Hilton Food Group plc

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

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

Printed date: 09/23/2025

Contents

Contents

C1. Introduction 10

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? 10

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. 10

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. 10

(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. 10

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period? 11

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. 12

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? 12

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. 14

(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities? 14

(1.8.1) Please provide all available geolocation data for your facilities. 15

(1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure? 24

(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source. 26

(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue? 34

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? 38

(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? 39

(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)? 40

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities 45

(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? 45

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? 46

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? 46

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. 47

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? 52
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? 52
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? 54
(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? 57
(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities. 57

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 59

(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? 59
(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. 59
(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. 80
(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? 83
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations? 88
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? 89
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by? 89
(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? 90
(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. 90
(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. 102

C4. Governance 105

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? 105
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? 106
(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. 106
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? 112
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization? 114

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 115
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? 120
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 121
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? 125
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. 125
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? 130
(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? 131
(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year? 132
(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. 135
(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? 136
(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. 137

C5. Business strategy 139

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? 139
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis. 140
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis. 155
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan? 157
(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning? 158
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy. 159
(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning. 161
(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition? 164
(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition. 164
(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? 165
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? 166
(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon. 166
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? 169

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? ... 170
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? ... 173
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process? ... 176
(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. ... 178
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues. ... 181
(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity ... 192
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. ... 192
(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members. ... 197
(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement? ... 200
(5.13.1) Specify the CDP Supply Chain members that have prompted your implementation of mutually beneficial environmental initiatives and provide information on the initiatives. ... 201

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach ... 203
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data. ... 203

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change ... 204
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP? ... 204
(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? ... 204
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? ... 204
(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? ... 205
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. ... 206
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions. ... 206
(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? ... 207
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. ... 207
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e? ... 215
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e? ... 217
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. ... 220
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years. ... 230

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. 239
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements. 240
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 241
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 243
(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? 254
(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. 254
(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? 260
(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure? 260
(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business? 261
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type? 264
(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). 264
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. 266
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. 270
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity. 270
(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure? 270
(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category. 270
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. 272
(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity. 272
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. 272
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response? 273
(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary. 274
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period. 289
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges? 310
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future? 310
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy? 311
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. 311
(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh. 312

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel. 314
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. 315
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year. 319
(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. 321
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. 331
(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. 337
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business. 340
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? 341
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. 341
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year? 350
(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production. 350
(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets. 353
(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s). 355
(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. 358
(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. 358
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below. 359
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? 364
(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits? 365
(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice. 365
(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged? 369
(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation? 369
(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation. 370
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services? 372
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? 373
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products. 373

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year? 375

C8. Environmental performance - Forests 376

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data? 376

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity. 376

(8.2.1) Provide details on any soy embedded in animal products sourced by your organization. 377

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes. 379

(8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel? 410

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year? 410

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year. 412

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them. 417

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used. 427

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes. 429

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities. 432

(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date. 436

(8.9.2) Provide details of third-party certification schemes not providing full DF/DCF assurance. 438

(8.9.3) Provide details of production unit monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date. 438

(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date. 440

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities. 442

(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint. 443

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes. 446

(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes. 447

(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members. 448

(8.12.1) Provide details of the certified volumes sold to each requesting CDP Supply Chain member. 450

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain? 458
(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details. 458
(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals? 459
(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation. 460
(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year. 461
(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in. 464
(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains? 465
(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains 465
(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection? 467
(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s). 467

C9. Environmental performance - Water security 471

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? 471
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? 471
(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? 477
(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. 480
(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress? 481
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. 483
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination. 486
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge. 488
(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? 491
(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year. 492
(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? 553
(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member? 556

(9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member. ... 556
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency. ... 559
(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source. ... 560
(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services. ... 563
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? ... 564
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact? ... 565
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets? ... 565
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. ... 565
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made. ... 566

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics ... 569
(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type? ... 569
(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities. ... 569
(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content. ... 572
(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content. ... 573
(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used. ... 574
(10.6) Provide the total weight of waste generated by the plastic you produce, commercialize, use and/or process and indicate the end-of-life management pathways. ... 575

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity ... 577
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? ... 577
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities? ... 577
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year? ... 578
(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity. ... 580

C13. Further information & sign off ... 611
(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? ... 611
(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used? ... 611
(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. ... 612
(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website. ... 612

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:
☑ English

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

Select from:
☑ GBP

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Hilton Foods is a leading international protein manufacturer, supplying major retailers through 24 state of the art facilities across Europe, Australia, and New Zealand, with expansion planned in Canada and the Middle East. Founded in 1994, the Group has evolved from a UK meat processor into a diversified business, offering meat, fish, prepared meals, and plant-based proteins. Each facility is run by a local management team enhanced by specialist central leadership, expertise, advice and support. Hilton Foods also hold strategic investments to further diversify their portfolio in Foods Connected (award-winning supply chain software), Agito Group (automation solutions), and Cellular Agriculture Ltd (developing scalable alternative protein production). In Portugal, we operate under a profit-sharing joint venture model. Hilton Foods do not directly own or operate any primary agriculture, fisheries or slaughter facilities, instead focusing on advanced food processing, packing and logistics, delivering scale, efficiency, and consistent quality.
[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

12/31/2024

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

Select from:

☑ No

(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:

☑ 4 years

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

Select from:

☑ 4 years

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

Select from:

☑ 4 years

[Fixed row]

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

3988300000.00

(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

GB00B1V9NW54

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:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

HFG.L

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

B1V9NW5

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

213800JY7VJFS2OOX355

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

21-984-0027

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

☑ Greece
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Denmark
☑ Ireland
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ 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	*Data for all sites*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Australia, Victoria

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-37.827292

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

144.764544

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Werribee basin

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Australia, Queensland

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-27.644156

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

152.988381

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Brisbane basin

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Australia, Perth

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.362256

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

115.687236

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Collie / Preston basin

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

New Zealand

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-37.002247

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

174.85589

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Northern Wairoa basin

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fairfax Meadow, Derby

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

52.902068

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-1.448725

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Derwent basin

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fairfax Meadow, Enfield

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.648527

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.028584

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Lee basin

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fairfax Meadow, Eastleigh

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.978904

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-1.387787

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Beaulieu basin

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Denmark

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

56.100465

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

10.074285

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Gudena / East Denmark Coast basin

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sweden

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

59.584817

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

16.474509

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Lake MÃlaren basin

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Central Europe

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.099236

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

19.04195

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Sola basin

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Portugal

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.25071

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-8.71196

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Tagus Basin

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ireland

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.730187

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-6.328453

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Boyne basin

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Greece

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.9885

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

20.72388

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Achelous basin

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Dalco Oostehout

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.631647

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.88383

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Meuse Delta basin

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Holland

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

52.424841

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.808734

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Zuiderzee basin

Row 17

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Grimsby, Estate Road

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.576669

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.112103

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Great Eau basin

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Grimsby, Laforey Rd

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.582183

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.12025

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Great Eau basin

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Foppen NL

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

52.362746

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

5.646433

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Zuiderzee basin

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Huntingdon

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

52.347548

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.190349

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Great Ouse basin
[Add row]

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

Production

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

Select from:

☑ Value chain (excluding own land)

(1.11.2) Primary reason emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

Select from:

☑ Do not own/manage land

(1.11.3) Explain why emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

The land in our ownership is land for some of the plants operations. It is not relevant for forestry or/ and agriculture.

Processing/ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Distribution

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Retailing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

13832

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☑ Kilogram

(1.22.10) Provide details of the methods, conversion factors used and the total commodity volume in the original unit

divide by 1000 to get from kg to t

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Primary packaging

☑ Secondary packaging

☑ Tertiary packaging

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ 1-5%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 81-90%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

We use timber products in packaging, as paper, cardboard and wood.

Palm oil

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

13

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☑ Kilogram

(1.22.10) Provide details of the methods, conversion factors used and the total commodity volume in the original unit

divide by 1000 to get from kg to t

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil derivatives

☑ Refined palm oil

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

We don't source palm oil directly, but palm oil appear to be in our ingredients

Cattle products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Processing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

268368

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☑ Kilogram

(1.22.10) Provide details of the methods, conversion factors used and the total commodity volume in the original unit

divide by 1000 to get from kg to t

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Beef

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ 51-60%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 51-60%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.19) Please explain

Cattle is main product of Hilton Foods for business

Soy

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Mixture of embedded soy and direct soy

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

104057

(1.22.6) Of the total commodity volume, state how much is embedded soy (metric tons)

103476

(1.22.7) Of the total commodity volume, state how much is direct soy (metric tons)

534

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☑ Kilogram

(1.22.10) Provide details of the methods, conversion factors used and the total commodity volume in the original unit

divide by 1000 to get from kg to t

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Embedded soy [soy row only]

☑ Soybean meal

☑ Other, please specify :Soy protein concentrate.

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 71-80%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

The total of volumes embedded and direct don't add up to total because we accounted for soy in ingredients
[Fixed row]

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

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

Fish is sourced from wild and farmed suppliers which are subject to Group's strict quality requirements, as well as retail customers own specifications. These products are then retail packed ready for Group's customers to sell.

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

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

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

Poultry Products: poultry is sourced from abattoir companies which are subject to Hilton Foods strict quality requirements, as well as retail customers own specifications. These sheep products are then retail packed ready for Group's customers to sell. Pig Products: pig meat is sourced from abattoir companies which are subject to Hilton Foods strict quality requirements, as well as retail customers own specifications. These pig products are then retail packed ready for Group's customers to sell.

