fria

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 16

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify **:**Lingshan Wan

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 17

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify **:**Manatee

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 18

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Thailand

☑ Other, please specify :Chao Phraya Delta

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.

Row 19

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Canada

☑ St. Lawrence

(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

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk.
[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

☑ Fines

(3.3.3) Comment

In 2023 we had one fine for environmental non-compliance totalling 17,500, compared to 0 in 2022. The site at which this incident occurred has since been closed and is no longer under Berry's control.
[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

1

(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines

17500

(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated

1

(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(3.3.1.5) Comment

In 2023 we had one fine for environmental non-compliance totalling 17,500, compared to 0 in 2022. The site at which this incident occurred has since been closed and is no longer under Berry's control.
[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

17500

(3.3.2.3) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify :California, Calaveras Basin

(3.3.2.4) Type of incident

Select from:
☑ Other non-compliance with permits, standards, or regulations

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

Deficient Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) / Deficient Best Management Practice (BMP) implementation. Incident occurred in 2022 reporting year but penalty was issued, and therefore reported, in 2023 reporting year. Plans were revised and finalized in accordance with California requirements, and incident was resolved in March 2023.
[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:
☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

(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
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

(3.6.1.3) 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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Finland
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ South Africa
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Germany
☑ Romania
☑ Tunisia
☑ Colombia
☑ Slovakia
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

For most of Berry Global's customers, Scope 3 GHG emissions represent the largest portion of their total GHG emissions. We anticipate that will drive demand for products with lower emissions intensity. Plastics are already very well positioned since they typically have lower GHG emissions per functional unit than alternatives. Furthermore, Berry has a long history of light-weighting our products - further reducing their carbon intensity. There is also significant work being done on the use of *recycled content, which has lower associated GHG emissions than virgin resin. We currently commercially sell many products with recycled content, and that list is ever-expanding. An example where this opportunity has been realized is for beverage cups produced by Berry in North America. Berry converted a line of paper cups with a PS lid to PP cups, this resulted in a GHG emissions saving of 23% and a resin reduction of 12%. We heavily invest in R&D to ensure that opportunities like the above can be realized.*

(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:

☑ 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

Factoring in the likelihood of this opportunity to be realized, we estimate that new business as a result of our ability to provide low-carbon products could lead to around a 1% increase in revenue. We do not expect all of our customers to change at once. We anticipate the transition may be relatively slow.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

126600000

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

126600000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

A 1% increase in revenue would result in an opportunity in the region of 126,600,000 USD, based on our current revenue of 12.66 billion USD. 12,660,000,000 USD/100126,600,000 USD

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

82000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The total cost of research and development for Berry was 82 million USD in FY2023. We do not disclose further detail about research spend, but within these associated resources we work each year to realizing this opportunity.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Many of our development work over the years has been related to offering lighter weight products - whether lighter than our existing products, or alternative products made from heavier substrates such as paper, metal, and glass. Lightweighting has therefore been in our DNA since prior to sustainability or climate change being in our lexicon. This is because lighter parts typically cost less - a true triple bottom line success! Although our top line sales may decrease with lightweighting, by staying ahead of our competitors, we are able to gain market share, and typically improve margin. In addition, we can also offer recyclable and renewable products.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(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

☑ Germany

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Across multiple river basins within the US.

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Water efficiency improvement opportunities are being realized across our business, with a number of projects completed by the end of fiscal year 2023. This involves the installation of upgraded water towers and the installation of new water cooling systems at facilities across the US, UK, and Germany. These opportunities have a strategic impact on these individual sites as they reduce water usage, have capital savings, and reduce the water risk rating of these facilities. Additionally, best practice learned during these projects can be used across the rest of our business having further substantive impact; and can further reduce the number of "highest risk" facilities. We expect additional opportunities to be realized by the end of 2024.

(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:

☑ 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

Implementation of these projects will firstly, reduce the spend on water, with a potential saving of up to 250,000 cubic meters annually, and also provide further capital savings through the reduction of lost-manufacturing due to lines being suspended due to cleaning, which is required more frequently on older lines. This totaled, has the potential to save up to 1,200,000 dollars per year.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

1200000

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

1200000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Implementation of these projects will reduce the spend on water and energy on-site, saving over 3 million KWhs annually. The total savings across water and energy usage has the potential to save up to 1.2 million USD per year.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

3800000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

This cost reflects the total estimated cost of installation of the required equipment to realize the water, and subsequent energy, savings opportunities. These costs relate to the strategy to install new water towers and upgrade water cooling systems.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

This cost reflects the total estimated cost of installation of the required equipment to realize the water, and subsequent energy, savings opportunities. These costs relate to the strategy to install new water towers and upgrade water cooling systems.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of low-carbon energy sources

(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

- ☑ China
- ☑ India
- ☑ Italy
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Brazil
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Czechia
- ☑ Denmark
- ☑ Estonia
- ☑ Finland
- ☑ Thailand
- ☑ Argentina
- ☑ Netherlands
- ☑ Philippines
- ☑ South Africa
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ France
- ☑ Mexico
- ☑ Poland
- ☑ Sweden
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Romania
- ☑ Tunisia
- ☑ Colombia
- ☑ Slovakia
- ☑ Russian Federation
- ☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
- ☑ United States of America
- ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

To aid our commitment to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, we have the opportunity to enter into Purchase Power Agreements (PPAs) or Virtual Purchase Power Agreements (VPPAs). These would allow us to increase our renewable energy consumption, whether it be via a physical connection, or ownership of RECs, to reach our environmental goals, whilst also having the potential to save capital when electricity rates fluctuate. An example of a VPPA opportunity we have realized in the last two years is a project in Spain where we entered into a VPPA agreement with Axpo in 2021 to purchase 70GWh annually of renewable energy from a new solar park development in Guadalajara. We receive RECs for this energy, and estimate this will provide us with an annual reduction of around 20,000MT CO2e.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- ☑ Returns on investment in low-emission technology

(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

A VPPA exchanges the variable OMIP market price for electricity against a fixed price per MWh based on our purchase annually. Therefore the exact gains that will be realised will depend upon the actual market prices experienced during this period. The VPPA contract opportunity we are currently realizing had an estimated value of around 1 million, which it has far exceeded - while future ventures might not be as profitable. Based on this, we have set a Potential Impact figure of 0-5m USD. As we investigate other vPPA opportunities we anticipate similar expected returns within this range.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

0

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

5000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

A VPPA exchanges the variable OMIP market price for electricity against a fixed price per MWh based on our purchase annually. Therefore the exact gains that will be realised will depend upon the actual market prices experienced during this period. The VPPA contract opportunity we are currently realizing had an estimated value of around 1 million, which it has far exceeded - while future ventures might not be as profitable. Based on this, we have set a Potential Impact figure of 0-5m USD. As we investigate other vPPA opportunities we anticipate similar expected returns within this range.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Based on analysis that is conducted internally, we would not enter contracts where it is expected to generate a financial loss, so the potential cost of this project is 0. vPPA Projects can be completed using 0 USD of additional cost relating to achieving this opportunity, such as employee or third-party function costs, as any accrued costs would have occurred within the bandwidth of already existing resources.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Based on analysis that is conducted internally, we would not enter contracts where it is expected to generate a financial loss, so the potential cost of this project is 0. vPPA Projects can be completed using 0 USD of additional cost relating to achieving this opportunity, such as employee or third-party function costs, as any accrued costs would have occurred within the bandwidth of already existing resources.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of low-carbon energy sources

(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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Finland
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ South Africa
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Germany
☑ Romania
☑ Tunisia
☑ Colombia
☑ Slovakia
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Unknown

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In order to meet globally defined GHG Emissions targets, as defined by the Paris Agreement, radical changes in emissions regulation is expected, with current pricing regulation on carbon considered unsustainable and expected to rise. Based on scenario analysis, under a NZE Scenario, a worst-case scenario of 120/Ton CO2e Carbon tax could be implemented by 2030. Berry Global operates over 280 manufacturing sites globally across a number of different countries, using 5.9 million MWh of energy annually and has an annual Scope 1 & 2 CO2e footprint of 1.85 million MT. Current Carbon pricing regulation across our business is averaged at 13.2/MT.

Due to our large emissions footprint, a rise from an average of 13.2/MT to 120/MT by 2030, means we would have a significant opportunity to reduce costs in our direct operations relating to these emissions, and the energy that we purchase by committing to reducing our energy consumption and lowering our carbon footprint by diversifying energy sources and procuring more low-carbon energy, as well as implementing energy reduction initiatives. For example we have an internal program to reduce 100,000,000KWh of energy use in FY22, and are looking into avenues to increase our share of renewable energy from 3% in 2022. Taking this action gives us the additional opportunity to have reduced exposure to the current carbon taxes that are in place, and any future risk from carbon tax increases.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Reduced exposure to GHG emissions and therefore less sensitivity to changes in cost of carbon

(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:

☑ 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

Berry Global has committed to net-zero by 2050, with an SBTi approved, short-term target of a 25% reduction in Scope 12 emissions by 2025 from a 2019 baseline. In-line to achieving net-zero, we would be working towards a 50% reduction by 2030 from a 2019 baseline. Although we expect to be on-track to hit these goals as part of our net zero strategy, under a worst-case scenario we can assume no further reduction in GHG Emissions from our 2023 total of 1.73 million MT CO2e, but we would still have the opportunity to eliminate our emissions through carbon offsets and renewable energy contracts.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

184800000

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

184800000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*To calculate the potential Impact figure under this worst-case scenario we have calculated the difference between current carbon taxes in regions that we operate, and the anticipation of an average Carbon Tax of 120 USD/MT CO2e in 2030 under NZE Scenario. We have sites in many different regions; some sites lie in areas that have already implemented a carbon pricing structure, while others operate in jurisdictions that do not currently have carbon pricing. The average current Carbon Price across regions we operate in is 13.2/MT. This results in an increased medium-term opportunity in 2030 of 194.8 million USD annually, based on the assumptions listed above. 1.73 million MT CO2e * 13.2/MT 22.8 million current 1.73 million MT CO2e * 120/MT 207.6 million in 2030. Difference 184.8 million USD.*

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

15440000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*Based on our 2023 Fiscal year Scope 1 emissions of 144,025 MT CO2e, and a current cost to offset these emissions of 30 USD/MT CO2e, we estimate the annual cost of offsetting these emissions to be 5.04 million USD. 144,025*304.32 million USD Based on our 2023 Fiscal Scope 2 electricity usage of 4,621,397 MWh, and an average REC price of 2.3USD per MWh in NA, 0.95 USD per MWh in China and 3 USD per MWh in ROW, we estimate the annual cost of purchasing 100% renewable electricity to be 11.12 million USD. (2,521,942*2.3)(1,573,621*3)(220,541*0.95)11.12 million USD. This gives the total response as 15.44 million USD 4.32 m11.12 m 15.44 million USD We understand that in addition to the previously mentioned assumptions, this also assumes no change to current REC or carbon offset pricing. We understand the risk response is required to be reevaluated annually due to the volatile nature of REC and Carbon Offset pricing. There is 0 USD of other additional cost relating to this response, such as employee function costs, as it would be completed within the bandwidth of existing resources.*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Under a worse-case scenario, assuming no further reduction in GHG Emissions from energy efficiency projects or production optimization, we would need to realize the long-term risk opportunity of mitigating carbon taxes in 2030 through the offset of our direct use of energy onsite; our Scope 1 emissions, and through the purchase renewable energy certificates to eliminate Scope 2 emissions.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(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

☑ Belgium

☑ Germany

☑ Poland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The effects of climate change and greenhouse gases production are leading to the potential introduction of new regulatory changes addressing the causes of climate change, including mandates on plastic packaging and the circular economy. Future recyclability mandates may allow only plastic products that are designed for recycling. Designing for recyclability is now an essential part of any new pack development, particularly as we are seeing legislation moving toward the requirement to have recyclability at scale. For example, the current proposal of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive from the European Commission that is now under *review proposes a requirement to allow only packaging that is designed for recyclability by 2030. As a result of these developments, food companies are now looking for alternative materials that can offer the same benefits as PVC film but demonstrate an improved environmental profile. We have the opportunity to develop new products that align with these mandates to replace current business and potentially capture new businesses if peers are unable to adapt.*

(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:

☑ 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 current proposal of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive from the European Commission that is now under review proposes a requirement to allow only packaging that is designed for recyclability by 2030. As a result of these developments, food companies are now looking for alternative materials that can offer the same benefits as PVC film but demonstrate an improved environmental profile. We have the opportunity to adapt and design reformulated products in order to retain this business, and grow the business if peers are unable to adapt.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

3000000

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

4000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Our current PVC film business in Europe, which is considered unrecyclable under potential incoming mandates, is between 3 – 4 million dollars per annum, so as a worst-case scenario we have the opportunity to retain this value.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

3500000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

For development of a replacement for this business, we estimate this will require one-off costs of 500,000 in R&D and around 3,000,000 in new equipment. Once in place, additional extra costs will be negligible.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The primary method to achieve this opportunity is through development of a new, recyclable, alternative solution. This requires research and development spend and the purchase of new lines for production.
[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:

☑ Revenue

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

320400000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

These figures represent the total financial substantive effects opportunities based just on the opportunities we have identified and disclosed in question 3.6.1

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

1200000

(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

These figures represent the total financial substantive effects opportunities based just on the opportunities we have identified and disclosed in question 3.6.1
[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:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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

All director nominations are made on merit, in the context of the skills and competency matrix which the Nominating & Governance Committee shall determine from time to time ("Skills Matrix"), reflecting its assessment of the Board's current and long-term needs, among others. In support of this goal, the Nominating & Governance Committee will, when identifying candidates to recommend for election to the Board: (i) consider individuals who are highly qualified, based on their talents, experience, and personal skills, character and qualities, having regard to the Company's Skills Matrix; (ii) consider criteria that promotes diversity, including with regard to gender, ethnicity, age, national origin and other attributes; (iii) consider the level of diversity on the Board, including women and underrepresented groups, when making recommendations for nominees to the Board and with regard to succession planning for the Board; and (iv) as and when required, engage qualified independent external advisors to assist the Board in conducting its search for candidates that meet the Board's criteria regarding skills and diversity.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

Amended and Restated Corporate Governance Guidelines.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
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
☑ 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 :Nominating & Governance Committee Charter

(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

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Effective board oversight of ESG matters, including climate water and biodiversity, is crucial for ensuring that sustainability and responsible business practices are integrated into our strategic decision-making processes. The Board of Directors and its committees align with our strategic priorities and oversee the execution of our Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategies as an integrated part of our overall strategy and risk management. Berry Global's Board of Directors holds the highest level of direct responsibility for decisions relating to the company's strategy for addressing environmental issues. The board has oversight responsibility for risk management, including climate-related risk, ensuring we operate to the highest standards in all aspects of climate governance, and reviews the company's long-term sustainability strategic plans and the principal issues that the company will face during at least one Board meeting each year. Although all Board committees contribute to elements of ESG, the Nominating and Governance Committee is ultimately responsible for ESG oversight. It receives feedback on ESG topics through multiple channels. First, our VP of Sustainability provides regular updates based on feedback from customers, suppliers, team members, and NGOs around the globe. Second, this person also leads our internal ESG team, which shares industry trends and discusses stakeholder views. Finally, our double *materiality assessment collects information from external and internal stakeholders regarding ESG topics. The full Board is briefed on the materiality assessment process and results, but the Nominating and Governance Committee is responsible for providing strategic direction based on the results, industry trends, and feedback from stakeholders. The Compensation and Talent Development Committee oversees the company's social sustainability matters, including aspects of diversity, equity, and inclusion strategy, initiatives, and disclosures. The committee reviews the company's corporate policies, programs, and significant publications relating to social sustainability management at least annually, in coordination with the other standing Board committees and, as appropriate, make recommendations on social matters to the full Board. The committee also reviews significant social findings of internal and external sustainability assessments and audits, including those of company stakeholders and other third parties, to ensure that principal risks related to social sustainability are identified, monitored, and controlled and that sufficient resources are allocated to address such risks. In addition, the Audit Committee assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities by reviewing and discussing with management the company's major risk exposures and the results of an annual corporate-wide risk assessment, the related corporate guidelines, and policies for risk assessment and risk management.*