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 51-60%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

Cattle Products: Beef is sourced from abattoir companies which are subject to strict quality requirements from Hilton Foods, as well as retail customers own specifications. These beef products are then retail packed ready for Group's customers to sell.
[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders relevant and included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Through product traceability systems we have been able to assess our value chain in detail to farm, feed production, packaging production unit and consumer. We have further mapped a generic value chain for input resources into those processes based on national data in material geographies.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain
☑ Downstream value chain
☑ End-of-life management

(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

Select all that apply
☑ Preparation for reuse
☑ Recycling
☑ Waste to Energy
[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:
☑ 100%

(1.24.2.7) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped for this sourced commodity

Palm oil

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(1.24.2.7) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped for this sourced commodity

Cattle products

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.7) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped for this sourced commodity

Soy

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(1.24.2.7) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

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

The short term horizon covers our immediate in-year actions.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

The medium-term horizon includes our near-term business strategy.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(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

The long-term time horizon encompasses our actions that contribute to achieving our net zero strategy, our asset life and sufficient time period for climate-related risks to manifest.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Plastics

☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(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

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare) approach, TNFD

☑ SEDEX

☑ TNFD – Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

☑ Life Cycle Assessment

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Drought
☑ Wildfires
☑ Heat waves
☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

Chronic physical
☑ Heat stress
☑ Water stress
☑ Sea level rise
☑ Change in land-use
☑ Declining water quality
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy
☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation

Market
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

Reputation
☑ Impact on human health

Technology

☑ Transition to reusable products

☑ Transition to recyclable plastic products

☑ Transition to increasing recycled content

☑ Transition to increasing renewable content

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Other commodity users/producers at a local level

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

☑ Water utilities at a local level

☑ Other water users at the basin/catchment level

(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 accordance with provision 28 of the 2018 UK Corporate Governance Code, the Directors confirm that they have carried out a robust assessment of the emerging and principal risks facing Hilton Foods that might impede the achievement of its strategic and operational objectives or affect performance and cash position. As a leading international food and supply chain services provider in a fast-moving environment it is critical that Hilton Foods identifies, assesses and prioritises its risks. The result of this assessment is a statement of principal risks together with a description of the main controls and mitigations that reduce the effect of those risks were they to crystallise. This, together with the adoption of appropriate mitigating actions, enables us to monitor, minimise and control both the probability and potential impact of these risks. Hilton Foods takes a proactive approach to risk management with well-developed structures and a range of processes for identifying,

assessing, prioritising and mitigating its key risks. The delivery of our strategy depends on our ability to make sound risk informed decisions. The Internal Audit function provides independent assurance that Hilton Foods risk management, governance and internal control processes are operating effectively. The Audit Committee are regularly updated on the risk based assurance plan by the Internal Audit function who maintain and review processes for risk identification and assessment, measurement, control, monitoring and reporting. The Board aims to balance a robust and proportionate control environment with the agility needed to pursue new business opportunities. Despite these efforts, the business will inevitably face certain risks and uncertainties, as outlined below. At Hilton Foods we nurture a culture where everyone is required to be aware of the risks facing the business and their responsibilities for managing them. To support this, we maintain and create an environment where employees feel comfortable speaking up. Our processes for identifying existing and emerging risks and responding collaboratively to them is managed by the Internal Audit function. Identified risks are measured and assessed for likelihood and impact allowing for the correct risk responses to be developed. Policies, procedures, controls and other measures are put in place to mitigate risks. We use a suite of preventative, detective and corrective controls. Risk ownership is assigned to key leaders. This ownership is reviewed as part of the ongoing risk management process. Mitigation plans and controls are developed collaboratively with the risk owner to ensure effective management. Not all the risks listed are within the Group's control and others may be unknown or currently considered immaterial, but could turn out to be material in the future. These risks, together with our risk mitigation strategies, should be considered in the context of our risk management and internal control framework, details of which are set out in the Corporate governance statement. It must be recognised that systems of internal control are designed to manage rather than completely eliminate any identified risks. Further details of our principle risks and approach to risk are detailed in our Annual Report.
[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

Interconnections are assessed through a matrix approach in our double materiality impact assessment process. This considers impacts and risks/opportunities separately and allows us to align impacts with risks/opportunities.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

☑ Areas of high ecosystem integrity

☑ Areas of rapid decline in ecosystem integrity

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

☑ Areas of importance for ecosystem service provision

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

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

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

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We used ENCORE tool (https://encorenature.org/en) to identify Key Biodiversity areas. We uploaded the locations of our sites and checked for protected areas and key biodiversity areas. We double checked Key biodiversity areas on related portal (www.keybiodiversityareas.org). For disclosure we selected those sites that are located in the 2 km threshold of key biodiversity areas.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we will be disclosing the list/geospatial map of priority locations

(2.3.6) Provide a list and/or spatial map of priority locations

Supplier map.pptx
[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
☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:
☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:
☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

5000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply
☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

All types of risks applicable to the business, including climate-related ones, are regularly reviewed and a formal risk assessment is carried out to highlight the most significant risks to the business. Identified risks are measured and assessed for likelihood and impact allowing for suitable risk responses to be developed. Our Risk Management Committee considers the risk appetite and reviews development and implementation of responses and internal controls. They report regularly to the Audit Committee, and risk exposure is also reviewed by the Audit Committee twice a year. Hilton Foods risk heat map, showing likelihood and impact, is shown in our Annual Report 2024, page 26.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

5000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

All types of risks applicable to the business, including climate-related ones, are regularly reviewed and a formal risk assessment is carried out to highlight the most significant risks to the business. Identified risks are measured and assessed for likelihood and impact allowing for suitable risk responses to be developed. Our Risk

Management Committee considers the risk appetite and reviews development and implementation of responses and internal controls. They report regularly to the Audit Committee, and risk exposure is also reviewed by the Audit Committee twice a year. Hilton Foods risk heat map, showing likelihood and impact, is shown in our Annual Report 2024, page 26.

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

We qualitatively assess the level of media exposure and the impact that will have on our brand.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

We qualitatively assess the level of media exposure and the impact that will have on our brand.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

Our facilities have effluent monitoring systems at the majority of sites, pollution control devices on outflows and regular water quality testing in place in line with our wider environmental management systems. This includes automatic pH monitoring and routine testing of outflows to monitor thermal, biological and chemical pollution. This is aligned to our Group Environmental Policy. The most relevant metrics are chemical oxygen demand, suspended solids, temperature and pH. Under the terms of our environmental permits we have conducted a risk assessment of potential hazardous substances to classify substances in accordance with the Industrial Emissions Directive. From this we have implemented appropriate measurement, interception and mitigation policies, in line with ISO14001.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Pathogens

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Pathogenic contamination of water, likely due to a failure in municipal water treatment and distribution. This could interrupt production as hygiene and production processes are not able to be completed safely.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

All our facilities have supplementary UV water treatment systems to prevent pathogenic contamination of products which could cause harm to human health. In addition, we conduct regular water quality testing across all water outlets. In the event of contamination being detected, we have procedures in place for immediate product recall of products produced during the relevant timeframe. In the factory, processes are in place to identify, isolate and clean relevant equipment and retest as necessary to prevent reoccurrence. If the cleanliness of local water sources cannot be restored rapidly, we have business continuity plans in place, sourcing tanker water to resume production.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

	Environmental risks identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Plastics	*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

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Poland

☑ Sweden

☑ Denmark

☑ Ireland

☑ Portugal

☑ Australia

☑ Netherlands

☑ New Zealand

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Hilton produces a wide range of protein-based products, including plant based, but our largest volumes are currently focused in beef, pork, lamb and seafood. If in the context of rising climate change awareness consumers could choose alternatives to beef and lamb to reduce their personal carbon footprint, this could have a significant impact on our revenue due to decreased consumer demand. Our exposure to this risk is Medium based on our internal assessment, assuming no mitigation from the transition to lower-carbon intensity proteins produced by the Group outlined below. We conducted detailed modelling of a potential reduction in demand for beef and lamb in the UK market, which is considered to be among the most impacted by changes in consumer behaviour as our research shows how health and sustainability are rapidly growing in importance as drivers of diet choices. In summary, we determined that beef and lamb products would receive the largest increase in pricing, albeit with some regional variation, and that the price of fish or plant-based products are unlikely to increase significantly.

(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:

☑ More likely than 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

Negative impact on sales without mitigation

(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)

1473127

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

5036400

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The actual potential for changes in demand for our products due to climate change concerns is very unclear at the moment and hence we have used the scenarios below as examples of possible impacts in this high-level analysis. These scenarios will change over time as we are able to include more details. The impact range is based on a modelled reduction in demand for beef and lamb of 5.85% to 20% in the UK market only, which is considered to be among the most impacted by changes in consumer behaviour. The range has been chosen to align with the IEA Stated Policy Scenario (5.85%) and the recommendations of the UK Climate Change Committee (20%). We have conducted consumer research in the UK that showed how health and sustainability are rapidly growing in importance as drivers of diet choices. The financial impact reflects the estimated annual gross profit impact from a reduction in UK Beef and Lamb assuming that there is pro-rata relationship between the estimated volume impact and gross profit and does not allow for any mitigating benefits from the transition to lower carbon intensity proteins produced by the group. The net profit from UK beef and lamb in 2024 had the value of 25,182,000 GBP. Other mitigations that have not been considered in this risk assessment include our ability to reduce the footprint of beef and lamb, and positively market these products together with verified reductions. 5.85% 25,182,000 GBP = 1.47 mil 20%* 25,182,000 GBP = 5.04 mil*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Agricultural practices

☑ Adopt alternative livestock management practices

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4440000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The costs we have included under 'costs of response' include the cost of our annual membership of the European Roundtable for Beef Sustainability (25,000 GBP) and the investment in Cellular Agriculture (4,400,000 GBP) Total cost of response to risk 25,000 + 4,400,000 = 4,425,000 GBP

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our strategic task is to work to reduce the impact of livestock farming, whilst also diversifying into proteins with a lower emissions intensity. As part of our Sustainable Protein Plan we have announced a commitment to double production of plant-based proteins by 2025 compared to a 2020 baseline. We are investing in acquisitions to gain market share in lower emission proteins, such as the outright purchase of Dalco, a producer of meat alternative plant-based protein products, in 2021 and Foppen, a large producer of salmon products in 2022. We have also invested in Cellular Agriculture, to develop cultured meat production processes, with a goal to commercialise this before 2048. Hilton Foods has aligned its objectives for mitigating the greenhouse gas emissions of cattle in the UK and Ireland to the European Round table for Beef Sustainability (ERBS) objectives of an intensity reduction of 15% in emissions of cattle with a timescale ending by 2025. We have published a transition plan for cattle (using independent expert advice) to identify the areas where the most impactful mitigations are and we are working collaboratively with other companies, farmers organisations, and government to implement them in line with our 2025 targets and 2030 SBT. The result of these combined actions will be to have a broad and balanced portfolio of proteins that aligns with consumer demand, and achieving significant reductions in the emission intensity of beef and lamb supplied to Hilton Foods.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

(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

☑ Greece

☑ Netherlands

☑ Norway

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Viet Nam

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increasing cost associated with verified DCF soy protein concentrate for suppliers, currently used as a major component in feed for farmed fish, will reduce the affordability of fish products to consumers, limiting their access to an important part of a sustainable balanced diet.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Negative impact on cost of ingredients without mitigation

(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)

1200000

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

3000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*The additional annual purchase costs of 20,000 tonnes of gutted salmon, based on 2-5% higher feed costs and feed being approximately 50% of the cost of production. Assumes baseline purchase cost of salmon is 6 per kg and that the increase was not absorbed by the supply chain. 20000 tonnes at 6 per kg 120,000,000 2% increase in feed costs would increase total production costs by 1% (2%*50%) 1,200,000 5% increase in feed costs would increase total production costs by 2.5% 3,000,000*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

135000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of a one-year project utilising the FERA facilities and the Greencore food waste to test various combinations of feed substrate and then produce at pilot scale for feed companies to evaluate. This has been fully costed and funded by a generous grant by WWF. Following this research insect meal is now being used in select supply chains

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The movement to DCF soya for animal feed supply chains is challenged by the availability of soy with complete traceability as the industry is still developing the processes around this. Thus our options are either to pay more for sustainable verified DCF soy protein concentrate or find an alternative protein source that has equivalent nutritional benefits and equal or better environmental footprint. The task is to evaluate the commercial production of insect protein meal fed on food waste and algae that has a lower LCA emissions footprint and delivers consistent high quality protein that will also maintain or improve feed conversion and fish health. The actions we are taking is working with Future By Insects, FERA and Greencore on a joint project that will grow algae to feed to black soldier fly larvae together with bread crusts / waste salad materials from a Greencore sandwich factory. The algae will be grown in food factory waste water and its growth will be accelerated by

adding CO2, that will ultimately be from their cooking system, potentially making the meal carbon neutral. The trails will be conducted at the FERA bioreactor and will produce sufficient quantities to prove the scalability and consistency of the resulting insect protein meal. The intention is to be able to implement this in our supply chain in the next three years.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Pollution incident

(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

☑ Greece

☑ Poland

☑ Sweden

☑ Denmark

☑ Ireland

☑ Portugal

☑ Australia

☑ Netherlands

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Gudena

☑ Meuse

☑ Rhine

☑ Other, please specify :Achelous (Greece), Tagus (Portugal), Beaulieu, Derwent, Great Eau, Great Ouse, Lee River basins (England), Boyne (Ireland), Lake Mälaren (Sweden), Collie/ Preston, Brisbane, Werribee river basin (Australia), Northern Wairoia (New Zealand)

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Contamination of water supplied to our site with a chemical or pathogen necessitating a pause in production.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in 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-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

Cost to remediate and lost production time

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

345538

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

No stock is likely lost or production lost so minimum cost is 0 GBP. Maximum cost is to cover cost of having to destroy stock which has been produced after the last clear sample. Calculated on an average basis. Expenses on raw materials and consumables used (3,531,400,000 GBP) split evenly over the 28 independent production units and allocated for one day. 3,531,400,000/28/365 = 345538

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

2605

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*Cost of tankered water for one day to supplement water that is not available (2080 GBP) plus cost of additional testing to confirm compliance at 45 outlets (11.66 per outlet). Total cost of response to risk 2080 11.66*45 2605*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

All sites are fitted with buffer tanks and supplementary UV water treatment to reduce the risk of contamination. Hot water systems are held above 60C to prevent microbial grown in those systems and hot water pipes are insulated to prevent heat transference that could cause heat transfer to cold water systems and promote microbial growth. Microbiological sampling is in place at all sites to monitor compliance. In response to the risk coming to fruition, tankered water would be used to supplement the supply of water and additional testing would be required to verify compliance before production can recommence. Number of outlets based on one of our larger sites.

Plastics

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of recycled or renewable content

(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

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increasing cost associated with acquiring recycled content in packaging making it difficult to source product meeting our internal requirements for packaging.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-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

Negative impact on cost of product without mitigation

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We are working with industry to increase the quality and quantity of recycled material. With our supply chain we have successfully implemented processes allowing mechanical recycling of coloured PET in our trays and we are working to increase the amount of tray-to-tray recycled content. In partnership with Klochner Pentaplast, and charity, Keep Sea Blue, we are upcycling discarded plastic collected from Greek Mediterranean islands for use in Tesco's fresh fish packaging, removing around 240 metric tonnes of plastic from the environment each year. In addition, we are members of the Circular Economy for Flexible Packaging

(CEFLEX) initiative, a collaboration of over 180 organisations representing the entire flexible packaging value chain to expedite the implementation of chemical recycling.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Cattle products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

(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

☑ Brazil

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Beef supplied from South America is associated with risks around uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land ownership and occupancy rights as well as documentation issues proving legal permission for the historic deforestation that they have carried out or was done on the land that they purchased. Thorough due

diligence is required to address risk of fines from breaching the regulations. The fines would not be substantive as traceability and verification in each country with forest risks can be verified by our supplier audits.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Fines, penalties or enforcement orders

(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:

☑ Very unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-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

Negative impact on cost of product without mitigation

(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)

0

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

42360000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This is the maximum fine that may be imposed (4% of EU revenue, GBP 1.059 bn in 2024) should we fail to demonstrate sufficient due diligence in assessing the legality of our supply chains when challenged over a proven case of illegal deforestation on a farm in our supply chain. The fine would be imposed immediately if we were found to breach regulation.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater due diligence

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4500

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost to realise the opportunity is the estimated cost to maintain the software with software company Foods Connected. In addition to the 150 hours (at average cost of 30/h) required to ensure the appropriate due diligence of our verified DCF cattle supply chain in South America to address this risk according to legislation. 150hrs * £30/h = 4500*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The actions we are taking are working with trusted suppliers to ensure that they have robust traceability through the supply chain and verification of the deforestation permission status of each production site. This is to be carried out by a verification of the legal permission for the original forest clearance combined with satellite monitoring of the farms to ensure that any further deforestation is identified. Our policy is to avoid purchasing from farms that continue to deforest after 2020 so the verification process will confirm that no further forest clearance has occurred. The results will be that all of our supply in forest risk countries is from farms that have robust and traceable permission for their original deforestation activities historically and the avoidance of farms that have undertaken any deforestation activity since 2020. These precautions will be effective in preventing risk of fines for insufficient due diligence and will improve Hilton Foods' resilience at a corporate level,

preventing any future financial impacts. Timescale of implementation is based on our DCF target by 2025. This due diligence began in 2020 and will continue until we meet our 2025 target and thereafter to ensure we maintain that level.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

(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

☑ Greece

☑ Poland

☑ Sweden

☑ Denmark

☑ Portugal

☑ Netherlands

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increasing cost associated with verified DCF palm oil for our own operations making it difficult to source product meeting our internal requirements.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Negative impact on cost of product without mitigation

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

42360000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This is the maximum fine that may be imposed (4% of EU revenue, GBP 1.059 bn in 2024) should we fail to demonstrate sufficient due diligence in assessing the legality of our supply chains when challenged over a proven case of illegal deforestation on a farm in our supply chain. The fine would be imposed immediately if we were found to breach regulation.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater due diligence

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4500

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost to realise the opportunity is the estimated cost to maintain the software with software company Foods Connected. In addition to the 150 hours (at average cost of 30/h) required to ensure the appropriate due diligence of our verified DCF supply chain. 150hrs * £30/h = 4500*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The actions we are taking are working with trusted suppliers to ensure that they have robust traceability through the supply chain and verification of the deforestation permission status of each production site. This is to be carried out by a verification of the legal permission for the original forest clearance combined with satellite monitoring of the farms to ensure that any further deforestation is identified. Our policy is to avoid purchasing from farms that continue to deforest after 2020 so the verification process will confirm that no further forest clearance has occurred. The results will be that all of our supply in forest risk countries is from farms that have robust and traceable permission for their original deforestation activities historically and the avoidance of farms that have undertaken any deforestation activity since 2020. These precautions will be effective in preventing risk of fines for insufficient due diligence and will improve Hilton Foods' resilience at a corporate level, preventing any future financial impacts. Timescale of implementation is based on our DCF target by 2025. This due diligence began in 2020 and will continue until we meet our 2025 target and thereafter to ensure we maintain that level.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

(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

☑ Greece
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Denmark
☑ Ireland
☑ Portugal
☑ Netherlands

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increasing cost associated with PEFC/FSC certified packaging our own operations making it difficult to source product meeting our internal requirements for packaging.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Negative impact on cost of product without mitigation

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

42360000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This is the maximum fine that may be imposed (4% of EU revenue, GBP 1.059 bn in 2024) should we fail to demonstrate sufficient due diligence in assessing the legality of our supply chains when challenged over a proven case of illegal deforestation on a farm in our supply chain. The fine would be imposed immediately if we were found to breach regulation.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater due diligence

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4500

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost to realise the opportunity is the estimated cost to maintain the software with software company Foods Connected. In addition to the 150 hours (at average cost of 30/h) required to ensure the appropriate due diligence of our verified DCF supply chain. 150hrs * £30/h = 4500*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The actions we are taking are working with trusted suppliers to ensure that they have robust traceability through the supply chain and verification of the deforestation permission status of each production site. This is to be carried out by a verification of the legal permission for the original forest clearance combined with satellite monitoring of the farms to ensure that any further deforestation is identified. Our policy is to avoid purchasing from farms that continue to deforest after 2020 so the verification process will confirm that no further forest clearance has occurred. The results will be that all of our supply in forest risk countries is from farms that have robust and traceable permission for their original deforestation activities historically and the avoidance of farms that have undertaken any deforestation activity since 2020. These precautions will be effective in preventing risk of fines for insufficient due diligence and will improve Hilton Foods' resilience at a corporate level, preventing any future financial impacts. Timescale of implementation is based on our DCF target by 2025. This due diligence began in 2020 and will continue until we meet our 2025 target and thereafter to ensure we maintain that level.

[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:
☑ Assets

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

82170

(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)

821700

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Estimate that there is a risk of up to a 10% fluctuation in costs of new solar panel installation. Potentially entire asset is at risk from catastrophic weather events. Data based on solar PV installation at SoHi facility.

Forests

(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)

477797

(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)

57026139

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Estimated 2% premium for the purchase of certified deforestation free packaging material where this is not legally required. Calculated from total spend on paper/cardboard in 2024.

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)

386000

(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)

3300000

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Additional levy on water withdrawal from areas of high water stress. Estimated at an additional 1 GBP per tonne.
[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

Australia
☑ Other, please specify :Werribee

(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:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The site located in this area could become inoperable in extreme cases.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Greece

☑ Other, please specify :Achelous

(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:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The site located in this area could become inoperable in extreme cases.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Portugal

☑ Other, please specify :Tagus

(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:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The site located in this area could become inoperable in extreme cases.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify :Brisbane

(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:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The site located in this area could become inoperable in extreme cases.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Other, please specify :Lee River

(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:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The site located in this area could become inoperable in extreme cases.