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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 :Nominating & Governance Committee Charter

(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 the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Effective board oversight of ESG matters, including climate water and biodiversity, is crucial for ensuring that sustainability and responsible business practices are integrated into our strategic decision-making processes. The Board of Directors and its committees align with our strategic priorities and oversee the execution of our Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategies as an integrated part of our overall strategy and risk management. Berry Global’s Board of Directors holds the highest level of direct responsibility for decisions relating to the company’s strategy for addressing environmental issues. The board has oversight responsibility for risk management, including climate-related risk, ensuring we operate to the highest standards in all aspects of climate governance, and reviews the company's long-term sustainability strategic plans and the principal issues that the company will face during at least one Board meeting each year. Although all Board committees contribute to elements of ESG, the Nominating and Governance Committee is ultimately responsible for ESG oversight. It receives feedback on ESG topics through multiple channels. First, our VP of Sustainability provides regular updates based on feedback from customers, suppliers, team members, and NGOs around the globe. Second, this person also leads our internal ESG team, which shares industry trends and discusses stakeholder views. Finally, our double materiality assessment collects information from external and internal stakeholders regarding ESG topics. The full Board is briefed on the materiality assessment process and results, but the Nominating and Governance Committee is responsible for providing strategic direction based on the results, industry trends, and feedback from stakeholders. The Compensation and Talent Development Committee oversees the company's social sustainability matters, including aspects of diversity, equity, and inclusion strategy, initiatives, and disclosures. The committee reviews the company's corporate policies, programs, and significant publications relating to social sustainability management at least annually, in coordination with the other standing Board committees and, as appropriate, make recommendations on social matters to the full Board. The committee also reviews significant social findings of internal and external sustainability assessments and audits, including those of company stakeholders and other third parties, to ensure that principal risks related to social sustainability are identified, monitored, and controlled and that sufficient resources are allocated to address such risks. In addition, the Audit Committee assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities by reviewing and discussing with management the company’s major risk exposures and the results of an annual corporate-wide risk assessment, the related corporate guidelines, and policies for risk assessment and risk management.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply
☑ 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 :Nominating & Governance Committee Charter

(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 the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Effective board oversight of ESG matters, including climate water and biodiversity, is crucial for ensuring that sustainability and responsible business practices are integrated into our strategic decision-making processes. The Board of Directors and its committees align with our strategic priorities and oversee the execution of our Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategies as an integrated part of our overall strategy and risk management. Berry Global's Board of Directors holds the highest level of direct responsibility for decisions relating to the company's strategy for addressing environmental issues. The board has oversight responsibility for risk management, including climate-related risk, ensuring we operate to the highest standards in all aspects of climate governance, and reviews the company's long-term sustainability strategic plans and the principal issues that the company will face during at least one Board meeting each year. Although all Board committees contribute to elements of ESG, the Nominating and Governance Committee is ultimately responsible for ESG oversight. It receives feedback on ESG topics through multiple channels. First, our VP of Sustainability provides regular updates based on feedback from customers, suppliers, team members, and NGOs around the globe. Second, this person also leads our internal ESG team, which shares industry trends and discusses stakeholder views. Finally, our double materiality assessment collects information from external and internal stakeholders regarding ESG topics. The full Board is briefed on the materiality assessment process and results, but the Nominating and Governance Committee is responsible for providing strategic direction based on the results, industry trends, and feedback from stakeholders. The Compensation and Talent Development Committee oversees the company's social sustainability matters, including aspects of diversity, equity, and inclusion strategy, initiatives, and disclosures. The committee reviews the company's corporate policies, programs, and significant publications relating to social sustainability management at least annually, in coordination with the other standing Board committees and, as appropriate, make recommendations

on social matters to the full Board. The committee also reviews significant social findings of internal and external sustainability assessments and audits, including those of company stakeholders and other third parties, to ensure that principal risks related to social sustainability are identified, monitored, and controlled and that sufficient resources are allocated to address such risks. In addition, the Audit Committee assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities by reviewing and discussing with management the company's major risk exposures and the results of an annual corporate-wide risk assessment, the related corporate guidelines, and policies for risk assessment and risk management.
[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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

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

(4.2.4) Primary reason for no board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(4.2.5) Explain why your organization does not have a board with competence on this environmental issue

As The Berry Global board has had increased oversight of ESG climate related issues, we have felt the need for increased competence on the board in regards to climate and ESG as a whole, though this requirement has only gained importance over the last few years. Water-related issues are less material to our business, and only a small part of our overall ESG strategy, so competence in this area is not prioritized.
[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
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

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(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

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO holds overall responsibility for corporate strategy governance, performance, internal controls, and risk management, alongside the Berry Global Board, and monitors climate-related issues raised by the Chief Legal Officer as part of the company's annual Enterprise Risk Assessment (ERA) process. The CEO also has oversight of the Berry Global corporate goals, which include greenhouse gas emissions reduction and other climate-related metrics such as the GHG emissions target set out in the Berry Global Impact 2025 sustainability strategy. The Chief Strategy Officer reports directly to the CEO and is responsible for setting and implementing *the overall strategy for Berry Global as informed by the results of the ERA. The CEO also receives regular updates from The VP of Sustainability, whose role oversees climate-related efforts, such as setting GHG targets, reporting, and compliance, and completes an annual carbon and physical climate risk assessment in addition to the ERA. Results of this assessment are reported through the Chief Strategy Officer to the CEO. The EVP of Operations oversees all of Berry Global's worldwide operations and reports directly to the CEO. They monitor climate-related issues, such as the company's GHG emissions reduction strategy and support the development and drive the execution of operational and climate goals.*

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(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

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:
☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO holds overall responsibility for corporate strategy governance, performance, internal controls, and risk management, alongside the Berry Global Board, and monitors water-related issues raised by the Chief Legal Officer as part of the company's annual Enterprise Risk Assessment (ERA) process. The CEO also has oversight of the Berry Global corporate goals, which include water withdrawal intensity reduction. The Chief Strategy Officer reports directly to the CEO and is responsible for setting and implementing the overall strategy for Berry Global as informed by the results of the ERA. The CEO also receives regular updates from The VP of Sustainability, whose role oversees water-related efforts, such as setting water targets, reporting, and compliance, and completes an annual water risk assessment in addition to the ERA. Results of this assessment are reported through the Chief Strategy Officer to the CEO. The EVP of Operations oversees all of Berry Global's worldwide operations and reports directly to the CEO. They monitor climate-related issues, such as the company's water reduction strategy and support the development and drive the execution of operational and water-related goals.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(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

Policies, commitments, and targets
☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Implementing a climate transition plan
☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:
☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:
☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO holds overall responsibility for corporate strategy governance, performance, internal controls, and risk management, alongside the Berry Global Board, and monitors climate-related issues raised by the Chief Legal Officer as part of the company's annual Enterprise Risk Assessment (ERA) process. The CEO also has oversight of the Berry Global corporate ESG goals set out in the Berry Global Impact 2025 sustainability strategy.
[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

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

The short-term annual performance-based cash incentive is comprised of three components, one of which is a Greenhouse Gas emissions reduction target that comprises 10% of the incentive. No incentives are tied to water-related issues.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

The short-term annual performance-based cash incentive is comprised of three components, one of which is a Greenhouse Gas emissions reduction target that comprises 10% of the incentive. No incentives are tied to water-related issues.
[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

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

(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

10% of the CEOs total short-term incentive (STI) award for executives was tied to Berry achieving its annual greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. This reduction target is set at 4.2% annually, aligned with our short term SBTi target of a 25% reduction by 2025 from a 2019 baseline - developed in-line with preventing 1.5C warming under the IEA NZE Scenario, and in-line with our transition plan to reach net-zero emissions by 2050.

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

Linking the CEO, CFO, and C-Suite officers' compensation to an annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target that is aligned with our short term SBTi target of a 25% reduction by 2025 and in-line with our transition plan to reach net-zero emissions by 2050, creates a direct financial incentive for prioritization of these environmental goals. By tying executive bonuses to GHG emissions reduction, we ensure climate is embedded into our core business strategy and decision-making processes, fostering continual improvement and progress toward our environmental commitments and net-zero targets.

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

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

(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

10% of the CFOs total short-term incentive (STI) award for executives was tied to Berry achieving its annual greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. This reduction target is set at 4.2% annually, aligned with our short term SBTi target of a 25% reduction by 2025 from a 2019 baseline - developed in-line with preventing 1.5C warming under the IEA NZE Scenario, and in-line with our transition plan to reach net-zero emissions by 2050.

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

Linking the CEO, CFO, and C-Suite officers' compensation to an annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target that is aligned with our short term SBTi target of a 25% reduction by 2025 and in-line with our transition plan to reach net-zero emissions by 2050, creates a direct financial incentive for prioritization of these environmental goals. By tying executive bonuses to GHG emissions reduction, we ensure climate is embedded into our core business strategy and decision-making processes, fostering continual improvement and progress toward our environmental commitments and net-zero targets.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

(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

10% of the Corporate Executive teams total short-term incentive (STI) award for executives was tied to Berry achieving its annual greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. This reduction target is set at 4.2% annually, aligned with our short term SBTi target of a 25% reduction by 2025 from a 2019 baseline - developed in-line with preventing 1.5C warming under the IEA NZE Scenario, and in-line with our transition plan to reach net-zero emissions by 2050.

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

Linking the CEO, CFO, and C-Suite officers' compensation to an annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target that is aligned with our short term SBTi target of a 25% reduction by 2025 and in-line with our transition plan to reach net-zero emissions by 2050, creates a direct financial incentive for prioritization of these environmental goals. By tying executive bonuses to GHG emissions reduction, we ensure climate is embedded into our core business strategy and decision-making processes, fostering continual improvement and progress toward our environmental commitments and net-zero targets.

[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

☑ 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

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our Environmental Management Policy covers the whole of Berry Global's direct operations, under an operational control basis.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

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

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

(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

environmental-management-policy (28).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

☑ Ellen MacArthur Foundation Global Commitment

☑ Plastic Pact Network

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

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

Berry Global is a member of the Ellen MacArthur foundation, signing the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment to eliminate plastic pollution at its source in 2019. By signing the Global Commitment, Berry has pledged to take action to eliminate problematic or unnecessary plastic packaging, and reports annually on their progress as part of the Global Commitment Report. Berry is a member of the Plastics Pact Network, as a signatory of both the UK Plastics Pact and the South Africa Plastics Pact. Berry is a member of the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) having joined in 2021. As part of this membership we have committed to science-based, 1.5C ambition. This commitment is in the form of two SBTi approved targets; to reduce our Scope 1&2 emissions by 25% by 2025 from a 2019 baseline, and to reduce our Scope 3 emissions by 25% over the same time period. As part of our ongoing engagement we are committed to reporting annual company-wide GHG emissions and progress against our targets through our sustainability reports, website, and or this CDP questionnaire. We also complete an annual Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) report to showcase our climate governance, strategy and risk management process alignment with the TCFD.

[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:

☑ No, but we plan to have one in the next two years

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(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

Berry generally does not get involved with policy, especially at regional levels. Our engagements primarily consist of signing onto support letters, and these interactions are specifically targeted toward increasing the availability of recycling or renewable energy and are driven by the sustainability department, which ensures alignment is checked prior to involvement. Since Berry does not generally get involved with policy, any decisions to get involved are also approved by the CEO, who ensures alignment with our global strategies, including on climate change.
[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

North America

☑ American Chemistry Council

(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:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their 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

American Chemistry Council Plastics Division encourages reduced impacts on natural resources, minimized waste generation, and a shift toward renewable energy; all of which reduces greenhouse gas impacts. They also encourage policy decisions to be guided by scientific data that measures the impacts of products over their life cycle. To support climate progress, ACC calls on Congress to enact legislation to: Increase government investment and scientific resources to develop and deploy low emissions technologies in the manufacturing sector; Adopt transparent, predictable, technology- and revenue-neutral, market-based, economy-wide carbon price signals; and encourage adoption of emissions-avoiding solutions and technologies throughout the economy to achieve significant emissions savings. Berry generally does not get involved with policy, especially at regional levels. Our engagements primarily consist of signing onto support letters, and these interactions are specifically targeted toward increasing the availability of recycling or renewable energy and are driven by the sustainability department, which easily ensures alignment. Since Berry does not generally get involved with policy, any decisions to get involved are approved by the CEO, who ensures alignment with our global strategies, including on climate change.

(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 voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change
☑ 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
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Public policy engagement
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Whole Document

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

berry-global-annual-sustainability-report-2023-v4.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

The sustainability report provides a snapshot of our sustainability performance, strategy, and goals for the 2023 fiscal year. Our full sustainability disclosures can be found on our website, by key sustainability issue: https://www.berryglobal.com/en/sustainability/sustainability-strategy/key-issues
[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:

☑ Not defined

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Not defined

[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 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

☑ 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

2019

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IEA NZE scenario sets out a potentially achievable pathway to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. The scenario shows what is needed for the world to achieve net zero energy emissions by 2050. The Net Zero scenario would mean a huge decline in the use of fossil fuels, with the fossil fuels that remain in 2050 being used in goods where the carbon is embodied in the product such as plastics, or in facilities fitted with Carbon Capture Utilization & Storage (CCUS). Although growth will slow in comparison to the previous two decades, under this scenario global demand for primary chemicals will still be 30% higher in 2050 than in 2020 - appropriate plastic solutions will continue to see growth opportunities. The chemicals sector will, however, need to reduce emissions from 1.3 Gt in 2020 to 65 Mt in 2050. Amongst other solutions, this will be achieved through increased recycling (global plastic recycling collection rates would hit 27% by 2030 and 54% by 2050) to aid a transition away from virgin-based plastics to recycled and reused plastic, removing GHG emissions from the chemical production industry. For our business, this would mean a required transition towards increased use of recycled resin. The remaining use of virgin resin would need to be produced through CCUS applications, using hydrogen-based solutions, or with electrolysis.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

When developing our Impact 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we used the 2DS climate-related scenario to model the impact on operations in comparison to a business-as-usual pathway, such as the IEA STEPS (Stated Policies Scenario). Results of the scenario analysis determined the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy. This was set at a 25% intensity reduction in GHG emissions by 2025 from a 2016 baseline, in line with the 2DS pathway. As a direct result of the 2DS and GHG reduction target, further global energy reduction targets were calculated, and capex availability for energy reduction projects and renewable energy sourcing was put in place. In 2022 we expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario) pathway and RCP 2.6 Physical climate scenario, through which we identified our ability to be compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100; we have also set an appropriate science-based GHG emissions reduction target, approved by the SBTi, and committed to net-zero emissions.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(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

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

☑ 2080

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

When developing our Impact 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we used the 2DS climate-related scenario to model the impact on operations in comparison to a business-as-usual pathway, such as the IEA STEPS (Stated Policies Scenario). Over the last year we have expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2025 Scenario) pathway, which is compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100; we have also set an appropriate science-based GHG emissions reduction target, approved by the SBTi. For water specific scenario analysis, we utilized these in conjunction with the WRI aqueduct tool, where we can assess current water risk and future water risk for 2030, 2040 and 2050 under a "business as usual" pathway scenario vs these additional pathways, most notably IEA NZE2050.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Results of the scenario analysis determined the extent of water risk within our direct operations under each scenario. Using the scenarios, alongside WRI aqueduct tool, we can assess current water risk and future water risk for 2030 and 2040 under a "business as usual" pathway scenario vs additional pathways. Under the IEA NZE 2050 pathway, the water risks on our facilities are significantly reduced, as are the financial costs associated with these risks, and with water-related opex. Additionally, the price of the resin we purchase, which requires a large amount of brackish water for cooling, and is often produced in regions of high-water risk, is far lower under these scenarios vs business as usual. Results of the scenario analysis determined the extent of the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy, and analysis for potential climate risks and opportunities - which ties in with water risks. As a direct result of the analysis, global energy and water reduction targets were calculated, and annual capex availability for projects was put in place. We are driving a clear focus on energy, water and GHG emissions reduction across the business to ensure reductions are in line with our strategy and climate modeling.