Row 6

(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:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The site located in this area could become inoperable in extreme cases.
[Add row]

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

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Enforcement orders or other penalties but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

There were 7 incident(s) of non-conformance in FY 2024. At our Huntingdon (UK) business, it was identified that some solids were passing into the sewer. It was identified that around the time of the inspection that the screening filter had become blocked, and this had allowed water to bypass screening and enter the discharge

tank. Since this, physical guards have been installed both around the top and sides of the discharge tank so that any potential overspill is redirected back into the pre-screening tank. Additional checks have also been instated to ensure that the filter is cleaned and working effectively. At our Dalco Oosterhout (Netherlands) site between May to June 2024, a series of 6 incidents occurred where unusual amounts of sunflower oil were discharged into the drain. Since this, temperature sensors and oil valves have been adjusted, and more in-depth training has been implemented, to prevent similar incidents happening again.
[Fixed 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, but we anticipate being regulated in the next three years

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

To achieve the emissions reductions required, there are calls by the UK Climate Change Committee and others to change consumers eating habits to lessen meat consumption and increase other protein sources in their diet. Policy changes may therefore be implemented to drive down emissions in the agricultural sector and to shift consumer behaviours toward lower carbon options. Changes in carbon policy could be realized as a carbon tax or levy on food producers or retailers, inclusion of agricultural activities within existing cap and trade schemes, or through adjustments to existing agricultural subsidies. While future policy is uncertain, as part balance emissions reductions with the needs of a growing population and ensure continued levels of food security which contribute to a balanced and healthy diet. As such, there may be an increase in incentives for carbon offsetting schemes on agricultural land, or increased R&D incentives for low carbon agricultural techniques. The situation is currently unclear and is likely to be implemented in different ways across different political landscapes but on the balance of probability we anticipate some form of carbon pricing or land pricing to take effect in one of our four key geographies before 2025. We anticipate there is a high likelihood that UK ETS or EU ETS, are extended to cover at least one of our operations in the next two years. While future policy is uncertain, as part of our initial climate-related scenario analysis, Hilton sought to deepen understanding of how changes to carbon tax could impact upon our supply chain and impact upon pricing strategies adopted for different protein products. By leveraging our IT and automation solutions for supply chain management, we have an opportunity to add a strategic growth driver in the sale of technology and services to other companies to enable them to become more efficient and reduce operating emissions. Through Hilton Services, the Group is at the forefront of technology and physical architecture design, which improves internal logistics. We continue to work with customers and suppliers to incentivise uptake of our technology and supply chain solutions, incorporating robotics and warehouse automation systems. Since our investment in Foods Connected, this subsidiary has continued to grow, providing end-to-end supply chain management services and further opportunities for category diversification. We use Foods Connected to both give us the data we need around our business and supply chains, but also share that data up and downstream, helping farmers and suppliers to consider what the particular carbon footprint of their part in the supply chain is. Our joint venture with the Agito Group facilitates our development of highly automated logistics solutions for our supply chain and retail partners. We can also lead in environmental data collection and traceability across multi-tier supply chains and capitalize on growing requirements for transparency across value chains to prevent negative environmental impacts. We expect to see some steps towards carbon taxes in some of our markets by 2025. If product pricing is adjusted to reflect its carbon footprint there may be a reduction in consumer demand, leading to reduced profits from foods where the footprints have not been mitigated. The timing and methodology by which carbon pricing is imposed is uncertain, but the UK Health Alliance on Climate Change recommends the food industry sets a climate tax on food products with a high footprint to align with UK decarbonization targets. In New Zealand, plans to integrate the agricultural sector within the country's greenhouse gas emissions cap and trade system from 2025 have been proposed. Hilton Foods continues to be actively involved in supply chain carbon reduction programs in collaboration with other industry stakeholders and are targeting net zero emissions by 2050. To

progress our objective for reducing the emissions intensity of cattle by 15% by 2025, we have engaged in leadership of collaborative action to address the footprint of cattle farming with the European Round Table in Beef Sustainability (ERBS) and UK Cattle Sustainability Platform (UKCSP). We are in the process of developing a detailed decarbonization plans for key species to responsibly reduce our footprint and reduce our exposure to this risk.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of renewable 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

☑ Australia

☑ Portugal

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Hilton Foods is the leading specialist international food packing business. Our role in the meat value chain can have a direct impact in both the reduction of costs and the carbon footprint of the products delivered to ever-demanding consumers. Being a global company, but headquartered in the United Kingdom, Hilton Foods is subject to emerging regulations on carbon taxes, such as expanding scope of the EU ETS. This gives us the incentive to become more efficient and to purchase more renewable energy, what would also address our commitment to setting science-based targets to achieve net zero carbon across all of the food types we produce. Hilton Foods did already start switching to renewable contracts for countries where the price difference between the renewable and conventional contracts is not significant. Currently, as part of its SBT targets Hilton Foods has ambitious target to reduce its scope 1 and 2 targets by 2030 and has already set a target to reach the 100% share of renewables in its electricity mix in Europe by end of 2025 and globally by 2027, and plans are in place to achieve that. The opportunity deriving from switching to renewable electricity is a way for Hilton Foods to avoid paying the potential carbon taxes in its countries of operation. These are anticipated before the end of 2025. In this way Hilton Foods will assure that there is no increase or limited increase in operational costs ones the carbon taxes are in place as well as to improve resilience.

(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

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:
☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium

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

Reduced costs and reduced cost volatility

(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)

0

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

288462

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Contractual savings at Australian site to use 100% renewable electricity compared to grid AUD600,000/2.08 = £288462

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

502490

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost here is calculated based on the cost of a consultancy to support with understanding the market possibilities, tendering and legal implications of a power purchase agreement (PPA) of 23000 GBP and the average price on green electricity premium for the green products in Europe, which is currently of around 3.14 GBP/MWh multiplied with the global electricity consumption (152704). 3.14 GBP 152704 MWh 23000 = 502,490*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Hilton Foods has identified that more than 80% of our Scope 1 and 2 carbon footprint is determined by purchased electricity. In order to exceed our Science Based Target Hilton Foods has set itself the task of sourcing 100% renewable energy in Europe by 2025 and globally by 2027. Hilton Foods has acted on this, transitioning our electricity contracts across Europe to renewable supply with selected Australian sites being added in 2026. This has resulted in savings of over 20,000 tCO2e relative to non-specific supply.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased brand value

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The opportunity to grow sales and build consumer confidence by ensuring physically traceable verified DCF soy in all of our animal feed for our meat and fish products. There is a high potential for additional revenue in the UK and other countries where there is a growing consumer demand for products that have a lower footprint. Our consumer research shows that there is a specific demand for lower footprint livestock products. Using 100% DCF soy in feed will enable this. Our actions are driven by our commitment is to eliminate the conversion of natural forests to agriculture or livestock production in our supply chains by the end of 2025. Our strategy is to engage in collaborative forums to influence and negotiate directly with the major soy traders and through them to influence the practices of growers. We are founder members of the Soy Transparency Coalition and the UK Soy Manifesto, and sit on the governance board of the UK Soy Manifesto. We support the development of livestock sector plans in each of the countries where we source livestock that will deliver physically verified supply chains of DCF soy. Hilton Foods is part of an industry working group supporting DEFRA in developing the supply chain verification requirements and guidance to comply with the new UK regulation. We have been utilising both soy credits and mass balance certificates

(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:

☑ Medium-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

Increased sales and increased profit as a result

(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)

7103375

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

7103375

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The potential impact figure is based on the increase in sales by 5% if we had 100% DCF soy in our UK and Europe salmon supply chain as these regions are identified as an area with greater demand for this criterion. Calculation: 5% multiplied by estimated 2024 salmon revenue in UK & Europe.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

2486181

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*Calculation: Estimated DCF premium of 3.5% on feed, which is 50% of total cost of Salmon (GBP 142067500) 0.035*0.5*142067500 = 2486181*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*Our strategic actions are driven by our commitment to eliminate deforestation from the conversion of natural forests to agriculture or livestock production in our supply chains by the end of 2025. As one of many actions we are taking to address traceability of the soy supply chain, we are on the governance board of the UK Soy Manifesto, this resulted in 60% of the British food industry having a common commitment to DCF soy and a common to ask to the soy traders. We published Our UK Commitment to Sourcing Deforestation and Conversion Free Soy in 2022. We are supporting DEFRA in developing secondary regulation under the Env. Act to require due diligence against illegal deforestation. Our engagement is both directly and through the organisations we are members of. We are mapping soy usage and origin to allow us to conduct risk assessments for each of our supply chains, and to then develop appropriate deforestation due diligence. We are engaged in collaborative action to achieve verified DCF soy supply chains to the UK, and to the livestock feed industries in the countries where we import livestock from. Some examples of actions we are taking are: • We are founder members The Soy Transparency Coalition and through this forum we co-fund the soy trader benchmarking surveys and reports. • We joined the UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soya at its launch in July 2018 alongside our retail partners, where we have made a joint commitment to help protect the forests in South America from further deforestation. • We are leading the development of a sector plan for soy fed to cattle within the UK Cattle Sustainability Platform. This strategy is being implemented currently; all the Soy Protein used in our salmon feed complies with this commitment. We helped negotiate with the Soy Protein Concentrate (SPC) traders a collective commitment to only source DCF soy, with robust third-party verification processes and a cut-off date of Jan 2020. All the soy we use as a direct ingredient comes from farms that are in regions where there is no deforestation and conversion. With the target to have all UK product supply chains DCF by 2025. In Ireland we are working with Bord Bia and DFAM together with other industry stakeholder to implement the European Union Deforestation Regulation. Calculation: Estimated DCF premium of 3.5% on feed, which is 50% of total cost of Salmon (GBP 142067500) 0.035*0.5*142067500 2 486 181*

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Reduced water usage and consumption

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Werribee; Brisbane

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The opportunity to install rainwater harvesting systems to supplement water consumed by our on site cooling systems, which are wholly separate from hygiene systems.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Reduced costs

(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)

11058

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

12308

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

11058

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

12308

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Based on design that saves 150 kL/day, avoiding 23,000-25,600 AUD in water costs. Converted at exchange rate of 2.08

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

142652

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Quotation from supplier 297000 AUD / 2.08 = 142652 GBP

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Site level civil surveys have been carried out to assess the technical aspects of implementation. Plan to implement in most water-stressed sites. Total cost 297000 AUD.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Cattle products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased sales of existing products and services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Brazil