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

☑ 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

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

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

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation
☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Level of action (from local to global)
☑ Global targets
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science
☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)
☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate
☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The STEPS Scenario lays out future outcomes based on assessment of the specific policies that are currently in place, or have been announced, by governments around the world. As this Scenario is based on current policy decisions, which are ever evolving, the scenario's outlook changes over time. The most recent scenario is the 2021 STEPS. Under the scenario, global average surface temperature would reach 1.5C before 2030, with temperatures continuing to climb, reaching 2.6C in 2100. Warming such as this would lead to heightened frequency and intensity of climate-related disasters and increased climate risk on our business and our industry. Focusing on our industry, under the STEPS scenario, global plastics recycling rate is expected to only reach 20% by 2030. With continued low recycling rates, and therefore lack of alternative recycled feedstock available, it would mean less opportunity to move away from a product portfolio which is heavily virgin based. Increased demand for oil from the Petrochemical sector, amongst others, will additionally lead to increased oil prices as new oil supply lines will be required to meet demand. With crude oil remaining the predominantly available plastic feedstock, this would exert price-pressures on our business. Remaining on a STEPS trajectory would be unilaterally detrimental to our business.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

When developing our Impact 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we used the 2DS climate-related scenario to model the impact on operations in comparison to a business-as-usual pathway, such as the IEA STEPS (Stated Policies Scenario). Results of the scenario analysis determined the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy. This was set at a 25% intensity reduction in GHG emissions by 2025 from a 2016 baseline, in line with the 2DS pathway. As a direct result of the 2DS and GHG reduction target, further global energy reduction targets were calculated, and capex availability for energy reduction projects and renewable energy sourcing was put in place. In 2022 we expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario) pathway and RCP 2.6 Physical climate scenario, through which we identified our ability to be compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100; we have also set an appropriate science-based GHG emissions reduction target, approved by the SBTi, and committed to net-zero emissions.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA 2DS

(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
☑ 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

2013

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IEA ETP 2DS Scenario outlines a potential pathway with at least a 50% chance to limit average global surface warming to 2C by 2100. Compared to the IEA STEPS scenario, this scenario requires a challenging global transformation of how energy is produced and used. While energy usage continues to rise under the 2DS Scenario, emissions from the energy section would be required to fall to one-quarter of 2017 levels by 2060, with fossil fuels only providing 35% of primary energy demand. For the chemical and petrochemical sector to thrive under a 2DS Scenario, annual direct CO_2 emissions increases must remain below 3.6% up to 2025 while demand increases by 47%. Increased pre-and post-consumer recycling will be required to decarbonize the industry sector, by providing process pathways that are more energy-efficient than conventional virgin-based resin pathways. In addition, bio-based routes for downstream plastic products are further avenues for sector decarbonization. Analysis of this Scenario in 2019 helped shape our principal forward-looking sustainability strategy, Impact 2025, and progressed the transition of our business towards a lower carbon future.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

When developing our Impact 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we used the 2DS climate-related scenario to model the impact on operations in comparison to a business-as-usual pathway, such as the IEA STEPS (Stated Policies Scenario). Results of the scenario analysis determined the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy. This was set at a 25% intensity reduction in GHG emissions by 2025 from a 2016 baseline, in line with the 2DS pathway. As a direct result of the 2DS and GHG reduction target, further global energy reduction targets were calculated, and capex availability for energy reduction projects and renewable energy sourcing was put in place. In 2022 we expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario) pathway and RCP 2.6 Physical climate scenario, through which we identified our ability to be compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100; we have also set an appropriate science-based GHG emissions reduction target, approved by the SBTi, and committed to net-zero emissions.

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

☑ Market

☑ 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

2005

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The RCP 2.6 scenario entails a significant decline in the use of fossil fuels, and plastics manufacturers would need to adapt to this transition. In the plastics industry, this would mean moving towards more sustainable practices, such as increasing recycling rates, transitioning away from virgin-based plastics to recycled and reused plastics, and adopting low-carbon production methods. To thrive under the RCP 2.6 scenario, our business would be required to transition towards an increased use of recycled resin, promoting circular economy principles. Additionally, any remaining use of virgin resin would need to be produced through low-carbon methods, such as Carbon Capture Utilization & Storage (CCUS) applications, hydrogen-based solutions, or electrolysis.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

When developing our Impact 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we used the 2DS climate-related scenario to model the impact on operations in comparison to a business-as-usual pathway, such as the IEA STEPS (Stated Policies Scenario). Results of the scenario analysis determined the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy. This was set at a 25% intensity reduction in GHG emissions by 2025 from a 2016 baseline, in line with the 2DS pathway. As a direct result of the 2DS and GHG reduction target, further global energy reduction targets were calculated, and capex availability for energy reduction projects and renewable energy sourcing was put in place. In 2022 we expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario) pathway and RCP 2.6 Physical climate scenario, through which we identified our ability to be compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100; we have also set an appropriate science-based GHG emissions reduction target, approved by the SBTi, and committed to net-zero emissions.
[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

When developing our Impact 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we used the 2DS climate-related scenario to model the impact on operations in comparison to a business-as-usual pathway, such as the IEA STEPS (Stated Policies Scenario). Results of the scenario analysis determined the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy. This was set at a 25% intensity reduction in GHG emissions by 2025 from a 2016 baseline, in line with the 2DS pathway. As a direct result of the 2DS and GHG reduction target, further global energy reduction targets were calculated, and capex availability for energy reduction projects and renewable energy sourcing was put in place. In 2022 we expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario) pathway and RCP 2.6 Physical climate scenario, through which we identified our ability to be compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100; we have also set an appropriate science-based GHG emissions reduction target, approved by the SBTi, and committed to net-zero emissions. In this reporting year, as a result of the Scenario-analysis above, we set a net-zero target by 2050 and updated our internal transition plan to reflect our updated target.

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

☑ 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

When developing our Impact 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we used the 2DS climate-related scenario to model the impact on operations in comparison to a business-as-usual pathway, such as the IEA STEPS (Stated Policies Scenario). Results of the scenario analysis determined the extent of the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy, and potential climate risks and opportunities - which ties in with water risks. As a direct result of the 2DS and GHG reduction target, global energy and water reduction targets were calculated, and annual capex availability for projects was put in place. We are driving a clear focus on energy, water and GHG emissions reduction across the business to ensure emissions reductions are in line with our strategy and climate modeling. Over the last year we have expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2025 Scenario) pathway, which is compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100. Results of the scenario analysis determined the extent of the target for GHG emissions reductions in our strategy, and analysis for potential climate risks and opportunities - which ties in with water risks. As a direct result of the analysis, global energy and water reduction targets were calculated, and annual capex availability for projects was put in place. We are driving a clear focus on energy, water and GHG emissions reduction across the business to ensure reductions are in line with our strategy and climate modeling. Additionally, we use scenario analysis from WRI Aqueduct tool to assess the physical risk to our

facilities through 2030, 2050 and 2080. As a result of this analysis we undertake an annual water risk identification process for our facilities, which results in the implementation of site-level water management plans and, where appropriate, additional management of water withdrawals through water-reduction initiatives.
[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:
☑ No

(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

Our current net-zero transition plan is primarily focused on a high-level outline of the reductions that will be required in order to meet our approved short term science-based targets and long term net-zero commitment. As we further consider our road map towards 2050, further iterations of our transition plan will outline the required levers for full decarbonization in more detail, as new innovations and technology arise.

(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

Over the last year we have expanded our Impact 2025 strategy based on the IEA NZE2050 (Net-Zero Emissions by 2025 Scenario) pathway, which is compatible with modeling to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2100; we have also set an appropriate science-based GHG emissions reduction target, approved by the SBTi. This is the next major step in mitigating substantial climate risk and developing our long-term goal of net-zero emissions. The Berry Global board reviews the Company's long term strategic plans and the principal issues that the company will face in the future (including our Impact 2025 strategy and transition to net-zero emissions) during at least one Board meeting each year. After review with the board, we set our first net-zero target in 2023 (Net zero emissions by 2050)

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ More frequently than annually

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

In order to reduce the emissions required to achieve our net-zero commitments, and nearer term alignment targets, as outlined in our transition plan, a number of assumptions are required: • Our Customers having a desire to adopt lower carbon materials and increased uptake of our sustainable innovations. • Continued greening of electrical grids globally. • Increased availability of recycled resin and raw materials with lower carbon footprints • Improvements in recycling infrastructure and capacity. These assumptions will only be met with technological and industrial solutions from across our value chain, the implementation of positive government policies, and consumer behavioral changes.

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

Our CDP response as a whole outlines out progress to reduce GHG emissions in line with our transition plan and alignment with a 1.5 degree Celsius warming world. We are currently ahead of the proposed timeline for achieving net-zero, having achieved our near term Scope 1 and 2 target 2 years early, and on track to achieve our equivalent scope 3 goal 1 year early.

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other environmental issue considered

[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

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

Berry is proactively taking steps to reduce the climate impact of our products. It is our strategy to be a leader in the markets in which we participate. As a leader, we closely monitor consumer/customer preferences and develop products in response to demand. The Berry Global Impact 2025 sustainability strategy has been directly *influenced by this with one of the three pillars of the strategy focused on the impact of products. In order to reduce the climate-related impact of our products the strategy has the following targets; 100% of packaging to be reusable, recyclable or compostable by 2025, to lightweight products, achieve 10% recycled content across fast-moving consumer goods packaging and to encourage the development of renewable materials. The time horizon for achieving these targets is by 2025. The most substantial strategic decision influenced by climate-related risk and opportunities made in this area to date was the acquisition of RPC Group in July 2019. The acquisition of RPC Group and Berry creates a leading global supplier of valued-added protective solutions and one of the world's largest plastic packaging companies. With the market focus on the reduced environmental impact of packaging the acquisition of RPC Group introduced plastic recycling facilities in to the Berry Global business, which will reduce the climate impact of raw material sourcing. The combination of both companies also provides opportunities to leverage the combined know-how in innovative material science, product development, and manufacturing technologies to reduce the climate impact of the Berry Global's products. An additional recent strategic decision influenced by climate-related risk and opportunities was the building of a new recycling facility in Leamington Spa which went on-line in 2023, capable of handling highly contaminated waste and we are continually working to increase the quality of the recycled material. This will enable us to incorporate more recycled content into our products, in line with our target of 10% recycled content across all our packaging by 2025 and reducing transitional risks related to our products and services. It also helps reduce our Scope 3 footprint, and associated risks relating to carbon pricing mechanisms, as outlined in 3.1.1 as Risk2.*

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

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

Growing pressure from consumers, customers and regulation to mitigate climate change, as outlined in 3.1.1 as Risk3, has influenced the Berry Global strategy in relation to the supply and value chain in which the company operates. The Berry Global Impact 2025 sustainability strategy has been directly influenced by this with one of the three pillars of the strategy focused on partnerships. The overarching aim of this pillar of the strategy is to maximize positive impacts by engaging partners on key issues. Strategy has been influenced here by the need to reduce the climate related risks of our business that sit outside of our direct control such as, expanding and modernizing waste infrastructure to increase recovery and prevent plastic loss to the environment and to limit global warning by increasing the supply chain use of renewable energy and promoting science-based targets for GHG emissions. Although the timeline of the Berry Global Strategy is 2025 we see this as a much longer term strategy influence in order to drive reduced climate-related impacts of our supply and value chains. The most substantial strategic decision influenced by climate-related risk and opportunities made in this area to date are partnerships such as projects like the Pacific Northwest secondary sorting *demonstration project, sponsored by Berry Global. This innovative project aims to capture the value of six additional streams of plastic recyclables which would have otherwise become waste, therefore reducing the climate impact of the associated plastic waste and also creating the opportunity for increased recycling and reduced climate impact of the need for virgin materials. Additionally, the strategic decision to begin using EcoVadis in May 2021 as a supplier evaluation and risk mitigation tool, was partially driven by the need to evaluate and mitigate climate risk in our supply chain, and work with suppliers to reduce our Scope 3 footprint and associated carbon pricing risks as outlined as Risk2 in 3.1.1.*

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

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

Strategy in the area of investment in R&D has been influenced by the recognition that in line with customer, consumer and regulatory pressures the Berry Global portfolio of products needs to adapt to mitigate climate-related risk, such as Risk5 in 3.1.1, and to realize climate-related opportunities, such as those outlined as Opp1 & Opp5 in 3.6.1. In light of this Investment in R&D has increased over 170% from 2015 33 million to 82 million in 2023. R&D is an integral part of our long term strategy as a company. Increased R&D spend ensures that Berry Global remains at the forefront of product design and engineering. Investment in R&D can be linked directly to reputational risk as identified in the Berry Global Enterprise Risk Assessment and the risk related to the consumer perception of plastic driving a market change and reduction in demand for plastic products. Through R&D we can support the development on new low-carbon products, and acquire increased business. Through an increased investment in R&D Berry Global is advancing the sustainability strategy to reduce the climate-related impact of products. An example where this opportunity has been realized is for beverage cups produced by Berry in North America. Berry converted a line of paper cups with a PS lid to PP cups, this resulted in a GHG emissions saving of 23% and a resin reduction of 12%. We heavily invest in R&D to ensure that opportunities like the above can be realized.

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

☑ Water

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

Climate-related risks and opportunities have directly influenced the Berry Global operational strategy, most notably Risk1 outlined in 3.1.1 and Opp3 outlined in 3.6.1 relating to carbon pricing mechanisms. One of the 3 pillars of the Berry Global Impact 2025 sustainability strategy is related to minimizing the environmental impact of operations. The Impact 2025 strategy has a target to reduce operational GHG emissions by 25% by 2025 and energy consumption as a complementary target to this. The initial time horizon for this achievement is 2025 although GHG emissions reduction and energy efficiency are long term ambitions with the ultimate goal of the company to be carbon neutral in the future, setting our net-zero target for 2050. As a large manufacturing business with over 240 global operational facilities there is a clear need to drive this strategy for reduction; by focusing our operational strategy on reducing energy usage and emissions, this reduces the risk carbon pricing mechanisms will have on our direct operations, and increase the possibility of realizing our opportunities. Our Impact 2025 strategy also has a goal to reduce water intensity 1% year over year, and emissions generated from delivery of water to our facilities is included in our Scope 3 emissions, with the need for reduction tying back into our net-zero target for 2050. An additional case study of a strategic decision made in this area, influencing Opp2 in 3.6.1, is the move to renewable energy sourcing for Berry Global operations where possible. We set a goal of Year-on-Year increase in renewable energy volume, and increased our renewable energy use this year to over 300,000 MWh by purchasing RECs and entering into renewable energy contracts. This reduces our climate related risk in relation to GHG emissions, long term availability of fossil fuels and carbon taxes, and potential for further opportunities to enter into renewable energy contracts, such as the VPPAs. As part of our water risk identification process we have transitioned our strategy in relation to water to minimize our reliance on large volumes of water in our operations, targeting Risk6 in 3.1.1. Facilities with the highest baseline risk of water scarcity are required to identify areas to reduce their water withdrawals and/or water usage as part of a site-level water management plan. By monitoring and reporting on annual water use, we are finding ways to reduce our water intensity. Our sustainability committee looks at water savings when determining opportunities and risk for long term economics. The lifetime of equipment and ROI are important for determining the projects priority.

[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

☑ Direct costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Assets

(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

☑ Water

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

Financial planning has been influenced in the areas of revenue, direct costs, capital expenditures and assets. As an example for direct costs, and strategy relating to Risk1 in 3.1.1, Berry Global operates in an energy intensive sector which has high associated emissions and energy represents a significant portion of our raw material costs in addition to utility costs. Part of the Berry Global budgeting process includes anticipating energy prices, with carbon pricing being an influential element of this. As part of the financial planning process for energy, carbon pricing across all countries where Berry Global has facilities is analysed to inform budgets. Through these process risk countries can be identified where carbon taxes are increasing and therefore energy costs will increase, however increased carbon taxes and therefore energy process provide us with more of an economic opportunity to explore other sources of energy such as renewable energy, which will have a lower GHG impact. Carbon pricing has been considered on a long-term time horizon to 2030 with projections available to this timescale and the potential financial impact has been mapped for all countries Berry operates in. As an example for Capital Expenditures, GHG emissions have now been incorporated into the CapEx process to ensure the effect on operational emissions are taken into account when potential projects are identified. We have an internal tool which automates this process based on a projects' potential energy savings by type. In 2023 we also produced a tool which provides information on the average emissions intensity of grid electricity in locations where we operate. As a direct result of this process, we are able to incorporate GHG impact into financial decisions relating to production optimization and consider the impact on emissions volume output when managing production changes across multiple facilities. Water issues are integrated into long-term strategic business plans as part of our overall goal of reducing unnecessary water usage, and therefore, unnecessary spend. Long term financial includes water-

related issues, particularly where savings can be made alongside water reductions, with an initial investment. When determining equipment upgrades, the ROI over the lifetime of the equipment includes water reductions and water quality.
[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, and we do not 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)

1

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

0

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

3

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

3

(5.9.5) Please explain

Water related CapEx initiatives are delivered with a focus on meeting our goal of a 1% reduction in water consumption intensity, for example on projects such as updating water towers and pumps, and replacing older piping. Annual spend in water-related CapEx is predominantly driven by this intensity initiative, and we anticipate maintaining our current annual CapEx spend going forward. Our water-related OpEx spend is predominantly on our water treatment programs, and to providers overseeing our process water systems. We are currently in the process of standardizing water treatment requirements and getting facilities aligned with preferred vendors. Despite increased efficiency, rate increases have meant our OpEx spend rose about 3% YoY and we anticipate this to continue.
[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

☑ Navigate regulations
☑ Drive energy efficiency
☑ Drive low-carbon investment
☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making
☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in risk assessment

(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
☑ Price/cost of voluntary carbon offset credits

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

The analysis is performed at corporate level based on the anticipation of an average Carbon Tax of 120 USD/MT CO2e in 2030 under NZE Scenario, and then rolled out to divisional and facility level where necessary. The application of the shadow price is to analyse our future risk associated with energy prices, and better understand the regulation around it, and use that to change internal behavior, and as an analysis tool for investments into low carbon technology and energy efficiency. At this time, the analysis is primarily being done to 1) better understand potential future risks relating to Carbon pricing, and being able to estimate the potential magnitude of these risks on an annual basis 2) increased awareness of potential energy price inflation driven by increased carbon pricing, and associated price inflation for our raw material supply. The carbon pricing analysis has raised awareness on our strategy to manage our carbon usage and we are identifying how to use this for analysis for individual projects, such as how to fund renewable energy projects on an annual basis.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:
☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:
☑ Static

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

120

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

120

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

Select all that apply
☑ 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

100

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

We reassess our internal price on carbon annually as part of our Standalone Climate Risk Assessment Process.
[Add row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water ☑ Plastics
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water ☑ Plastics
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Plastics
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Plastics

[Fixed row]

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

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years
Water	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years
Plastics	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

[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

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In addition to our Supplier Code of Conduct, which features environmental requirements that all suppliers must meet, we leverage a two-step program to further identify and mitigate environmental, and wider ESG, risks in our supply chain. Where the Supplier Code of Conduct ensures commitment to our mandatory requirements, our supplier risk assessment platform enables us to recognize our highest-risk suppliers and encourage continuous improvement to their environmental and overall ESG programs. The utilization of a risk-modelling platform, EcoVadis IQ, enables us to map our entire supply base for ethical, social, and environmental risks, which provides us with robust risk visibility throughout our supply chain. Through this process, we can gather an inherent risk score for each supplier, based on key categories such as industry, spend, and country of operation. To mitigate identified risks, we utilize an evidence-based comprehensive assessment, EcoVadis, through which a supplier is scored on four themes, including Environment. We aim to have all identified medium-to-high-risk and critical Tier 1 suppliers take the assessment. it allows us to analyze the performance of our overall supply chain and individual suppliers based on their commitment to the environment and track and monitor progress on specific environmental KPIs.

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In addition to our Supplier Code of Conduct, which features environmental requirements that all suppliers must meet, we leverage a two-step program to further identify and mitigate environmental, and wider ESG, risks in our supply chain. Where the Supplier Code of Conduct ensures commitment to our mandatory requirements, our supplier risk assessment platform enables us to recognize our highest-risk suppliers and encourage continuous improvement to their environmental and overall ESG programs. The utilization of a risk-modelling platform, EcoVadis IQ, enables us to map our entire supply base for ethical, social, and environmental risks, which provides us with robust risk visibility throughout our supply chain. Through this process, we can gather an inherent risk score for each supplier, based on *key categories such as industry, spend, and country of operation. To mitigate identified risks, we utilize an evidence-based comprehensive assessment, EcoVadis, through which a supplier is scored on four themes, including Environment. We aim to have all identified medium-to-high-risk and critical Tier 1 suppliers take the assessment. it allows us to analyze the performance of our overall supply chain and individual suppliers based on their commitment to the environment and track and monitor progress on specific environmental KPIs.*

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In addition to our Supplier Code of Conduct, which features environmental requirements that all suppliers must meet, we leverage a two-step program to further identify and mitigate environmental, and wider ESG, risks in our supply chain. Where the Supplier Code of Conduct ensures commitment to our mandatory requirements, our supplier risk assessment platform enables us to recognize our highest-risk suppliers and encourage continuous improvement to their environmental and overall ESG programs. The utilization of a risk-modelling platform, EcoVadis IQ, enables us to map our entire supply base for ethical, social, and environmental risks, which provides us with robust risk visibility throughout our supply chain. Through this process, we can gather an inherent risk score for each supplier, based on key categories such as industry, spend, and country of operation. To mitigate identified risks, we utilize an evidence-based comprehensive assessment, EcoVadis, through which a supplier is scored on four themes, including Environment. We aim to have all identified medium-to-high-risk and critical Tier 1 suppliers take the assessment. it allows us to analyze the performance of our overall supply chain and individual suppliers based on their commitment to the environment and track and monitor progress on specific environmental KPIs.
[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, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are 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

The Berry Global Supplier Code of Conduct outlines our mandatory requirements for our suppliers in relation to the environment. The Supplier Code of Conduct ensures that all our suppliers have clarity around our expectations and conduct business in line with our principles and values. We expect all suppliers to return a signed copy of the Supplier Code of Conduct to confirm their commitment. Additionally, we expect our suppliers to establish a management system that supports the content of the code and monitors/records regulatory compliance. If necessary, we may conduct desk or site audits to ensure compliance to the Code of Conduct. If a supplier fails to meet the standards set forth in the Code, we will inform the supplier of the area(s) that require improvement and request a corrective action plan. If the plan is approved, the supplier will be given a set period to resolve the issues. If potential issues are not resolved, we may terminate the business relationship.

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, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are 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

The Berry Global Supplier Code of Conduct outlines our mandatory requirements for our suppliers in relation to the environment. The Supplier Code of Conduct ensures that all our suppliers have clarity around our expectations and conduct business in line with our principles and values. We expect all suppliers to return a signed copy of the Supplier Code of Conduct to confirm their commitment. Additionally, we expect our suppliers to establish a management system that supports the content of the code and monitors/records regulatory compliance. If necessary, we may conduct desk or site audits to ensure compliance to the Code of Conduct. If a supplier fails to meet the standards set forth in the Code, we will inform the supplier of the area(s) that require improvement and request a corrective action plan. If the plan is approved, the supplier will be given a set period to resolve the issues. If potential issues are not resolved, we may terminate the business relationship.
[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:
☑ Regular environmental risk assessments (at least once annually)

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

We have recently begun to leverage a two-step program to further identify and mitigate environmental, and wider ESG, risks in our supply chain. This supplier risk assessment platform enables us to recognize our highest-risk suppliers and encourage continuous improvement to their environmental, including climate change and water programs, as well as overall ESG performance. The utilization of a risk-modelling platform, EcoVadis IQ, enables us to map our entire supply base for ethical, social, and environmental risks, which provides us with robust risk visibility throughout our supply chain. Through this process, we can gather an inherent risk score *for each supplier, based on key categories such as industry, spend, and country of operation. To mitigate identified risks, we utilize an evidence-based comprehensive assessment, EcoVadis, through which a supplier is scored on four themes, including Environment. Our aim to have all identified medium-to-high-risk and all critical Tier 1 suppliers comply with this requirement to take the assessment. However, currently we have not yet been able to assess all suppliers through EcoVadis IQ, so only 1-25% of suppliers, based on spend and Scope 3% attribution have completed the assessment so far. A supplier has to meet a minimum score threshold on their EcoVadis assessment, otherwise we will utilize the corrective action functions to request improvement areas and time-bound actions plans for compliance.*

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Regular environmental risk assessments (at least once annually)

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

We have recently begun to leverage a two-step program to further identify and mitigate environmental, and wider ESG, risks in our supply chain. This supplier risk assessment platform enables us to recognize our highest-risk suppliers and encourage continuous improvement to their environmental, including climate change and water programs, as well as overall ESG performance. The utilization of a risk-modelling platform, EcoVadis IQ, enables us to map our entire supply base for ethical, social, and environmental risks, which provides us with robust risk visibility throughout our supply chain. Through this process, we can gather an inherent risk score for each supplier, based on key categories such as industry, spend, and country of operation. To mitigate identified risks, we utilize an evidence-based comprehensive assessment, EcoVadis, through which a supplier is scored on four themes, including Environment. Our aim to have all identified medium-to-high-risk and all critical Tier 1 suppliers comply with this requirement to take the assessment. However, currently we have not yet been able to assess all suppliers through EcoVadis IQ, so only 1-25% of suppliers, based on spend and Scope 3% attribution have completed the assessment so far. A supplier has to meet a minimum score threshold on their EcoVadis assessment, otherwise we will utilize the corrective action functions to request improvement areas and time-bound actions plans for compliance.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply
☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

The Berry Global Supplier Code of Conduct outlines our mandatory requirements for our suppliers in relation to the environment, covering 100% of spend, and Scope 3 attributable emissions.. The Supplier Code of Conduct ensures that all our suppliers have clarity around our expectations and conduct business in line with our principles and values, including on climate change and water. We expect all suppliers to return a signed copy of the Supplier Code of Conduct to confirm their commitment. Additionally, we expect our suppliers to establish a management system that supports the content of the code and monitors/records regulatory compliance. If necessary, we may conduct desk or site audits to ensure compliance to the Code of Conduct. If we identify any violations of our Code, we may notify the supplier of this and specify an appropriate deadline by which remedial action to comply is required. If a supplier fails to comply with the Code or to remediate by the specified deadline, or if the Breach of the Code is so severe that Berry cannot reasonably be expected to continue the business relationship, Berry reserves the right - without prejudice to any other rights - to terminate the relationship without prior notice and to rescind any associated contracts or agreements.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply
☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

The Berry Global Supplier Code of Conduct outlines our mandatory requirements for our suppliers in relation to the environment, covering 100% of spend, and Scope 3 attributable emissions.. The Supplier Code of Conduct ensures that all our suppliers have clarity around our expectations and conduct business in line with our principles and values, including on climate change and water. We expect all suppliers to return a signed copy of the Supplier Code of Conduct to confirm their commitment. Additionally, we expect our suppliers to establish a management system that supports the content of the code and monitors/records regulatory compliance. If necessary, we may conduct desk or site audits to ensure compliance to the Code of Conduct. If we identify any violations of our Code, we may notify the supplier of this and specify an appropriate deadline by which remedial action to comply is required. If a supplier fails to comply with the Code or to remediate by the specified deadline, or if the Breach of the Code is so severe that Berry cannot reasonably be expected to continue the business relationship, Berry reserves the right - without prejudice to any other rights - to terminate the relationship without prior notice and to rescind any associated contracts or agreements.
[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

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovative business models and corporate renewable energy sourcing mechanisms

(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:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

We have quarterly meetings with our largest resin suppliers, which make up 100% of our critical suppliers by number, and over 50% of total procurement spend/Scope 3 emissions from our suppliers. As the majority of our Scope 3 emissions come from the purchase of resin, we work to collaborate with these critical suppliers to explore avenues to track and reduce their direct emissions, which in turn would decrease the emission factors associated with the resin that we purchase, reducing the largest part of our Scope 3 footprint.

(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 :Alignment with our Code of Conduct

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

☑ No

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

Plastics

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Removal of plastic from the environment

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

☑ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

(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:

☑ 100%

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

Outlined in our Supplier Code of Conduct, we work with all our suppliers to ensure they sign-up too, or at a minimum, are aligned with the Operation Clean Sweep program, to prevent plastic resin being lost into the environment. Engagement is completed through requirements in the Code of Conduct, direct engagement at site level, and through best-practice share through the OCS industry associations.