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The opportunity is to grow our food service market share by providing assurance of the DCF status of all of the beef we purchase from South America. The strategy is to work with supplier partners to develop robust verification processes to trace purchases to farms that they are monitoring and prohibiting their land from deforestation or natural habitat conversion. By integrating our traceability tools in Foods Connected with geospatial monitoring of the farms we can provide visibility to the end customer. Geospatial monitoring tracks the condition of the ranches, ensuring that cattle purchased do not originate from properties with deforested areas. Monitoring of the indirect suppliers is the greatest challenge as requires the engagement of the entire value chain to ensure complete cattle traceability. As a case study, our principle supply chain partner, has pioneered the wider application of geospatial monitoring technology to 100% of direct suppliers in all biomes of Brazil (Amazon, Cerrado, Pantanal and Atlantic Forest). In 2021 the implementation of monitoring for 100% of purchases in Paraguay was concluded., and 90% are monitored in Argentina. Our partner has also started to integrate 2 new systems to further enhance the data from Geospatial monitoring and look further back down the supply chains - 1. Visipec a traceability and monitoring tool for indirect suppliers. The tool cross-references information from a property's Rural Environmental Registry (CAR, in Portuguese)

(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:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Increased sales and increased profit as a result

(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)

265500

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

265500

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The potential impact figure is based on the estimated sales which could be increased with full traceability for deforestation 10% increase in sales associated with traceable supply chains 265 500

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

22500

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Membership of The Soy Transparency Coalition which is leading delivery

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our strategic actions are driven by our commitment is to eliminate deforestation from the conversion of natural forests to agriculture or livestock production in our supply chains by the end of 2025. As one of many actions we are taking to address traceability of the soy supply chain, we are on the governance board of the UK Soy Manifesto, this resulted in 60% of the British food industry having a common commitment to DCF soy and a common to ask to the soy traders. We published Our UK Commitment to Sourcing Deforestation and Conversion Free Soy in 2022. Additionally, we are mapping soy usage and origin to allow us to conduct risk assessments for each of our supply chains, and to then develop appropriate deforestation due diligence. We are founder members The Soy Transparency Coalition and through this forum we co-fund the soy trader benchmarking surveys and reports. This strategy is being implemented currently; all the Soy Protein used in our

salmon feed complies with this commitment. With the target to have all product supply chains DCF by 2025. Calculation: Total volume of products sold in the UK with soy-based feed 71909073 tonnes.
[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:
☑ CAPEX

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

821700

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Installation cost of new solar panels at SoHi plant.

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ OPEX

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

1500

(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

Planting of trees on site to improve resilience, enhance local biodiversity and improve the environment for employees.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ CAPEX

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

12000

(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

Installation of rainwater capture facilities on our sites.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ 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

Our Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) policy reflects our commitment to embracing diversity in all its forms, truly reflecting the communities in which we operate and ensuring equitable opportunities for our people in all aspects of employment. Policy Contents • Working Practices • Recruitment • Learning and Development • Capability and Succession • Pay and Benefits • Behaviour and Definitions • Grievance • Responsibility

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

equity-diversity-and-inclusion-policy-2024.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply
☑ Director on board
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
☑ Other, please specify :Chief People Officer

(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
☑ Individual role descriptions
☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Sustainability Committee Terms of Reference

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

Select from:
☑ Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

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

Select all that apply
☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement
☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Positions listed are those in the Sustainability Committee. The Board has ultimate responsibility for sustainability, provides rigorous challenge to management on progress against sustainability and wider business goals and targets. The Sustainability Committee monitors the progress and performance of the Group's sustainability strategy (the Sustainable Protein Plan, or SPP), key initiatives for reducing business' climate footprint throughout our value chain, as outlined in our Transition Plan, and our performance in reducing our overall environmental impact. The Chair of the Sustainability Committee reports any updates to the Board as a standard agenda item at each Board meeting and informs the Board of our strategy and progress every three months.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

☑ Other, please specify :Chief People Officer

(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

☑ Individual role descriptions

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Sustainability Committee Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement
☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Positions listed are those in the Sustainability Committee. The Sustainability Committee discusses climate-related risks, opportunities, impacts and dependencies, and the progress of the SPP, including our Deforestation and Conversion Free (DCF) commitment. The committee also reviews and guides R&D priorities, annual budgets and monitors performance against targets. The Board is formally updated on the progress of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan every three months.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Director on board
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
☑ Other, please specify :Chief People Officer

(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

☑ Individual role descriptions

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Sustainability Committee Terms of Reference

(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 and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Positions listed are those in the Sustainability Committee. The Sustainability Committee has oversight of water target, monitoring compliance with our commitment to SDG 6 and Courtauld Commitment, and overseeing the assessment and review of dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities disclosed in TCFD. Furthermore, they are updated on and review innovation and R&D towards improving water efficiency. The Board is formally updated on the progress of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan every three months.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

☑ Other, please specify :Chief People Officer

(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

☑ Individual role descriptions

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Sustainability Committee Terms of Reference

(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 and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement
☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Positions listed are those in the Sustainability Committee. The Sustainability Committee discusses climate-related risks, opportunities, impacts and dependencies, and the progress of the Sustainability strategy including our DCF commitment and progress towards the certification of our supply chain to deforestation and convers supply. In addition to oversight over the strategy the committee also reviews and guides R&D priorities, and annual budgets and monitors implementation and performance against targets. The Board is formally updated on the progress of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan every three months.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
	☑ 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 Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(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 Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer has responsibility of forest-related issues, including monitoring progress against our deforestation commitment and the management of the annual budget. Through the Sustainability Committee (which the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer is a member of), the Board gets quarterly progress updates on our 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan and relevant climate-related issues. Furthermore, an annual deep dive on our sustainability strategy (including climate change, forests, water and biodiversity) is presented to the Board directly by the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(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 Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer has responsibility of forest-related issues, including monitoring progress against our deforestation commitment and the management of the annual budget. Through the Sustainability Committee (which the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer is a member of), the Board gets quarterly progress updates on our 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan and relevant climate-related issues. Furthermore, an annual deep dive on our sustainability strategy (including climate change, forests, water and biodiversity) is presented to the Board directly by the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

(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 Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer has responsibility of water-related issues. Through the Sustainability Committee (which the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer is a member of), the Board gets quarterly progress updates on our 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan and relevant climate-related issues. Furthermore, an annual deep dive on our sustainability strategy (including climate change, forests, water and biodiversity) is presented to the Board directly by the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ 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 Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer has responsibility of biodiversity and nature-related issues, including the Nature Positive Plan from page 41 of our 2024 Annual Report. Through the Sustainability Committee (which the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer is a member of), the Board gets quarterly progress updates on our 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan and relevant climate-related issues. Furthermore, an annual deep dive on our sustainability strategy (including climate change, forests, water and biodiversity) is presented to the Board directly by the Chief Quality and Sustainability Officer
[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

12

(4.5.3) Please explain

The inclusion of sustainability metrics in Hilton Foods Long-Term Incentive Plan (LTIP), enables us to embed our Transition Planning within our business strategy and incentivise management to deliver it. The annual bonus for the Executive Directors is augmented by the personal element bonus which is calculated based on several metrics including Scope 1 and 2 energy efficiency, Scope 3 and SMETA audit which includes an environmental section as part of the criteria.

Forests

(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

7

(4.5.3) Please explain

The inclusion of sustainability metrics in Hilton Foods Long-Term Incentive Plan (LTIP), enables us to embed our Transition Planning within our business strategy and incentivise management to deliver it. The annual bonus for the Executive Directors is augmented by the personal element bonus which is calculated based on several metrics including packaging recycled content and SMETA audit which includes an environmental section as part of the criteria.

Water

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2

(4.5.3) Please explain

The inclusion of sustainability metrics in Hilton Foods Long-Term Incentive Plan (LTIP), enables us to embed our Transition Planning within our business strategy and incentivise management to deliver it. The annual bonus for the Executive Directors is augmented by the personal element bonus which is calculated based on several metrics including SMETA audits which include an environmental section as part of the criteria.
[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

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Board approval of climate transition plan

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual multi-year bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

As three LTIPs are running at any point in time, see pages 30-31 of our Transition Plan for details of 2022-2024, 2023-2025 and 2024-2026. https://www.hiltonfoods.com/media/lmxgmiam/hilton-foods-transition-plan_2024.pdf

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

The purpose of our Long-Term Incentive Plan (LTIP) is to encourage and reward delivery of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan, as well as embedding our Transition Plan within our business strategy and incentivising management to deliver it. LTIPs provide a way of building up a meaningful shareholding in the Company and providing alignment with shareholders' interests.

Forests

(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

☑ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Eliminating deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems in direct operations and/or other parts of the value chain

Policies and commitments

☑ Increase in verified compliance with Deforestation and Conversion Free (DCF) policies and/or commitments

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual multi-year bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The ESG related performance conditions are 1) Packaging recycled content (5% weighting) 11.7% increase over 3 years 2) percentage of suppliers with a valid SMETA audit (2%) 80% of higher risk suppliers As three LTIPs are running at any point in time, see pages 30-31 of our Transition Plan for details of 2022-2024, 2023-2025 and 2024-2026. https://www.hiltonfoods.com/media/lmxgmiam/hilton-foods-transition-plan_2024.pdf

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

The purpose of our Long-Term Incentive Plan (LTIP) is to encourage and reward delivery of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan, as well as embedding our Transition Plan within our business strategy and incentivising management to deliver it. LTIPs provide a way of building up a meaningful shareholding in the Company and providing alignment with shareholders' interests.

Water

(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

☑ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual multi-year bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

80% of higher risk suppliers with a valid SMETA audit (2%) As three LTIPs are running at any point in time, see pages 30-31 of our Transition Plan for details of 2022-2024, 2023-2025 and 2024-2026. https://www.hiltonfoods.com/media/lmxgmiam/hilton-foods-transition-plan_2024.pdf

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

The purpose of our Long-Term Incentive Plan (LTIP) is to encourage and reward delivery of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan, as well as embedding our Transition Plan within our business strategy and incentivising management to deliver it. LTIPs provide a way of building up a meaningful shareholding in the Company and providing alignment with shareholders' interests.
[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

(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

This policy covers 100% of HFG manufacturing operations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Environmental and Human Rights Policies_CDP submission.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(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

This policy covers 100% of HFG manufacturing operations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Forests-specific commitments
☑ Commitment to no-conversion of natural ecosystems by target date, please specify :2025.12.31.
☑ Commitment to no-deforestation by target date, please specify :2025.12.31.