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

☑ Yes

[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:

☑ 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

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Berry Global's customers have significant control over the design choices and climate change impact related to the packaging supplied to them that can be positively influenced by an increased awareness of the impacts of design and material choices. Over the last 5 years we have initiated a webinar programme for our customers on topics such as design for the circular economy and chemical recycling. These webinars are open to all of our customers and engagement is sought through direct customer communications and advertisement of the webinars on social media and the Berry Global website. Additionally, Our R&D and innovation teams work with all customers to be able to provide sustainable solutions and meet their needs. This is approached differently which each customer depending on their needs, but our teams work to supply a number of different solutions which will reduce the customers CO2e footprint and/or other environmental impacts. We are also able to customers with LCAs for potential solutions to compare environmental impacts, to make sure we deliver the best product available.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Through the Berry Global webinars customers gain a greater understanding of the changes they can make to their products to reduce their climate impact. Success of webinars is measured through engagement (number of attendees) and also on any follow up discussions that occur as a result. Ultimate success is measured in terms of increased sales of climate-advantaged products. A number of successful projects have been implemented during FY23 as a result of working closely with the customer to provide a more sustainable solution, such as light weighting of bottles (reducing CO2e during manufacturing and transport), increased use of PCR (reducing CO2e from raw materials) and increasing the recyclability of our products (reducing net CO2e at EoL). We also measure the success through customer satisfaction surveys, which include questions regarding our ability to meet sustainability needs. Through webinars and one-on-one discussions with our trained sales staff directly with suppliers, we hit 100% of our critical customers by both number and scope 3 emissions. One example of success measure is the amount of recycled content we use in our products. The amount of PCR used has risen from 2.3% in 2020 to 3.6% in 2023 as a direct result of customer demand through our customer engagement processes. Similar engagement with our customers regarding the use of recyclable products has resulted in 86% of our products now considered recyclable, up from 79% in 2021.

Water

(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
☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

The majority of our products and operations are not water intensive so we often prioritize the engagement on other topics such as the climate impact of our products and operations in our direct engagements with customers and other partners in our supply chain. We do however recognize the importance of water to our supply chain partners and customers. We publish information on water and water Risk in our Impact Report and GRI reporting, detailing our management and use which is available to all supply chain partners on the Berry Global website (https://www.berryglobal.com/sustainability/howweperform). We also publish information on our water targets and strategy on the Berry Global website. Water Risk has been a topic included within our webinar programme for our customers.These webinars are open to all of our customers and engagement is sought through direct customer communications and advertisement of the webinars on social media and the Berry Global website. Additionally, our R&D and innovation teams work with all customers to be able to provide sustainable solutions and meet their needs, which includes water intensity if mentioned by customers as part of a LCA process.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Engagement success is measured by the number of visitors to the sustainability section of our website or downloads of our GRI report, and success of webinars is measured through engagement (number of attendees) and also on any follow up discussions that occur as a result.
[Add 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

Choosing the operational control consolidation approach for our environmental data reporting allows us to directly manage and influence the environmental performance of the entities we operate, ensuring consistent application of our environmental policies and standards. By focusing on operations we control, we can increase accountability and transparency, and implement and monitor initiatives effectively, ensuring compliance with regulations and reducing environmental risks. This approach provides a clear and precise assessment of our environmental footprint, reflecting the actual extent of our impact. By including only the operations we manage, we can set realistic environmental targets, track progress accurately, and provide stakeholders with reliable data.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

Choosing the operational control consolidation approach for our environmental data reporting allows us to directly manage and influence the environmental performance of the entities we operate, ensuring consistent application of our environmental policies and standards. By focusing on operations we control, we can increase accountability and transparency, and implement and monitor initiatives effectively, ensuring compliance with regulations and reducing environmental risks. This approach provides a clear and precise assessment of our environmental footprint, reflecting the actual extent of our impact. By including only the operations we manage, we can set realistic environmental targets, track progress accurately, and provide stakeholders with reliable data.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

Choosing the operational control consolidation approach for our environmental data reporting allows us to directly manage and influence the environmental performance of the entities we operate, ensuring consistent application of our environmental policies and standards. By focusing on operations we control, we can increase accountability and transparency, and implement and monitor initiatives effectively, ensuring compliance with regulations and reducing environmental risks. This approach provides a clear and precise assessment of our environmental footprint, reflecting the actual extent of our impact. By including only the operations we manage, we can set realistic environmental targets, track progress accurately, and provide stakeholders with reliable data.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

Choosing the operational control consolidation approach for our environmental data reporting allows us to directly manage and influence the environmental performance of the entities we operate, ensuring consistent application of our environmental policies and standards. By focusing on operations we control, we can increase accountability and transparency, and implement and monitor initiatives effectively, ensuring compliance with regulations and reducing environmental risks. This approach provides a clear and precise assessment of our environmental footprint, reflecting the actual extent of our impact. By including only the operations we manage, we can set realistic environmental targets, track progress accurately, and provide stakeholders with reliable data.
[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?

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, an acquisition
☑ Yes, a divestment

(7.1.1.2) Name of organization(s) acquired, divested from, or merged with

Pro-Western Plastics Ltd (Acquisition) Berry Mundra Facility, India (Divestiture)

(7.1.1.3) Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

All divestments and Acquisitions were completed during the fiscal year. Emissions for divested facilities have been removed from our inventory, including prior years up to our baseline year, and all acquisitions have been added to the current year inventory and all prior years, including our baseline year.
[Fixed row]

(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

(7.1.2.1) Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, a change in methodology

(7.1.2.2) Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s)

We improved our methodology for calculating our Scope 3 emissions to align further with the GHG protocol's principles of relevance, completeness, consistency, transparency, and accuracy. In cases, distinct trade-offs have still been made, as we favour the principles of relevance, completeness and consistency, sometimes at the expense to accuracy, in order to be able to provide a comprehensive overview of our whole value chain emissions to our stakeholders. We expect to continue to improve disclosure on Scope 3 emissions in time, lessening the need for such trade-offs and reducing reliance on extrapolation as we improve our methodology. As we make these changes, we ensure that equivalent changes have been made to our prior and baseline years.
[Fixed row]

(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2, location-based

☑ Scope 2, market-based

☑ Scope 3

(7.1.3.3) Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold

In line with the SBTi expectations, we reset our baseline as a result of acquisitions, divestment's, mergers, or reporting methodology changes that accounted for greater than 5% of annual GHG emissions. During this process we also updated and re-reported our data from years between the current reporting year and the baseline. As part of our Scope 3 methodology update, we also updated the methodology for prior years where possible and recalculated the data accordingly.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes
[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
☑ US EPA Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID)
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources
☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion Sources
☑ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019

(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

Our market-based number is calculated using location-based data combined with our renewable energy purchases, and does not include other supplier specific contracts or emission factors.

[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:

☑ Yes

(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Non-Production Facilities

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

0.1

(7.4.1.9) Estimated percentage of total Scope 3 emissions this excluded source represents

0.1

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

As per our reporting methodology, operational emissions from non-manufacturing facilities, such as offices, are excluded as they are de minimis usage (

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

Sales site have been excluded from the inventory, as these are mostly rented office buildings with minimal operational control. Where operational control is in place, an internal exercise during the 2017/2018 reporting period concluded that emissions from this source comprised of well under 0.1% of total emissions. Scope 3 emissions relating to energy, water and operational waste generation total only 4.3% of our total scope 3 footprint. With offices using minimal energy and water, and producing minimal waste compared to manufacturing sites (as demonstrated by offices only anticipated to be 0.1% of total Scope 12 footprint), we can consider Scope 3 emissions from these categories to be also de-minimis, and well under 0.1% of our total Scope 3 footprint) and are therefore excluded.

Row 2

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Additional fuel sources at sites that predominately use Natural Gas

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

3

(7.4.1.9) Estimated percentage of total Scope 3 emissions this excluded source represents

0.1

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

As per our reporting methodology, our manufacturing facilities that rely heavily on natural gas as their primary form of fuel use are not required to report de minimis usage of other fuels. Additionally, value chain emissions from other energy sources excluded from our operational reporting scope are excluded from the fuel and energy-related activities category.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

Historical exercises determined that fuel usage from these facilities was de minimis, as it represented under 3% of total emissions. In 2022, as part of an assurance process of our FY21 Scope 1 and 2 emissions, it was estimated these emissions remained under 3% of total emissions and could still be considered de minimis. Additionally, an additional internal analysis of propane purchases for our US facilities in FY21 estimated these emissions to be around 4,200MT (well under 1% of total emissions from US sites in FY20). As the company works towards electrification of processes, we anticipate these percentages to have fallen further year-over-year.

Row 3

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Process emissions: SOx, NOx, VOCs, and Fugitive emissions such as refrigerants and air conditioning leaks.

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

0.3

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

VOCs are not identified as a process emission, and air emissions of SOx and NOx are only tracked at site level, as internal investigations have concluded that these are not significant emissions at a company-wide level, and can be considered de minimis. Similar investigations have taken place regarding fugitive emissions from refrigerants, air conditioning leaks, and tooling gases, which have also been determined de minimis.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

An exercise to quantify these emissions was carried out in 2015. It was found that these emissions would account for around only 0.9% of total global emissions. It was therefore deemed that the process of collecting and converting the data was too complex and time consuming compared to the output of emissions and contribution to the total carbon emissions. We anticipate an updated investigation would determine an even lower percentage, but are investigating ways to collect this data for future years.

[Add row]

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

144599

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Our Scope 1 emissions represent direct emissions to atmosphere that each site is responsible for. This includes Direct emissions from fixed sources of combustion, and Direct emissions from mobile sources with combustion engine. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2277247

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Our Scope 2 emissions represent indirect emissions associated with the emissions to atmosphere that occur through the generation of outsourced energy supplies not owned or controlled by Berry Global. This includes Indirect emissions linked to electricity consumption, and Indirect emissions linked to steam or cold consumption. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub for US Facilitis, and IEA emission factors for Rest of World.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2116607

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Our Scope 2 emissions represent indirect emissions associated with the emissions to atmosphere that occur through the generation of outsourced energy supplies not owned or controlled by Berry Global. This includes Indirect emissions linked to electricity consumption, and Indirect emissions linked to steam or cold consumption. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub for US Facilitis, and IEA emission factors for Rest of World. Where facilities use renewable energy sources (such as renewable energy contracts, certificates, VPPAs or on-site renewable) these are included in the calculation of our market-based emissions.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7469513

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In-depth activity data for purchased resin is collected through the purchasing systems, with splits by region and resin type. Resin data is then multiplied by industry average emission factors also split by region and resin type where possible. For other purchased goods and services, a spend-based method was used, where total spend per spend category for facilities is cross-referenced against Supply Chain GHG Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries categories and multiplied by the relevant emission factors. For CPI Facilities, spend data on purchases is not easily accessible, so spend on consumed materials is used. Data is then extrapolated for facilities where activity data was not available to cover the entirety of Berry's operations. Emissions related to purchased water were calculated through multiplying the quantity of water withdrawals and water discharge by average water supply and treatment emissions factors respectively. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used. Location specific resin data is not available in all regions where Berry global purchases resin, so resin purchases were *grouped together into two regions for emissions calculations. Additionally, for resin purchases where emission factors are not available for that resin type, an average resin emission factor was used. For use of the Supply Chain GHG Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries, assumptions were made about the definitions of each listed purchasing category when grouping Berry's Global's purchases into a category. Best efforts have been made to ensure purchases are captured within the corrected category listed within the calculation tool. Additionally, where data for spend on material purchases is not easily available, spend on materials consumed is used. When extrapolating data to cover facilities where activity data was not available, this has been completed based on average spend per tracked facility. DEFRA GHG emission conversion factors are used for water across the business on the assumption that factor rates do not differ materially by region, with the principle of compiling complete data traded-off against accuracy. Over time Berry's aim to move towards using regional-based factors.*

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

77107

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A spend-based method was used, where total spend on capital goods was multiplied by the appropriate Supply Chain GHG Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries category. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used.

Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

449368

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Value Chain emissions related to purchased fuel and energy-related activities are calculated through multiplying the quantity of energy usage, by type, by the relevant secondary emissions data source. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used. DEFRA GHG emission conversion factors are used for gas and fuel *usage across the business on the assumption that factor rates do not differ materially by region, with the principle of compiling complete data traded-off against accuracy. Over time Berry aims to move towards using regional-based factors.*

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

418277

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Value chain emissions relating to the delivery of resin to our facilities are calculated by multiplying the volume of resin delivered by delivery vehicle by the appropriate emission factor and multiplied by estimate delivery distance. Emissions relating to the delivery of other goods are calculated using available mileage and tonnage data provided by our logistics system, multiplied by relevant emission factors for HGVs. Data is then extrapolated to cover the entirety of Berry Global's operations. Emissions relating to the delivery of goods to our customers, paid for by Berry, are calculated by our logistics company in partnership with the Smart Freight Centre. Data is then extrapolated to cover the entirety of Berry Global's operations. Due to the number of resin suppliers for our operations, estimations have been used for the average delivery vehicle and distance. Deliveries to North America are estimated to on average require a 1599km journey by train. Deliveries outside of North America are estimated to travel 1000km by ship and 300km by HGV. When extrapolating data for delivery of other goods to cover facilities where activity data was not available, this has been completed based on average delivery emissions per dollar () spend on other goods. When extrapolating data for delivery of goods to customers to cover facilities where activity data was not available, this has been completed based on the delivery emissions per Metric Tons sold.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31189

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Value Chain emissions related to waste generated at our operations are calculated through multiplying the quantity of waste, by end-of-life category, by the relevant secondary emissions data source. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used. Waste data is not collected by all facilities; therefore, extrapolation methods are used to determine estimated waste data for those facilities. Extrapolation is based on average-waste data from facilities that track waste metrics, and previous year values for facilities if available.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20992

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Value chain emissions related to business travel is provided from our third patty business travel providers for North American facilities. This data is extrapolated to cover the whole of Berry operations. As third-party emissions data has been provided, so assumptions have been made that the calculation methodology and data provided by these third parties are accurate. Data is not provided for all facilities; therefore, extrapolation methods are used to determine estimated data for remaining facilities. When extrapolating data, this has been completed based on the number of facilities covered by the provided data versus total facilities.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

225109

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Value chain emissions are calculated by multiplying the number of employees by an average commuting distance and transport method emission factor. We are unable at this time to collect actual employee commuting data from across our business. Instead we utilize average US commuting statistics and apply these to our methodology for commuting distances and transport methods. Commuting Assumptions: 17.9% Workforce do not commute, 67.8% Employees travel by Car Alone, *5.9% Carpooled with 1 other person, 1.2% Carpooled with 2 others, 0.8% Carpooled with 3 others, 1.5% by Taxi, 2.5% Travel by Train/Bus, 2.6% Travel by Bike/Walk, 65km a day average commute, Estimate of average of 261 working days. Over time Berry aims to move towards using regional-based factors and employee specific commuting data where possible.*

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The company does not have upstream leased assets for which it has operational control, and this category is therefore not relevant and not calculated.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

243231

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions relating to the delivery of goods to our customers, paid for by customers, are calculated by our logistics company in partnership with the Smart Freight Centre. Data is then extrapolated to cover the entirety of Berry Global's operations. When extrapolating data for delivery of goods to customers to cover facilities where activity data was not available, this has been completed based on the delivery emissions per Metric Tons sold.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Berry Global produces finished goods that require no further processing once leaving our facilities. Because of this, the Scope 3 emissions from this category can be considered not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.3) Methodological details

There are no further emissions associated with our products during their "use" phase, so therefore this section can be considered not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1976816

(7.5.3) Methodological details

An average-data methodology was used, where global sales tonnage was multiplied by end-of-life scenario emissions factors, based on the average end-of-life scenario rate. Average end-of-life rates taken from most recent OECD data for recycling, landfilling and combustion. Global rates are currently used with our global production tonnage. Over time Berry aims to move towards using regional-based factors where possible.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not have any downstream leased assets so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not have any franchises so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not have any investments so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not have any other upstream emission sources so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not have any other downstream emission sources so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included.
[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)

144025

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Our Scope 1 emissions represent direct emissions to atmosphere that each site is responsible for. This includes Direct emissions from fixed sources of combustion, and Direct emissions from mobile sources with combustion engine. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub.

Past year 1

(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

143100

(7.6.2) End date

09/29/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Our Scope 1 emissions represent direct emissions to atmosphere that each site is responsible for. This includes Direct emissions from fixed sources of combustion, and Direct emissions from mobile sources with combustion engine. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub.

Past year 2

(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

149684

(7.6.2) End date

09/29/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Our Scope 1 emissions represent direct emissions to atmosphere that each site is responsible for. This includes Direct emissions from fixed sources of combustion, and Direct emissions from mobile sources with combustion engine. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub.

Past year 3

(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

151975

(7.6.2) End date

09/29/2020

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Our Scope 1 emissions represent direct emissions to atmosphere that each site is responsible for. This includes Direct emissions from fixed sources of combustion, and Direct emissions from mobile sources with combustion engine. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub.
[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)

1689472

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)

1597469

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Our Scope 2 emissions represent indirect emissions associated with the emissions to atmosphere that occur through the generation of outsourced energy supplies not owned or controlled by Berry Global. This includes Indirect emissions linked to electricity consumption, and Indirect emissions linked to steam or cold consumption. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub for US Facilitis, and IEA emission factors for Rest of World. Where facilities use renewable energy sources (such as renewable energy contracts, certificates, VPPAs or on-site renewable) these are included in the calculation of our market-based emissions.

Past year 1

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1755898

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)

1703268

(7.7.3) End date

09/29/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Our Scope 2 emissions represent indirect emissions associated with the emissions to atmosphere that occur through the generation of outsourced energy supplies not owned or controlled by Berry Global. This includes Indirect emissions linked to electricity consumption, and Indirect emissions linked to steam or cold consumption. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub for US Facilitis, and IEA emission factors for Rest of World. Where facilities use renewable energy sources (such as renewable energy contracts, certificates, VPPAs or on-site renewable) these are included in the calculation of our market-based emissions.

Past year 2

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1871542

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)

1792593

(7.7.3) End date

09/29/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Our Scope 2 emissions represent indirect emissions associated with the emissions to atmosphere that occur through the generation of outsourced energy supplies not owned or controlled by Berry Global. This includes Indirect emissions linked to electricity consumption, and Indirect emissions linked to steam or cold consumption. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub for US Facilitis, and IEA emission factors for Rest of World. Where facilities use renewable energy sources (such as renewable energy contracts, certificates, VPPAs or on-site renewable) these are included in the calculation of our market-based emissions.

Past year 3

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2111479

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)

2018597

(7.7.3) End date

09/29/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Our Scope 2 emissions represent indirect emissions associated with the emissions to atmosphere that occur through the generation of outsourced energy supplies not owned or controlled by Berry Global. This includes Indirect emissions linked to electricity consumption, and Indirect emissions linked to steam or cold consumption. Emissions are calculated following an Operational Control method in line with the GHG Protocol, using factors updated annually from EPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Hub for US Facilitis, and IEA emission factors for Rest of World. Where facilities use renewable energy sources (such as renewable energy contracts, certificates, VPPAs or on-site renewable) these are included in the calculation of our market-based emissions.
[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)

5641992

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ 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

In-depth activity data for purchased resin is collected through the purchasing systems, with splits by region and resin type. Resin data is then multiplied by industry average emission factors also split by region and resin type where possible. For other purchased goods and services, a spend-based method was used, where total spend per spend category for facilities is cross-referenced against Supply Chain GHG Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries categories and multiplied by the relevant emission factors. For CPI Facilities, spend data on purchases is not easily accessible, so spend on consumed materials is used. Data is then extrapolated for facilities where activity data was not available to cover the entirety of Berry's operations. Emissions related to purchased water were calculated through multiplying the quantity of water withdrawals and water discharge by average water supply and treatment emissions factors respectively. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used. Location specific resin data is not available in all regions where Berry global purchases resin, so resin purchases were grouped together into two regions for emissions calculations. Additionally, for resin purchases where emission factors are not available for that resin type, an average resin emission factor was used. For use of the Supply Chain GHG Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries, assumptions were made about the definitions of each listed purchasing category when grouping Berry's Global's purchases into a category. Best efforts have been made to ensure purchases are captured within the corrected category listed within the calculation tool. Additionally, where data for spend on material purchases is not easily available, spend on materials consumed is used. When extrapolating data to cover facilities where activity data was not available, this has been completed based on average spend per tracked facility. DEFRA GHG emission conversion factors are used for water across the business on the assumption that factor rates do not differ materially by region, with the principle of compiling complete data traded-off against accuracy. Over time Berry's aim to move towards using regional-based factors.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

72718

(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

A spend-based method was used, where total spend on capital goods was multiplied by the appropriate Supply Chain GHG Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries category. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used.

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)

360462

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value Chain emissions related to purchased fuel and energy-related activities are calculated through multiplying the quantity of energy usage, by type, by the relevant secondary emissions data source. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used. DEFRA GHG emission conversion factors are used for gas and fuel usage across the business on the assumption that factor rates do not differ materially by region, with the principle of compiling complete data traded-off against accuracy. Over time Berry aims to move towards using regional-based factors.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

355800

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

23

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value chain emissions relating to the delivery of resin to our facilities are calculated by multiplying the volume of resin delivered by delivery vehicle by the appropriate emission factor and multiplied by estimate delivery distance. Emissions relating to the delivery of other goods are calculated using available mileage and tonnage data provided by our logistics system, multiplied by relevant emission factors for HGVs. Data is then extrapolated to cover the entirety of Berry Global's operations. Emissions relating to the delivery of goods to our customers, paid for by Berry, are calculated by our logistics company in partnership with the Smart Freight Centre. Data is then extrapolated to cover the entirety of Berry Global's operations. Due to the number of resin suppliers for our operations, estimations have been used for the average delivery vehicle and distance. Deliveries to North America are estimated to on average require a 1599km journey by train. Deliveries outside of North America are estimated to travel 1000km by ship and 300km by HGV. When extrapolating data for delivery of other goods to cover facilities where activity data was not *available, this has been completed based on average delivery emissions per dollar () spend on other goods. When extrapolating data for delivery of goods to customers to cover facilities where activity data was not available, this has been completed based on the delivery emissions per Metric Tons sold.*

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

28512

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value Chain emissions related to waste generated at our operations are calculated through multiplying the quantity of waste, by end-of-life category, by the relevant secondary emissions data source. Supplier specific emissions data sources were not used. Waste data is not collected by all facilities; therefore, extrapolation methods are used to determine estimated waste data for those facilities. Extrapolation is based on average-waste data from facilities that track waste metrics, and previous year values for facilities if available.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

12360

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

37

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value chain emissions related to business travel is provided from our third-party business travel providers for North American facilities. This data is extrapolated to cover the whole of Berry operations. As third-party emissions data has been provided, so assumptions have been made that the calculation methodology and data provided by these third parties are accurate. Data is not provided for all facilities; therefore, extrapolation methods are used to determine estimated data for remaining facilities. When extrapolating data, this has been completed based on the number of facilities covered by the provided data versus total facilities.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

182272

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Value chain emissions are calculated by multiplying the number of employees by an average commuting distance and transport method emission factor. We are unable at this time to collect actual employee commuting data from across our business. Instead we utilize average US commuting statistics and apply these to our methodology for commuting distances and transport methods. Commuting Assumptions: • 17.9% Workforce do not commute • 67.8% Employees travel by Car Alone • 5.9% Carpooled with 1 other person; 1.2% Carpooled with 2 others; 0.8% Carpooled with 3 others • 1.5% by Taxi • 2.5% Travel by Train/Bus • 2.6% Travel by Bike/Walk • 65km a day average commute • Estimate of average of 261 working days. Over time Berry aims to move towards using regional-based factors and employee specific commuting data where possible.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The company does not have upstream leased assets for which it has operational control, and this category is therefore not relevant and not calculated.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

177567

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

37

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions relating to the delivery of goods to our customers, paid for by customers, are calculated by our logistics company in partnership with the Smart Freight Centre. Data is then extrapolated to cover the entirety of Berry Global's operations. When extrapolating data for delivery of goods to customers to cover facilities where activity data was not available, this has been completed based on the delivery emissions per Metric Tons sold.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Berry Global produces finished goods that require no further processing once leaving our facilities. Because of this, the Scope 3 emissions from this category can be considered not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

There are no further emissions associated with our products during their "use" phase, so therefore this section can be considered not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

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)

1835324

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

An average-data methodology was used, where global sales tonnage was multiplied by end-of-life scenario emissions factors, based on the average end-of-life scenario rate. Average end-of-life rates taken from most recent OECD data for recycling, landfilling and combustion. Global rates are currently used with our global production tonnage. Over time Berry aims to move towards using regional-based factors where possible.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not have any downstream leased assets so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not have any franchises so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not have any investments so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not have any other upstream emissions sources so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not have any other downstream emissions sources so therefore the emissions are not relevant, non-existent, and not included
[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

09/29/2022

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

6350382

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

75488

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

449043

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

441667

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

27873

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

11980

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

208467

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

177495

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

2130884

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

09/29/2021

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

6745241

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

80223

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

457983

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

445276

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

29237

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

5736

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

218281

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

197048

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

2243475

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

09/29/2020

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

6907176

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

72436

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

450924

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

381352

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

34195

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

11656

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

214122

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

215671

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

2027315
[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

berry-global-annual-sustainability-report-2023-v4.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Page 66-67

(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

berry-global-annual-sustainability-report-2023-v4.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

66-67

(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

berry-global-annual-sustainability-report-2023-v4.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

66-67

(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: Employee commuting
☑ 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: Downstream 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

berry-global-annual-sustainability-report-2023-v4.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

66-67

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

95
[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)

39966

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In FY23 we increased the amount of renewable energy consumed by 120,770 MWh, from 184,523 MWh in FY22 to 305,293 MWh in FY23. Due to the locations in which this renewable energy was procured and consumed, the emissions value saved by the increase in renewable energy was 39,966 MT CO2e. This accounts for a 2.2% decrease from previous years' emissions, which totaled 1,846,368 MT CO2e. [39,966/1,846,368*100] 2.2%*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20732

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We implemented emissions reduction projects as part of our 100 million KWh challenge, which aimed to reduce our energy usage by 100 million KWh across our global business. Through this challenge, a number of different types of efficiency projects were implemented, saving a total of 20,732 MT CO2e. This accounts for a 1.1% reduction from previous years' emissions, which totaled 1,846,368 MT CO2e. [20,732/1,846,368*100] 1.1%*

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

89158

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4.8

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In FY23, Production Volume fell 8.6% year over year. As a result of the decrease in production, we saw an estimated 4.8% decrease in emissions compared to the previous year, which totals 89,158 MT CO2e. This accounts for a 4.8% decrease from previous years' emissions, which totaled 1,846,368 MT CO2e.
*[89,158/1,846,368*100] 4.8%*

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

44981

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.4

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Each year we update the grid, gas, and fuel emission factors, from which we calculate our emissions, using the latest e-GRID and IEA data available; multiplying our usage in each country or region, by the relevant emission factor. In FY23, worsening across grid emission factors lead to an overall increase of 44,981 MT CO2e from our inventory. This accounts for a 2.4% increase from previous years' emissions, which totaled 1,846,368 MT CO2e. [44,981/1,846,368*100] 2.4%*
[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:
☑ Market-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:
☑ No

(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)

143896

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

59

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

70

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 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)

54

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

9387

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4815

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

163

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

10854

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

10854

Bosnia & Herzegovina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8503

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8503

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

13567

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

13567

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4361

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8721

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8716

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5423

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

143548

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

141416

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

137

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

6943

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

6943

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

105

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3102

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3102

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

58

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3218

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3218

Estonia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

123

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3425

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3425

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

382

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

382

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8650

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

14453

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

13374

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17459

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

104633

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

104473

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

9169

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

2718

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1667

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

17200

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

15424

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1368

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

38804

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3655

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5762

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

32059

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

29867

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

208

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

208

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

91

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8098

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8098

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

922

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

61934

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

61934

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

117

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3401

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3401

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

30

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1900

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1900

Slovakia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

170

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1511

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1511

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

165

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

38830

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

38830

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

287

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

20029

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

171

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

473

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

473

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

44

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

4545

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4545

Tunisia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1472

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1472

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13387

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

71558

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

71558

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

83249

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1047545

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1029087
[Fixed row]

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply
☑ By business division

(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	*Corporate (Fleet)*	*11832*
Row 2	*Engineered Materials*	*28264*
Row 3	*Consumer Packaging International*	*20248*
Row 4	*Health, Hygiene & Specialties*	*72351*
Row 5	*Consumer Packaging North America*	*11330*

[Add row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

(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	*Health, Hygiene & Specialties*	*410111*	*360538*
Row 2	*Consumer Packaging North America*	*529852*	*528737*
Row 3	*Consumer Packaging International*	*463311*	*432055*
Row 4	*Engineered Materials*	*286198*	*276139*

[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)

144025

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1689472

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1597469

(7.22.4) Please explain

All emissions fall within our consolidated accounting group

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

Our response does not include any other entities
[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

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

Select from:
☑ More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%

(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:*

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
	☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No

[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:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

767069

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

767069

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

305293

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

4316104

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

4621397

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

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

199163

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

199163

Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

33380

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

33380

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

305293

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

5315715

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

5621008
[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:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[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:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not currently use any Sustainable Biomass.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not currently use any Biomass.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not currently use any other fuels, such as renewable hydrogen

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We have phased all coal usage from our business.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

63792

(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

63792

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We use Oil for the generation of heat.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

703277

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

123269

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

515213

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

64795

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Gas is used in our businnes primarily for the generation of heat, but also for electricity and in rare cases, steam.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use other non-renewable fuels such as hydrogen currently.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

767069

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

123269

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

579005

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

64795

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Across our business we use both gas and oil to generate heat, and then in places, gas to generate electricity and stream.
[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 States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(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)

6862

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(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

RECs purchased annually by a group of our North American facilities to cover their electricity usage.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

69041

(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:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

vPPA set up to provide renewable energy for a portion of our electricity usage at our Spanish Facilities

Row 3

(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:
☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

31506

(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:
☑ Spain

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Renewable Energy contract in place to provide renewable energy coverage for the remainder of our spanish electricity usage.

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)

88227

(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:
☑ Mexico

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

We are on a 100% renewable electricity contract at all of our Mexico Facilities.

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(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)

15874

(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:
☑ Argentina

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

We have contracts in place providing us with renewable energy for 50% of our electricity usage in Argentina.