Social commitments
☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, in line with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Deforestation Statement and Human Rights Policy_CDP submission 2025.pdf

Row 3

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

This policy covers 100% of HFG manufacturing operations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Water Policy and Human Rights Policy_CDP submission.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

☑ UN Global Compact
☑ Cerrado Manifesto
☑ Plastic Pact Network
☑ Race to Zero Campaign
☑ Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)
☑ Global Roundtable for Sustainable Beef (GRSB)
☑ Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member
☑ Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)
☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
☑ UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy
☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Soy (RTRS)
☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
☑ Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP)

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

We engage with multiple frameworks to work towards the shared goal of having deforestation-free and conversion-free commodities. This engagement spans our collaboration with the Cerrado Manifesto, UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy, RTRS, RSPO, GRSB, FSC and WRAP. We are members of the UK Plastics Pact, and European and Canadian Plastics Pacts to help drive innovation and achieve infrastructural change to promote recycled materials and reduced plastics use. We have reported against the GRI and TCFD frameworks for multiple years (and TNFD reporting started in 2024) to promote transparency, push for best practices, and guide our progress. Similarly, we have been members of the UN Global Compact for numerous years as a platform to share best practice and learnings. Finally, we are members of the SBTi framework as an organisation with verified Science-Based Targets and a commitment to reach net zero by 2048. Similarly, we have been members of the UN Global Compact for numerous years as a platform to share best practice and learnings. Finally, we are members of the SBTi framework as an organisation with verified Science-Based Targets and a commitment to reach net zero by 2048.
[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 directly with policy makers

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

2024-sustainability-report.pdf

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on

Select all that apply
☑ Voluntary government register

(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization

EU Code of Conduct

(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

The Sustainability Committee includes our Director of Communications and Investor Relations, we have upskilled them on our Environmental policy and strategy to ensure our external engagement aligns with our commitments. This training has been extended to our Executive Leadership Team and Managing Directors. Other senior staff engaged in external stakeholder engagement have also had relevant sustainability training.
[Fixed row]

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Row 1

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

DEFRA Food Data Transparency Partnership

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

☑ Emissions – methane

☑ Emissions – other GHGs

☑ Other environmental impacts and pressures, please specify :Climate-related reporting, Climate Transition plans, Transparency requirement

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ National

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(4.11.1.6) Your organization’s position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Support with minor exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization’s proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

There are some elements of delivery that still need to be resolved, including the scope and immediacy of data flows which we are working constructively with the group to resolve but overall we are supportive of the policy.

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

☑ Responding to consultations

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

0

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

Harmonisation of data reporting from farm to fork allows us to effectively monitor our Scope 3 emissions without putting undue burden on the supply chain. That then allows us to focus resources on reducing emissions. This has informed our engagement by ensuring we support harmonisation across sectors, working particularly in the seafood sector with Seafish, the UK levy board. Success can be measured by the harmonisation of farm tools and the coalescing of the sector behind a few tools.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify :British Meat Processors Association

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

The British Meat Processors Association (BMPA) represents members on topics including food safety and science, environmental sustainability, diet and health. The BMPA is committed to reaching the UK government's 2050 net zero goal and Hilton Foods is actively engaged in its work developing a net zero programme for the sector.

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

51208

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

This funding supports ongoing sector-wide advocacy. This is not entirely climate-focused, but the BMPA engage regularly with government on relevant legislation.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ IFRS

☑ TCFD

☑ TNFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Commodity volumes
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Public policy engagement

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

TCFD & TNFD: 39-54; Biodiversity indicators: 26; Emissions, energy, commodity and water data: 55-60; GRI Index: 68-79

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024-sustainability-report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

We publish environmental information in multiple places including Sustainability Report, Annual Report, other frameworks, and on our website.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios
☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:
☑ SSP1

(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

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Impacts are considered in the context of the current business structure, financial performance and prices. Impacts are modelled to occur in a linear fashion, when in practice dramatic climate-related impacts may occur suddenly after tipping points are breached. The analysis considers each risk and scenario in isolation, when in practice climate-related risks may occur in parallel as part of a wider set of global impacts.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are strongly reduced, resulting in a trajectory consistent with limiting the temperature increase to less than 1.5°C in 2100 compared to the pre-industrial period. This provides a below 2°C scenario.

Forests

(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:
☑ SSP1

(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
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Impacts are considered in the context of the current business structure, financial performance and prices. Impacts are modelled to occur in a linear fashion, when in practice dramatic climate-related impacts may occur suddenly after tipping points are breached. The analysis considers each risk and scenario in isolation, when in practice climate-related risks may occur in parallel as part of a wider set of global impacts.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are strongly reduced, resulting in a trajectory consistent with limiting the temperature increase to less than 1.5C in 2100 compared to the pre-industrial period. This provides a below 2C scenario.

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

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

☑ 2080

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

To evaluate dependencies and impacts on water we used WRI Aqueducts physical risks data. Coastal and riverine flooding risks of varying intensities were also assessed using historical and forecasted data, providing a detailed understanding of potential water-related vulnerabilities.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

As water is crucial for our sites operations, we performed different scenarios to understand better our dependencies and impacts from water resource perspective.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(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

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Impacts are considered in the context of the current business structure, financial performance and prices. Impacts are modelled to occur in a linear fashion, when in practice dramatic climate-related impacts may occur suddenly after tipping points are breached. The analysis considers each risk and scenario in isolation, when in practice climate-related risks may occur in parallel as part of a wider set of global impacts. Hilton Foods primary revenue base is currently derived from meat proteins, thus it is important for us to understand how consumer purchasing behaviours are likely to change in this decade. Through our forward-looking risk assessment approach, we are well aware of changes to the market which may drive shifts in demand for proteins, i.e. a trend toward lower carbon or healthier alternatives or market disruptors such as lab-based proteins. Hilton does not directly own or operate the farms or abattoirs from which we source our protein products where the

more significant impact comes from our scope 3 emissions. We have therefore focused our scenario analysis on the impact that policy changes or consumer purchasing behaviours are likely to have on the Group's businesses and strategy. To develop a baseline understanding of consumption data for different protein sources in different geographical regions, we have considered the OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021-2030 which provides a baseline projection for protein consumption based on expectations of regional demand. We have considered our three key operating regions: the UK and Ireland, Europe and Australia. Our Dalco operations and SoHi joint venture operations are included in the modelling but Fairfax Meadow is not included in this modelling as it was acquired too late in the process. We consider impacts to a range of protein products, primarily pork, beef, lamb, fish and vegetarian proteins. Additional factors such as significant and unexpected inflation, efficiencies in farming practices, changes in the cost of agricultural production and changes in policy may further impact upon regional supply and demand and this would impact upon our analysis. It is currently unclear where and how changes to carbon policy could impact upon the supply chain. We have therefore assessed the impact of changes to a carbon price across the supply chain, to assess how this could impact upon the retail value of our produce, and consequently, on consumer behaviour.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

A combination of physical and transition risk impacts as temperatures rise by around 2.5°C by 2100 with 50% probability. This scenario is used as it represents a base case scenario with the trajectory implied by today's policy settings.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(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

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Impacts are considered in the context of the current business structure, financial performance and prices. Impacts are modelled to occur in a linear fashion, when in practice dramatic climate-related impacts may occur suddenly after tipping points are breached. The analysis considers each risk and scenario in isolation, when in practice climate-related risks may occur in parallel as part of a wider set of global impacts.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

GHG emissions continue to grow unmitigated, leading to a best estimate global average temperature rise of 4.3C by 2100. This scenario is included for its extreme physical climate risk impacts. This year Hilton Foods enhanced our physical risk assessment alongside further development of our risk disclosure. With 24 facilities across the world, Hilton Foods maintains a large and diverse geographical footprint. We have chosen to use geospatial risk modelling software to analyse the Group's exposure to natural hazards such as heat stress, sea level rise, storms and drought, and how these risks may change in the future under various scenarios for global temperature rise. The analytical choice was made to consider these impacts at 2030, 2050, and 2100. Our most pertinent physical risk exposure is global sea level rise, which under a baseline scenario presents a high or extreme risk to approximately a third of our total estate by 2100, concentrated in Grimsby and the Netherlands. The parameters of our modelling software mean that we are only able to model this risk to 2100, but modelling to 2100 gives some indication of what the most severe outcomes may be, which helps contextualise our response in our defined time horizons. All models assumed static business volumes as projections across such timescales would not be robust.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(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

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The WWF water risk filter was applied to our sites to assess ongoing water vulnerability

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

As water is crucial for our sites operations, we performed different scenarios to understand better our dependencies and impacts from water resource perspective.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(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

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Impacts are considered in the context of the current business structure, financial performance and prices. Impacts are modelled to occur in a linear fashion, when in practice dramatic climate-related impacts may occur suddenly after tipping points are breached. The analysis considers each risk and scenario in isolation, when in practice climate-related risks may occur in parallel as part of a wider set of global impacts. Hilton Foods primary revenue base is currently derived from meat proteins, thus it is important for us to understand how consumer purchasing behaviours are likely to change in this decade. Through our forward-looking risk assessment approach, we are well aware of changes to the market which may drive shifts in demand for proteins, i.e. a trend toward lower carbon or healthier alternatives or market disruptors such as lab-based proteins. Hilton does not directly own or operate the farms or abattoirs from which we source our protein products where the more significant impact comes from our scope 3 emissions. We have therefore focused our scenario analysis on the impact that policy changes or consumer purchasing behaviours are likely to have on the Group's businesses and strategy. To develop a baseline understanding of consumption data for different protein sources in different geographical regions, we have considered the OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021-2030 which provides a baseline projection for protein consumption based on expectations of regional demand. We have considered our three key operating regions: the UK and Ireland, Europe and Australia. Our Dalco operations and SoHi joint venture operations are included in the modelling but Fairfax Meadow is not included in this modelling as it was acquired too late in the process. We consider impacts to a range of protein products, primarily pork, beef, lamb, fish and vegetarian proteins. Additional factors such as significant and unexpected inflation, efficiencies in farming practices, changes in the cost of agricultural production and changes in policy may further impact upon regional supply and demand and this would impact upon our analysis. It is currently unclear where and how changes to carbon policy could impact upon the supply chain. We have therefore assessed the impact of changes to a carbon price across the supply chain, to assess how this could impact upon the retail value of our produce, and consequently, on consumer behaviour.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

A combination of physical and transition risk impacts as temperatures rise by around 2.5C by 2100 with 50% probability. This scenario is used as it represents a base case scenario with the trajectory implied by today's policy settings.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios
☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:
☑ SSP5

(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
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Impacts are considered in the context of the current business structure, financial performance and prices. Impacts are modelled to occur in a linear fashion, when in practice dramatic climate-related impacts may occur suddenly after tipping points are breached. The analysis considers each risk and scenario in isolation, when in practice climate-related risks may occur in parallel as part of a wider set of global impacts.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

GHG emissions continue to grow unmitigated, leading to a best estimate global average temperature rise of 4.3C by 2100. This scenario is included for its extreme physical climate risk impacts. This year Hilton Foods enhanced our physical risk assessment alongside further development of our risk disclosure. With 24 facilities across the world, Hilton Foods maintains a large and diverse geographical footprint. We have chosen to use geospatial risk modelling software to analyse the Group's exposure to natural hazards such as heat stress, sea level rise, storms and drought, and how these risks may change in the future under various scenarios for global temperature rise. The analytical choice was made to consider these impacts at 2030, 2050, and 2100. Our most pertinent physical risk exposure is global sea level rise, which under a baseline scenario presents a high or extreme risk to approximately a third of our total estate by 2100, concentrated in Grimsby and the Netherlands. The parameters of our modelling software mean that we are only able to model this risk to 2100, but modelling to 2100 gives some indication of what the most severe outcomes may be, which helps contextualise our response in our defined time horizons. All models assumed static business volumes as projections across such timescales would not be robust.
[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

Our most pertinent physical risk exposure is global sea level rise which, under a baseline scenario, presents a high-very high risk to roughly a third of our total estate by 2100 (long-term horizon), concentrated in Grimsby & the Netherlands. While this risk has widespread impacts and relies on collective and Government action (e.g. UK Environment Agency), we have also ensured our Netherland sites have very strong standards of regional flood protection (strategy and financial planning), and are strengthening our skills and modelling around this risk (capacity building). More detail in 2024 Annual Report page 69 and our Transition Plan.