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(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)

648

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(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

RECs purchased to cover the electricity usage of one facility in the US.

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(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)

48181

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(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

RECs purchased to cover the electricity usage across multiple US facilities to produce products for a specific customer.

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2486

(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:
☑ China

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

On-site solar array at one of our Chinese facilities.

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

920

(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:

☑ China

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

On-site solar array at one of our Chinese facilities.

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ India

(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)

2617

(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:
☑ India

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

We have a wind power contract in place at an Indian facility to provide a portion of the sites' total electricity usage.

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ India

(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:
☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

6267

(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:
☑ India

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

We have a solar power contract in place at an Indian facility to provide a portion of the sites' total electricity usage.

Row 12

(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)

462

(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:

☑ 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

RECs purchased to cover the electricity usage of one facility in Germany.

Row 13

(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:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

14916

(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:

☑ 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

RECs purchased to cover the electricity usage of one facility in France.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(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)

6209

(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

RECs purchased to cover the electricity usage at a facility in Italy to produce products for a specific customer.

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(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)

5934

(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:

☑ 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

RECs purchased to cover the electricity usage at a facility in the Netherlands to produce products for a specific customer.

Row 16

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ France

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(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)

5143

(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:

☑ 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

RECs purchased to cover the electricity usage at a facility in France to produce products for a specific customer.
[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)

32593

(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)

32593.00

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

65345

(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)

65345.00

Bosnia & Herzegovina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11573

(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)

11573.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

129953

(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)

129953.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

67188

(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)

67188.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

223947

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

15114

(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)

239061.00

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

36033

(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)

36033.00

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7006

(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)

7006.00

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33104

(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)

33104.00

Estonia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5078

(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)

5078.00

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4115

(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)

4115.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

268648

(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)

268648.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

302144

(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)

302144.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12628

(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)

12628.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

60119

(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)

60119.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

97401

(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)

97401.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

80204

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

10730

(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)

90934.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20241

(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)

20241.00

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11992

(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)

11992.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

92729

(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)

92729.00

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9851

(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)

9851.00

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5067

(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)

5067.00

Slovakia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10911

(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)

10911.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

41459

(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)

41459.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

100546

(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)

100546.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

36917

(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)

36917.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9764

(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)

9764.00

Tunisia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3462

(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)

3462.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

340106

(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)

340106.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2501271

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

206698

(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)

2707969.00
[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

0.00014

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

1741494

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

12664000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

14.5

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our Scope 1 and 2 Greenhouse Gas intensity (metric ton of emissions per total revenue in USD) increased by over 14% from the previous year. This is predominantly due to a reduction in revenue (and therefore volume), which results in production inefficiencies. This was offset slightly by an improvement in renewable energy percentage, and additional emissions reduction activities.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.484

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

1741494

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

3596734

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

3.2

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our Scope 1 and 2 Greenhouse Gas intensity (metric ton of emissions per metric ton of production) increased by over 3% from the previous year. This is predominantly due to a reduction in volume, which results in production inefficiencies. This increase was offset slightly by an improvement in renewable energy percentage, and increased emissions reduction activities.

[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

0.67

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Total Energy Use (MWh)

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Production tonnage (MT)

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

4.7

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Absolute waste to landfill fell year over year, however due to the decrease in overall production, landfill waste intensity increased by over 4%, meaning we missed our target of a 5% reduction. The main reason for this increase is the inefficiencies associated with lower production volume, however we are assessing potential routes of improvement and identifying opportunities we can explore with our worst performing facilities.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

1.56

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Total Energy Use (MWh)

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Production Tonnage (MT)

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

2.9

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Our energy intensity (MWh of energy per metric ton of production) increased by just under 3% from the previous year, failing to meet our Impact 2025 target of a 1% year-over-year reduction. This is predominantly due to a reduction in volume, which results in production inefficiencies. This increase was offset slightly by increased energy reduction activities.
[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

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/31/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(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:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

09/29/2019

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

144559

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2197507

(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)

2342066.000

(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

09/29/2025

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25.2

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1751865.368

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

144025

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1597469

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1741494.000

(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

101.76

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers our entire Scope of Scope 1 and 2 reporting outlined in this CDP Response.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To ensure short-term alignment with our net-zero commitments.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.1.86) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

We have an annual program to reduce our energy usage by 100 million KWhs annually, which we achieved each year since initiation in 2021, and is also outlined in other sections of this CDP response. This involves a range of energy reduction programs including processes efficiency, lighting, and large capital projects. In addition, we increased our renewable energy purchases considerably since 2019, and the average grid-factor fell over the same period.

Row 3

(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

2022-02-11_Berry Global VAU Approval Letter 1_D02.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/31/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(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 3

(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 7 – Employee commuting

☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

09/29/2019

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7469525

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

77107

(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)

449368

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

418277

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

31189

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

20992

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

225109

(7.53.1.22) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

243231

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1976816

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

10911614.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

10911614.000

(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

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.43) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (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

09/29/2025

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25.2

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

8161887.272

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

5641992

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

72718

(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)

360462

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

355800

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

28512

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

12360

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

182272

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

177567

(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)

1835324

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

8667007.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

8667007.000

(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

81.63

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers our entire Scope of Scope 3 reporting outlined in this CDP Response.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To ensure short-term alignment with our net-zero commitments.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We have achieved over 80% of our reduction target so far, with 2 years remaining, so are on track to achieve or exceed our target goal. We will continue to work on existing processes to ensure the goal is met, including the transition to recycled content purchases, lightweighting of our products, and improvements in energy efficiencies.

(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

☑ Net-zero targets

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

06/28/2023

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

☑ Abs2

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

09/29/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and we have committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative in the next two years

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) 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)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers out full operations, with the aim to achieve a 100% reduction from our 2019 baseline by 2050, with up 10% of that reduction being emissions neutralization of any remaining residual emissions as per SBTi guidance. The methodology, including exclusions, matches that which is outlined in our Scope 1, 2 and 3 reporting guidance and coverage.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

The company aims to reduce its total Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions by 100% by 20250 with up 10% of that reduction being emissions neutralization of any remaining residual emissions, as per SBTi guidance. Meeting these goals helps ensure Berry is aligned with a 1.5C warming scenario and supports the Paris Agreement's goal of limiting global warming to well-below 2C.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ No, we do not plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

In order to ensure short-term alignment with our net-zero goal, we have set an official target of a 25.2% reduction by 2025 from a 2019 baseline, for both Scope 1 and 2, and Scope 3. In addition, we anticipate setting 1.5 degree Celsius aligned targets for 2030, 2035, 2040 and 2045.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Our short-term SBTi approved targets have been set to ensure that we remain aligned with our net-zero commitment. This allows us to monitor progress, address any deviations, and adjust our strategy in response to any emerging challenges or opportunities.
[Add row]

(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	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*175*	*10500*
Implementation commenced	*75*	*2500*
Implemented	*342*	*20734*
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

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Automation

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

341

(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)

18747006

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2644165

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 2.64m on 5 automation energy initiatives, saving over 877,000 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 341 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 1.85m, giving a payback period of 1-3 years.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Compressed air

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

901

(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)

973824

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

58125

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 0.97m on 26 Compressed air initiatives, saving 4,480,552 KWh of energy annually, which calculates to 901 MT of CO2e reduction across Scope 1 and Scope 2. The annual expected monetary savings is 973,824, giving a payback period of

Row 3

(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)

1728

(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)

1962244

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2531952

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 2.53m on 26 cooling technology energy initiatives, saving over 7,210,967 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 1,728 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 1.96m, giving a payback period of 1-3 years.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Electrification

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

545

(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

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

985000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

71992

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 71,992 on 4 electrification initiatives, saving over 1,754,852 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 545 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 985,000, giving a payback period of

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

689

(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)

232055

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

587212

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 587,212 on 16 HVAC energy initiatives, saving over 1,250,011 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 689 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 232,055 giving a payback period of 1-3 years.

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Insulation

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

26

(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)

67102

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we implemented 5 insultation initiatives at no cost, saving over 288,915 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 26 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 67,102 giving a payback period of

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1102

(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)

1002019

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

652866

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 652,866 on 40 lighting energy initiatives, saving over 4,000,142 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 1,102 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 1.00m giving a payback period of

Row 8

(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)

4807

(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)

10856204

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

9388556

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 9.39m on 94 machine/equipment replacement energy initiatives, saving over 13,498,136 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 4,807 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 10.86m giving a payback period of

Row 9

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Maintenance program

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

572

(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)

1198729

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

3574530

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 3.57m on 22 maintenance program energy initiatives, saving over 1,781,443 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 572 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 1.20 giving a payback period of 1-3 years.

Row 10

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Motors and drives

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1589

(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)

1353612

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1256407

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 1.26m on 31 Motors and drives energy initiatives, saving over 5,829,664 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 1,589 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 1.35m giving a payback period of

Row 11

(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)

2984

(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)

18790310

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

11747535

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 11.75m on 62 Process optimization energy initiatives, saving over 12,806,536 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 2,984 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 18.79m giving a payback period of

Row 12

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Reuse of water

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1017

(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)

1216662

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

464393

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we spent 464,393 on 3 Reuse of water energy initiatives, saving over 3,160,202 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 1,017 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 1.22m giving a payback period of

Row 13

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Solar shading

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

3021

(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)

360030

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we implemented 4 solar initiatives at no cost, saving over 5,619,723 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 3,021 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 360,030 giving a payback period of

Row 14

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Reuse of steam

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

904

(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)

193000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we implemented 2 steam initiatives at no cost, saving over 1,492,035 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 904 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 193,000 giving a payback period of

Row 15

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Waste heat recovery

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

477

(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)

285834

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we implemented 2 waste heat recovery initiatives at no cost, saving over 1,334,230 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 477 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 285,834 giving a payback period of

Row 16

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Wastewater treatment

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

31

(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)

55749

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Across Berry we implemented 1 wastewater recovery initiative at no cost, saving over 90,000 KWh of energy annually, which calculates at 31 MT of CO2e reduction. The annual expected monetary savings is 55,749 giving a payback period of
[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:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The primary drivers for decreasing energy and emissions are our electricity, natural gas, and greenhouse gas reduction goals. These corporate level goals roll down to each division and each plant. It is then up to each plant to determine what investment is necessary to meet the goal. Plants are recognized both for meeting their *goals as well as for implementing projects toward the goals. Our 100 million KWh initiative is an industry leader in encouraging our different facilities and business units to uncover new ways to save energy and to share best practice with other units. Additionally, executive compensation is tied to our greenhouse gas emissions targets, which are predominantly determined by our energy usage and efficiency improvements, which encourages a greater drive for investment in this area.*

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Employee engagement has been increased in regards to energy efficiency through the implementation of the Berry Global sustainability strategy as well as initiatives such as the increased uptake of ISO 50001 across the company, which requires employee engagement and training on energy use and efficiency.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

A shadow price for carbon has been implemented to raise awareness of the potential costs of GHG emissions and drive efforts to reduce GHG emissions.

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Manufacturing sites across Berry set energy efficiency budgets on an annual basis from which projects are generated. A portion of our capital budget is dedicated to energy efficiency projects, and through this we have an internal goal of achieving an energy reduction of 100 million KWh annually, which we achieved in fiscal year 2023.

Row 6

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We regularly stress the cost of energy and that those costs can be reduced by reducing energy consumption. All of our sites are therefore motivated to reduce energy consumption not only for the environmental benefits but also the financial benefits. We have developed tools which ensure emissions savings calculations are taken into account as part of wider financial optimization processes, including CapEx identification and production transfer optimization.

Row 7

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Targets set by compliance schemes such as the Climate Change Agreement for UK sites or targets set as part of the ISO 50001 accreditation drives emissions reduction activities.
[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:
☑ 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)

Other
☑ Other, please specify

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

We class all Plastic products as low carbon, as they have a lower contribution to climate change than alternative materials. TruCost published a study called "Plastics and Sustainability: A Valuation [...] for Continuous Improvement". In this study, they found plastic products to have 61% lower contributions to climate change than plastic alternatives (metal, glass, paper, etc.). Franklin Associates reached a similar conclusion in their Life Cycle Assessment "IMPACT OF PLASTICS PACKAGING [...] IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA: Substitution Analysis", which found plastic packaging had 56% lower GHG emissions than alternatives based on the substitution method. Additionally, our packaging innovation provides product protection; in multi-layer barrier packaging technology means that products have a long shelf life and reduces food waste throughout the supply chain and in the consumer's home which has a major environmental impact. We further reduce the carbon impact of all products by; Using recycled content, Lightweighting and using renewable materials. As 100% of our products are plastic, we believe they can reasonably be classed as a low carbon products when compared to alternative packaging materials.

(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

100
[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Row 1

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Water usage from non-production facilities (Offices/Warehouses)

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Small volume [rainwater]

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

Water is used directly for cooling in our manufacturing process, as well as in some of our other processes in our recycling facilities. In comparison, the water usage at our non-production facilities is de-minimis and therefore excluded from our reporting.
[Add row]

(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

Invoices and/or Meter Readings

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure and report their monthly water withdrawals in cubic meters. Annual Berry Global water withdrawals are reported as a standalone, and as a KPI (cubic meters/tonne produced). Sites' monthly reported figures are monitored, and abnormal figures are investigated prior to annual accounting.

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

Invoices and/or meter readings.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites monitor water withdrawals by source - the main source being third party, municipal sources. The source for all water withdrawals for each site is measured and reported internally each month. Sites' monthly reported figures from each source are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated prior to annual accounting.

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

Visual inspections and/or analytical testing.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites monitor water withdrawal quality alongside withdrawal volume and source.

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

Invoices and/or meter readings.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure and report their monthly water discharges in cubic meters. Annual Berry Global water discharges are reported as a standalone, and as a KPI (cubic meters/tonne produced). Sites' monthly reported figures are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated prior to annual accounting.

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

Invoices and/or meter readings.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure and report their monthly water discharges in cubic meters. Annual Berry Global water discharges are reported as a standalone, and as a KPI (cubic meters/tonne produced). Sites' monthly reported figures are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated prior to annual accounting.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(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

Visual inspections and/or analytical testing.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure treatment method for all their monthly water discharges. Treatment methods for all of sites' discharge methods are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated prior to annual accounting.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(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

Visual inspections and/or analytical testing.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure discharge quality, including temperature, for all their monthly water discharges. Water quality for all of sites' discharge methods are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(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

Visual inspections and/or analytical testing.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure discharge quality, including water emissions rate, for all their monthly water discharges. Water quality for all of sites' discharge methods are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(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

Visual inspections and/or analytical testing.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure discharge quality, including temperature for all their monthly water discharges. Water temperature for all of sites' discharge methods are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated.

Water consumption – total volume

(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

Calculation based on withdrawals and discharge metrics.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Berry Global sites measure and report their monthly water withdrawals and discharge in cubic meters, from which consumption can be calculated. Annual Berry Global water consumption is reported as a standalone, and as a KPI (cubic meters/tonne produced). Sites' monthly reported figures are monitored and abnormal figures are investigated prior to annual accounting.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Reuse or recycling of water does occur at a number of sites across Berry Global, but this is not currently monitored at a high level.

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:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Tracking and review vs WASH criteria.