Forests

(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

The results of heat stress show that all of our sites are located in zones of low or no wildfire risk currently. Weather conditions related to increased wildfire stress may slightly increase at some sites under our base case and worst case scenarios relative to current period, but the location of our sites in industrial zones away from vegetation mitigates direct impact from fires. Our exposure is not projected to increase materially across our estate under any scenarios or by any of the studied time horizons (2030, 2050 & 2100). This is outlined in more detail in our TCFD report.

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

☑ 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

For example, flooding in New Zealand has raised awareness of the potential risk to our facilities from storms and flooding. This could lead to disruption to production and increased costs. More detail in our 2024 Annual Report page 69.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.2.5) Description of activities included in commitment and implementation of commitment

Our transition plan covers scope 1, 2 and 3.

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

Select from:

☑ We do not have a feedback mechanism in place, but we plan to introduce one within the next two years

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

Our Transition Plan is aligned to current government policy in relevant markets, in particular those focused on decarbonisation, but includes relevant mitigations if those policies are not implemented change. More details can be found in attached relevant documents

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

This is our first iteration of our transition plan. Full detail can be found in our annual report attached and in this submission.

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

hilton-foods-transition-plan_2024.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Plastics

☑ Biodiversity

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

Ending deforestation is a key element of our transition plan and has been considered throughout as a key lever in our transition. The role of plastic packaging and how we can achieve a circular packaging system is a key pillar of our transition plan. We have also considered plastic remediation within that. Biodiversity was also considered throughout the development of the transition plan.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

As consumers are increasingly demanding food that is healthy for both people and the planet, Hilton Foods has adopted a strategy to diversify its product range, by investing in alternative lower emission protein products. This can be seen with the outright purchase of Dalco in 2021 and through our investments in Hilton Foods Seafoods and Cellular Agriculture. Our strategy to address deforestation is focused on farmed animal feed where soy is major component. We are also signatories to the UK Soy Manifesto and sit on the steering group.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Extreme weather and chronic climate change may impact the supply of crop products or have a detrimental impact on livestock production in our supply chain through degradation of pasture, volatility in the supply of animal feed or water, and physical heat stress. In response, we maintain flexibility in regional and global supply chains. For more details of upstream/downstream value chain risks and opportunities, see our combined TCFD & TNFD Report (Sustainability Report page 45-51)

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

There is a risk that we fail to take advantage of changing purchasing preferences for lower emission proteins. resulting in loss of market share and reduced revenues. Our mitigation strategy includes achieving significant reductions in the emission intensity of beef and lamb supplied to Hilton Foods and creating a diversified portfolio of proteins that aligns with consumer demand. We are including long-term financial planning for innovation in our agricultural supply over the 10 year time horizon, such as our existing project in the development of insect meal feed ingredients described in our response to strategy.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Rising sea levels, severe weather events and resource efficiency are some of the risks/opportunities to our own operations. In response, we will continue to proactively monitor projected changes to this risk and our business continuity plans at the site. We are also focused on improving the efficiency of water use. For more detail of our operational risks and opportunities, see our combined TCFD & TNFD Report (Sustainability Report page 45-51).
[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
☑ Acquisitions and divestments

(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

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

Climate related issues have influenced our financial decisions in acquisitions and divestments. Our acquisition of Seachill, our fish processing business, is seen to improve our sustainability reputation and influence given their strong track record for driving sustainability through the fish supply chain in the past. Additionally, Hilton Foods realized that there is a demand by consumers for food that is healthy for themselves and the planet. Social consciousness is of growing importance to consumers when making decisions about their lives and the food they eat. We continue to diversify the range of healthy, delicious proteins we offer to our customers and consumers. Our recent partnership with Cellular Agriculture and acquisition of Foppen demonstrates our continued commitment to diversify our range of sustainable products. As part of our journey to circularity, we had capital investments and direct costs in R&D in order to ensure we embed the waste hierarchy in every product decision we make. Reducing the amount of packaging we use is our first priority, before exploring reusable solutions and then striving for the highest quality recycling route. This is implemented through a set of sustainable design principles, using systems thinking to ensure we are providing the best packaging solution whilst considering any second life the product might have. These strategies ensure we are able to reduce the environmental impact of our packaging throughout the full product lifecycle.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply
☑ Revenues

☑ Direct costs
☑ Acquisitions and divestments

(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
☑ Forests

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

Forest-related issues have influenced financial decisions in the implementation of our traceability systems through Foods Connected. This enables us to monitor certification of ingredients in line with our deforestation policy.

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply
☑ Revenues
☑ Direct costs
☑ Acquisitions and divestments

(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

☑ Water

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

We have conducted detailed modelling on the availability of appropriate temperature water for production of salmon in the North Atlantic. Higher average temperatures may contribute to welfare risks such as an increased window for the potential of sea lice infestation, exacerbated gill health challenges due to the unpredicted presence of plankton, or prevalence of new diseases. As a consequence we are working to diversify our species portfolio. This requires us to invest in equipment that can robustly handle multiple seafood species.

[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	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Turnover methodology

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue/Turnover

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

3988300000

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

100

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

100

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

100

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

Turnover from subsidiaries with business-level transition plans in line with the group transition plan.
[Add row]

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

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

0

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

100

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

There was no water-related CAPEX in 2023 or 2024 but we plan water related capex in the future. At a group level we don't track our water related permits and quality testing spend. However we expect our water related OPEX is about the same as 2023 and will remain similar in the future.
[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

☑ Conduct cost-benefit analysis

☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment to international standards

☑ Alignment to scientific guidance

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

We have conducted a very limited pilot of a carbon price in specific business decisions to understand the effect that would have on decision-making. This was calculated by benchmarking other organisations and considering carbon prices used in other sectors, assuming that this is representative of the market price.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 - Capital goods

(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)

50

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

100

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

Select all that apply
☑ Capital expenditure
☑ Procurement

(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

0.1

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

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

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

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
		☑ Water ☑ Plastics

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on water availability

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

This is conducted in line with wider business thresholds. Where dependencies and impacts are identified in our supply chain with a risk potential over 50,000,000 GBP they are classified as substantive.

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

0

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

This is conducted in line with wider business thresholds. Where dependencies and impacts are identified in our supply chain with a risk potential over 50,000,000 GBP they are classified as substantive.

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

0

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on water availability

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

This is conducted in line with wider business thresholds. Where dependencies and impacts are identified in our supply chain with a risk potential over 50,000,000 GBP they are classified as substantive.

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

0

Plastics

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

Select from:

☑ No, we do not assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, and have no plans to do so within 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

☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Vulnerability of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We work with our suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our terms of trade. This helps to reduce the risks to our business around compliance, supply and resilience, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets. We have conducted risk assessments to identify substantive impacts and dependencies in our supply chain.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to forests

☑ Material sourcing

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We work with our suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our terms of trade. This helps to reduce the risks to our business around compliance, supply and resilience, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets. We have conducted risk assessments to identify substantive impacts and dependencies in our supply chain.

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

☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to water

☑ Business risk mitigation

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We work with our suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our terms of trade. This helps to reduce the risks to our business around compliance, supply and resilience, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets. We have conducted risk assessments to identify substantive impacts and dependencies in our supply chain.

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

☑ Other, please specify :Recycling

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We work with our suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our terms of trade. This helps to reduce the risks to our business around compliance, supply and resilience, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets. We have conducted risk assessments to identify substantive impacts and dependencies in our supply chain.
[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 Foods Connected Supplier Compliance solution simplifies supplier data capture and compliance checks through a clear and user-friendly format. The solution centralises supplier approval lists, questionnaires, approval and compliancy tracking and supplier documentation. In one central location, users can manage supplier compliance through supply chain mapping and risk assessments, supplier ranking and KPIs. The platform provides dashboard reporting, audit schedules and automated notifications to help users manage the supplier compliance process.

Forests

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, 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 Foods Connected Supplier Compliance solution simplifies supplier data capture and compliance checks through a clear and user-friendly format. The solution centralises supplier approval lists, questionnaires, approval and compliancy tracking and supplier documentation. In one central location, users can manage supplier compliance through supply chain mapping and risk assessments, supplier ranking and KPIs. The platform provides dashboard reporting, audit schedules and automated notifications to help users manage the supplier compliance process.

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 Foods Connected Supplier Compliance solution simplifies supplier data capture and compliance checks through a clear and user-friendly format. The solution centralises supplier approval lists, questionnaires, approval and compliancy tracking and supplier documentation. In one central location, users can manage supplier compliance through supply chain mapping and risk assessments, supplier ranking and KPIs. The platform provides dashboard reporting, audit schedules and automated notifications to help users manage the supplier compliance process.
[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

☑ Geospatial monitoring tool

☑ On-site third-party audit

☑ 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:
☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

N/A

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ No deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Certification
☑ Geospatial monitoring tool
☑ 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%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

N/A

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

☑ Geospatial monitoring tool

☑ On-site third-party audit

(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%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

N/A
[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:
☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Facilitate adoption of a unified climate transition approach with suppliers

☑ Other innovation and collaboration activity, please specify :We work with our suppliers on various projects such as: Recycled content in plastic packaging, sustainable soy in animal feed, highly efficient trawlers with on board processing of otherwise discarded products, and methane reducing feed additives.

(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%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Engaged suppliers to understand their transition activities and share research into shared supply chains.

(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 :certified soy in animal feed, recycled content in packaging

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Timber products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
☑ Engage with suppliers to advocate for policy or regulatory change to address environmental challenges

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers
☑ Tier 3 suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

101

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

We engage with our suppliers to ensure paper for our packaging comes from sustainable sources.