(9.2.4) Please explain

At this time, we have verified with operational leadership that all of our sites meet minimum WASH expectations. Our draft self-assessment was developed in line with WBCSD guiding principles.
[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)

7445

(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:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The total decrease in water withdrawals is 77 megaliters. As this change is an decrease, but of less than 1%, we consider this "lower" than the previous year. The reason for this reduction primarily due to a reduction in overall production across our operations, but also due to our approach to reducing water intensity 1% Year on Year. Over the next 5 years we expect to reduce water withdrawals over 1% each year through efficiency advancements, so would consider each years withdrawals to be "lower" than the previous, and the five year reduction to withdrawals to be "much lower" when compared to current.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

6305

(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 efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The total increase in water discharge is 277 megaliters. As this change is an increase, but of less than 5%, we consider this "higher" than the previous year. The reason for this increase is primarily due to increased efficiency of water consumption, meaning more water is discharged from our operations, Through efficiency advancements, over the next 5 years we expect to reduce water withdrawals and water consumption by over 1% each year, so over 5% each in total. With withdrawals "much lower", and consumption also "much lower", the effect on discharge will be negated, and we would expect it to remain about the same.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

1140

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The total decrease in water consumption is 354 megaliters. As this change is a decrease of greater than 5%, we consider this "much lower" than the previous year. The reason for this reduction primarily due to a reduction in overall production across our operations, bringing down total withdrawals, but also due to our approach to reducing water consumption intensity Year on Year. Over the next 5 years we expect to reduce water consumption over 1% each year through efficiency

advancements, so would consider each year's consumption to be "lower" than the previous, and the five year reduction to withdrawals to be "much lower" when compared to current. This is amplified by our work to also reduce total withdrawals by a similar amount.
[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)

1810

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much 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:
☑ Higher

(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

24.31

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Updates to the WRI Aqueduct tool to reflect global conditions meant that a greater number of our facilities were identified as in areas of water stress, therefore increasing the volume of withdrawals in such areas. While there were reductions in withdrawals across these facilities, the total volume of withdrawals overall was still much higher. Over the next 5 years we expect a similar trend to continue, and therefore have marked our forecast as higher.
[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:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We did not do any withdrawals from any fresh surface water sources during the 2023 reporting period.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We did not do any withdrawals from any brackish or seawater sources during the 2023 reporting period.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1091

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much 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

Ground water withdrawal is most commonly from boreholes allowing the sites to be self-sufficient with water supply and avoiding low flow rates at times of high water demand. Withdrawals from his site decreased by more than 5% than last year, so we consider this "much lower" than the previous year. This is a result of those sites and/or our operations that withdrew from these sources showed lower levels of production to the previous year, so less water was required.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We did not have any withdrawals from any non-renewable groundwater sources during the 2023 reporting period.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We did not have any withdrawals from any produced water sources during the 2023 reporting period.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

6354

(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

Third party water sources are our primary water source due to availability, quality and security of supply. We reported lower withdrawals than last year (
[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)

2

(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:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Water discharge to this source was previously only relevant for only a small number of sites who discharge their groundwater withdrawal as surface water hence the difference between surface water withdrawal and discharge numbers. For the majority of these sites, they no longer discharge any water as surface water, and instead the water is discharged municipally.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We did not have any discharges to any brackish or seawater destinations during the 2023 reporting period.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

90

(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:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Water discharge to this source is relevant for only a small number of sites who discharge their groundwater withdrawals back as groundwater. This discharge amount reduced by more than 5% so we consider this "much lower" than the previous year.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

6213

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

The majority of our water discharges are to third party destinations, similarly to our water withdrawals, as this is often the most available and responsible route for our water discharges. Water discharges to this source increased as a result of reduced discharges to other sources.

[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:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant: In all our plants, discharge is not released to the natural environment without treatment. Water volumes are discharged either after on-site treatment/purification or after treatment by a third party.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant: In all our plants, discharge is not released to the natural environment without treatment. Water volumes are discharged either after on-site treatment/purification or after treatment by a third party.

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

Water treatment is handled at site level, and volume data by treatment method is not calculated at group level. Water is either treated on site, or discharged to a third party without treatment.

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

Not relevant: In all our plants, discharge is not released to the natural environment without treatment. Water volumes are discharged either after on-site treatment/purification or after treatment by a third party.

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

Water treatment is handled at site level, and volume data by treatment method is not calculated at group level. Water is either treated on site, or discharged to a third party without treatment.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not Relevant
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply
☑ Nitrates
☑ Phosphates
☑ Pesticides

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

We do not track data relating to emissions of priority substances to water as these substances are not used as part of our manufacturing process, and any emissions released will only occur as part of facility maintainence. Data is tracked at site level, and emissions are always within allowed permit limits.
[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

20

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

When a facility is situated in a location identified by WRI as high or extremely high risk in any of the major risk categories, we classify this facility as high-risk. Facility managers and divisional leaders for high-risk facilities are informed of their high-risk status and required to develop individual action plans at the site level to mitigate their water risk. These plans are focused on implementing best-practice improvements for on-site water efficiency and working with the local communities on water-related issues. In addition, high-risk facilities are cross-referenced with annual water intensity metrics. Facilities with above-average water intensity levels are classified as the highest risk. These facilities must undertake specialized action plans in conjunction with the corporate water risk team to investigate, in detail, the current water requirements of the facility and identify efforts to reduce water intensity. Additional water withdrawal and consumption reduction targets may be put in place for these facilities to further prioritize efficiency improvements and mitigate water risk. In 2023, 20 facilities (8%) were considered highest risk.

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, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

While the production of resin is more water intensive than converting plastic resin, we have multiple key suppliers all over the world, which reduces our risk at any given location. Further, resin suppliers are typically located next to large bodies of water to ensure availability. which reduces the potential impact of baseline water stress and drought.
[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 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America

☑ Other, please specify :San Gabriel

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.86481

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-117.811726

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

34.3

(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

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

34.3

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

29.8

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

29.8

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

4.5

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

France
☑ Other, please specify :Leie

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.717704

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

2.737779

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

51

(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

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

50.9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

37.7

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

37.7

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

13.2

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

Belgium

☑ Other, please specify :Schledt

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

51.073414

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

4.043182

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.7

(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

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

0.7

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.6

(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

0.6

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Black

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.363563

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-78.552244

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

448.4

(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

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

448.4

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

312

(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

312

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

136.4

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America
☑ Other, please specify :Santa Ana

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.998175

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-117.69894

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

30

(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

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

30

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

26.7

(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

26.7

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3.3

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

China

☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.910824

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.45887

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

37.1

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ 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

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

37.1

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

37.1

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

37.1

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

All water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling).

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Raritan

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.331333

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-74.458648

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

35.9

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ 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

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

35.9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

31.9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ 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

31.9

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3.9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

Netherlands

☑ Meuse

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

51.756765

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

5.860133

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

173.6

(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

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

173.6

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

149.8

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(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

149.8

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

23.8

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

Germany
☑ Rhine

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.43538

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

10.302852

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

387.2

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

380.4

(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

6.8

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

344.6

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

344.6

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

42.6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Saluda

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.736241

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-82.379598

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

16.8

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

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

16.8

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

15

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

15

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Duck

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.429857

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-86.756017

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

26.1

(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

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

26.1

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

23.2

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

23.2

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2.9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Rocky

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.091223

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-80.687305

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

24.6

(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

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

24.6

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

24.6

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

24.6

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

All water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling).

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America
☑ Other, please specify :South Yadkin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.625123

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-80.796768

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

74.7

(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

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

74.7

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

64.3

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

64.3

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

10.5

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Aqua Fria

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.448685

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-112.241755

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

45.3

(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

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

45.3

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

39.4

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(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

39.4

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

5.9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

China

☑ Other, please specify :Lingshan Wan

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.98419

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.18818

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

23.3

(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

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

23.3

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

21.6

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

21.6

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.7

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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 States of America
☑ Other, please specify :Manatee

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

27.410301

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-82.531267

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

13.8

(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

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

13.8

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

12

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

12

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.8

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

China

☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.348092

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.794045

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

79.7

(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

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

79.7

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

79.7

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

79.7

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

All water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling).

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

Thailand
☑ Other, please specify **:**Chao Phraya Delta

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

13.557533

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

100.650436

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

16.9

(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

16.9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

15

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ 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

15

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

Canada

☑ St. Lawrence

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

43.76536

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-79.162582

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

8.9

(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

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

8.9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

7.9

(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

7.9

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.

Row 20

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

n/a

(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

China

☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.75783

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

117.24084

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

15.9

(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

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

15.9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

14.2

(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

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

14.2

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.7

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The majority of water withdrawn at this facility is discharged after use (cooling), with a small amount consumed.
[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:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not currently have third-party verification of any water-related metrics, as these are considered less material than metrics relating to Energy and GHG Emissions.
[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:

☑ This is confidential

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

12664000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

1701007.39

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

We have a target of a 1% reduction in water intensity (per MT produced) year-over-year, and anticipate that our forward trend should follow that target. Our revenue-based efficiency should generally trend in the same direction.
[Fixed 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:

☑ Less than 10%

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

We do not quantify this at group level, but estimate revenue from Berry products containing SVHC's is well under 0.1%, and none of these products compositions include greater than 0.1% SVHC.

[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

	Products and/or services classified as low water impact	Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Lack of internal resources	*We have not yet analysed life-cycle analyse of our products vs alternative materials to determine, and certify, their water impact comparisons.*

[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.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Water pollution is managed at a site-level, in compliance with all local and regional requirements. Currently we do not feel an additional corporate goal is required on this topic.

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

We do not feel that there are any other water-related aspects material to us that require a corporate target in place.
[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:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per unit of production

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

09/30/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

09/29/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

1.91

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

09/29/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

1.88

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

2.08

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Expired

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-567

(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

Targets covers 100% of reported water withdrawals across the business.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Our water withdrawal intensity increased in FY23 compared to FY22, which fell short of our target of a 1% decrease. This was mainly as a result of a decrease in production which causes operational inefficiencies.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Increase in the proportion of employees using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

09/30/2016

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

09/29/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

100.0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

09/29/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(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

Target covers 100% of facilities.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Safety is a top priority at Berry. The safety of our workers includes safe water and sanitation. We do not accept anything less than 100% access to water and sanitation at all our facilities, every year.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

At this time, we have verified with operational leadership that all of our sites meet minimum WASH expectations. Safety is the number one value for Berry and it is the responsibility of Berry to provide a safe and responsible working environment to employees
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.1.2) Target type and metric

Plastic packaging

☑ Eliminate problematic and unnecessary plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is reusable

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is compostable

☑ Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale

☑ Increase the proportion of renewable content from responsibly managed sources in plastic packaging

Microplastics

☑ Reduce the potential release of microplastics and plastic particles

(10.1.3) Please explain

As a plastic converter, we have multiple targets relating to plastic packaging, including targets to; Achieve 100% reusable, recyclable, or compostable packaging by 2025; Lightweight products; Increase use of circular plastics (30% by 2030); Achieve 10% post-consumer recycled content (PCR) across our packaging by 2025.In addition, we also have targets relating to operational waste management, including management of plastic resin/microplastics waste; Reduce landfill intensity by 5% year over year; Prevent resin loss through Operation Clean Sweep (OCS); Implement OCS at acquisition sites within the first year.

[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain.

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain.

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain.

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain. In our direct Operations we do not produce goods or services that use plastic packaging (other than plastic goods already covered in the above categories) or provide financial services.

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain. In our direct Operations we do not produce goods or services that use plastic packaging (other than plastic goods already covered in the above categories) or provide financial services.

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain.

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We are a plastics converter and recycler, and therefore plastics are used/produced in all aspects of our business and supply chain. In our direct Operations we do not produce goods or services that use plastic packaging (other than plastic goods already covered in the above categories) or provide financial services.

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

All activities covered by the above categories.
[Fixed row]

(10.3) Provide the total weight of plastic polymers sold and indicate the raw material content.

(10.3.7) Please explain

This is confidential. While all Polymer produced is recycled resin, we do not report on the total weight of polymer sold, or provide a breakdown by percentage.
[Fixed row]

(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content.

	Please explain
Durable goods and durable components sold	*This is confidential. We do not report on the total weight sold, or provide a breakdown by percentage.*
Durable goods and durable components used	*We do not currently track this datapoint at the corporate level.*

[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

Plastic packaging sold

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply
☑ % virgin fossil-based content
☑ % virgin renewable content
☑ % pre-consumer recycled content

☑ % post-consumer recycled content

(10.5.3) % virgin fossil-based content

90

(10.5.4) % virgin renewable content

0.6

(10.5.5) % pre-consumer recycled content

5.8

(10.5.6) % post-consumer recycled content

3.6

(10.5.7) Please explain

We do not report on the total weight sold, it is confidential.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

Plastic packaging sold

(10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

Select all that apply
☑ % reusable
☑ % technically recyclable
☑ % recyclable in practice and at scale

(10.5.1.2) % of plastic packaging that is reusable

1

(10.5.1.3) % of plastic packaging that is technically recyclable

86

(10.5.1.4) % of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice at scale

84

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

Technically recyclable is as determined by Berry Global (using guidelines from APR and RecyClass), not following EMF Guidelines from the Recycling Rate Survey. Recyclable in practice and at scale is as determined by EMF.
[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments
	Select from: ☑ No, we are not taking any actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

[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?
	Select from: ☑ No

[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

We do not currently track locational data against this area type.

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

We do not currently track locational data against this area type.

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

We do not currently track locational data against this area type.

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

We do not currently track locational data against this area type.

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:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Analysis completed using WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter tool, where data for Global KBAs were overlaid onto HydroSHED Level 7 assessment areas and classified into risk classes. Further information can be found in their methodology document.

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

We do not currently track locational data against other area type.
[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ China

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Qingdao-Rizhao coastal wetland and islands

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ South Africa

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Ethekwini south

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Ethekwini north

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

Row 4

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ South Africa

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Illovo

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 5

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ South Africa

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

False Bay Coast

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 6

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Spain

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Montsant and Prades mountains

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

Row 7

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Mountains of Barcelona

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 8

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Spain

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Cortados del Jarama

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 9

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Spain

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Sierras de Lokiz, Urbasa y Andía

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 10

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ France

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

La Dombes

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 11

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Slovakia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Ostrovné lúky

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

Row 12

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Oberes Rhinluch / Havelländisches Luch Nauen-Friesack

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 13

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Fiener Bruch

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 14

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Netherlands

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Rijntakken

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 15

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Netherlands

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Slagharen - de Krim

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

Row 16

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

North Pennine Moors

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

Row 17

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Bowland Fells

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 18

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Upper Blue Ridge Mountains

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

Row 19

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Santuario del Agua y Forestal Subcuenca Tributaria Arroyo Sila

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

Row 20

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Shenzhen Wutongshan

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Plastic converting facility

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

[Add 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

☑ Fuel consumption

☑ Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ASAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Intertek Assuris were commissioned by Berry Global for independent third-party verification of Berry's energy metrics for Fiscal Year 2023, calendar normalized to from October 1st 2022 to September 30th 2023. Verification was performed in accordance with ISAE 3000. This was a limited assurance assessment. Verification statement can be found on pages 66-67 of our attached sustainability report.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

berry-global-annual-sustainability-report-2023-v4 (3).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

Chief Executive Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

[Fixed row]