(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 :Deforestation and conversion free certification

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection
☑ Collect water quantity information at least annually from suppliers (e.g., withdrawal and discharge volumes)

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

We are working with suppliers to ensure production is not concentrated in areas of high water stress through detailed supply chain modelling. By identifying supply hot spots we are able to craft strategies to reduce this dependence.

(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 :Water stress hot spots

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Information collection

☑ Other information collection activity, please specify :Recyclability

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

We engage with our customers and suppliers to deliver a recyclable packaging and remove non-recyclable on each stage of the value chain.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Palm oil

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Engage with suppliers to advocate for policy or regulatory change to address environmental challenges

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

1

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

Engaged with suppliers, NGOs and EU MS competent authorities to ensure that our supply chains are deforestation free and will be compliant with the EU Deforestation Regulation - this ensures that the production of palm oil has not contributed to deforestation or forest degradation with a cut-off date of 30th Dec 2020. In high risk countries we will utilise satellite mapping and third party certification services to provide these assurances.

(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 :Deforestation and conversion free certification

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Cattle products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Engage with suppliers to advocate for policy or regulatory change to address environmental challenges

☑ Other innovation and collaboration activity, please specify :support research initiatives on lower carbon agricultural practices

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

75

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

Engaged with suppliers, NGOs and EU MS competent authorities to ensure that our supply chains are deforestation free and will be compliant with the EU Deforestation Regulation - this ensures that the production of cattle has not contributed to deforestation or forest degradation with a cut-off date of 30th Dec 2020. In high risk countries we will utilise satellite mapping and third party certification services to provide these assurances.

(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 :Deforestation and conversion free certification

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Soy

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Engage with suppliers to advocate for policy or regulatory change to address environmental challenges

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

21

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

Engaged with suppliers, NGOs and EU MS competent authorities to ensure that our supply chains are deforestation free and will be compliant with the EU Deforestation Regulation - this ensures that the production of soy has not contributed to deforestation or forest degradation with a cut-off date of 30th Dec 2020. In high risk countries we will utilise satellite mapping and third party certification services to provide these assurances.

(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 :Deforestation and conversion free certification

(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]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Cattle products

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building
☑ Offer on-site technical assistance and extension services
☑ Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

31

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Through our collaboration with Chirrup.ai, we have engaged 30 smallholder farms in bioacoustic monitoring of bird biodiversity, generating an automated biodiversity report. This has enabled farmers to better understand the trophic structures in their farm with ecologists and implement ecosystem enhancements accordingly. Measures of success are their being able to act on the data provided and the effectiveness of the follow up recording. A verification study, conducted in 2024, found Chirrup was able to identify species at a higher accuracy than the average of the human ecologists. The verification of the technology allows the accelerated roll out of Chirrup boxes to farms across our supply chain and support farmers improving biodiversity on farm.
[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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

We work in partnership with our customers, sharing data and transition planning details to deliver on our shared scope 3 goals. This includes regular working-level feedback systems and formal data sharing of relevant data on our climate footprint and underlying methodologies.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

This enables us to modify our transition planning activities in line with our customer expectations to ensure we can more effectively deliver our transition. Success is measured through the effectiveness of our carbon reductions and through customer satisfaction metrics.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

We share details of our sustainability innovation projects and risk exposure with investors and shareholders both at relevant formal junctures and on an ad hoc basis on request. This is to ensure they remain informed on our progress against our Transition Plan and provide them with information to balance the risks in their investments. All our investors are also sent a copy of our annual report.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

This engagement enables us to enhance our risk monitoring through ongoing communication with those working with peers. Success is measured through investor satisfaction.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

We are currently developing our understanding of water impacts within our supply chain. We engage with our investors to deepen their understanding of companies' water-related dependencies and impacts. This includes understanding our direct operations, both upstream and downstream value chain. All our investors are also sent a copy of our annual report.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

This engagement enables understanding our major stakeholders' request on water risk mitigation and opportunity creation. Success is measured through including water into company strategy.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

We engage with investors through multiple benchmarking platforms, including CDP to share details on the certification of products and our progress against our strategy in addition to disclosing this in our annual Sustainability Report and sharing highlights when presenting results. All our investors are also sent a copy of our annual report.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

This engagement pushes for transparency and best practice reporting to drive change and help us reach our targets.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :NGOs

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

As result of our active membership in various innovation and sustainability-driven industry working groups we are able to influence the industry trends and terms of emissions reductions. More detail on our partnerships can be found on page 38 of our sustainability report.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our engagement helps guide the setting of targets and industry commitments. Additionally, it provides a forum for us to communicate shared ambitions across the sector to help advocate for policy changes and innovate together so that we can work towards our shared targets.
[Add row]

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Innovation

☑ Other innovation, please specify :Product innovation to reduce food waste and reduce Scope 3 emissions.

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

Improved product shelf life

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of downstream value chain emissions (own scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

190000

(5.12.11) Please explain

Product life extension reduces waste in retail chain

Row 2

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Assess life-cycle impact of products or services to identify efficiencies

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

Use of Seafood Carbon Emissions Profiling Tool (SCEPT) to assess footprint of products. Launched in the summer of 2024, the easy-to-use tool allows businesses across the supply chain to calculate the footprint of their products to a standardised methodology. This collaboration has enabled the industry to coalesce around a single tool, reducing the burden on farmers and fishers posed by multiple tools and enabling them to better focus on action. We are now starting to roll out the SCEPT to our supply chain, supporting suppliers with their data collection and emissions calculation. This will enable us to increase the amount of supplier level emissions factors in our Scope 3 calculations and enable our suppliers to build a better understanding of their own footprint so they can more effectively target emissions reduction activities.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

☑ Increased transparency of upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Reduction of downstream value chain emissions (own scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:
☑ 0-1 year

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:
☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

2000

(5.12.11) Please explain

Seafood Carbon Emissions Profiling Tool provides transparency of the supply chain, allowing us to better pinpoint resource to reductions.
[Add row]

(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(5.13.1) Specify the CDP Supply Chain members that have prompted your implementation of mutually beneficial environmental initiatives and provide information on the initiatives.

Row 1

(5.13.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.13.1.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.13.1.4) Initiative ID

Select from:

☑ Ini1

(5.13.1.5) Initiative category and type

Change to provision of goods and services

☑ Reduce packaging weight

(5.13.1.6) Details of initiative

Flow wrap mince packaging

(5.13.1.7) Benefits achieved

Select all that apply

☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

(5.13.1.8) Are you able to provide figures for emissions savings or water savings in the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ Yes, emissions savings only

(5.13.1.9) Estimated savings in the reporting year in metric tons of CO2e

1200

(5.13.1.11) Please explain how success for this initiative is measured

Reduced packaging weight whilst not compromising quality of product or shelf life.

(5.13.1.12) Would you be happy for CDP Supply Chain members to highlight this work in their external communication?

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Equity share	*Aligned to prior reporting and Greenhouse Gas Protocol*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Equity share	*Aligned to our scope of change*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Equity share	*Aligned to our scope of change*
Plastics	*Select from:* ☑ Equity share	*Aligned to our scope of change*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Equity share	*Aligned to our scope of change*

[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

Acquisition: Cellular Agriculture Limited, Hilton Foods Solutions Divestment: Sphere Design Limited

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

The Group sold its 50% interest in Sphere Design Limited (Jul-2024), and acquired additional interests in Cellular Agriculture Ltd (Jan-2024, additional 9.75%) and Hilton Foods Solutions (Oct-2024, now 100%). Our 2024 reporting includes backward calculated emissions across Scope 1, 2 and 3, allowing for consistent comparison within the report. Original calculations can be found in prior reports.
[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)

In 2024, there has been no major change to methodology, with the exception of 'Category 02. Capital Goods' and '05. Waste'. For Category 02 we have transitioned from a financial accounting approach using the WRI tool, which has been retired, and from 2024 will use an inventory-based approach. Emissions from IT purchases are calculated by allocating the number of units to the appropriate lifecycle assessment data for similar equipment, while other capital purchases are allocated to an appropriate emission factor, calculated from actual purchased equipment derived from the equipment purchased. Emissions from waste are now entirely based on actual measured disposal data, rather than some elements being based on extrapolation.
[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:

☑ No, because the impact does not meet our significance threshold

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

Recalculations are carried out where a significant error (defined as greater than 0.1% of total emissions) is identified in the original data, where methodological improvements can be made to improve accuracy significantly (defined as by 0.5%) or where acquisitions/divestments are made that impact the footprint significantly (defined as by 0.5%). In our Annual Report 2024, restatements have been made in prior year figures including the base year due to printing errors. The effect is not material.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

Select all that apply

☑ ISO 14064-1

☑ IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ Australia - National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☑ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol Agricultural Guidance: Interpreting the Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard for the Agricultural Sector

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

All gases are included in the calculation; CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3. We do not produce any biogenic CO2 emissions. Our calculation model is aligned to ISO14044 and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol.
[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19022

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 calculation covers Natural Gas, and LPG. All gases are included in the calculation (CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3). 2020 was chosen as baseline as it was the first year for which detailed data was available. Emission Factor Sets used: Australian National Greenhouse Accounts Factors, IEA, UK Government Greenhouse gas reporting: conversion factors 2023 and Supplier Data. Equity share was taken as an approach for organisational boundary. HFG's calculation model is aligned to ISO14044 and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. HFG does not produce any biogenic CO2 emission. 100% of 2020 scope 1 reported emissions have been externally verified with limited assurance by an independent third party (Arthian) in accordance with ISO14064:3.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

75730

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 location-based calculation includes non-renewable electricity, renewable electricity, solar generated electricity, district heating. All gases are included in the calculation; CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3. 2020 was chosen as baseline as it was the first year for which detailed data was available. An assessment was conducted at sites where data was available for prior years to understand the impact of COVID-19, but it was determined that there was not a significant anomaly in energy use. Emission Factors used: IEA emissions factors. The calculation model is aligned to ISO14044 and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. 100% of 2020 scope 2 (location based) reported emissions have been externally verified with limited assurance by an independent third party (Arthian) in accordance with ISO14064:3

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

56557

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 market-based calculation includes non-renewable electricity, renewable electricity, solar generated electricity, district heating. All gases are included in the calculation; CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3. 2020 was chosen as baseline as it was the first year for which detailed data was available. An assessment was conducted at sites where data was available for prior years to understand the impact of COVID-19, but it was determined that there was not a significant anomaly in energy use. Emission Factors used: supplier specific emission factors. Our calculation model is aligned to ISO14044 and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. The percentage of renewable electricity used from total is 24%. Including nuclear zero emissions electricity this rises to 47%. 100% of 2020 scope 2 (market based) reported emissions have been externally verified with limited assurance by an independent third party (Arthian) in accordance with ISO14064:3

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14373792

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 1 covers purchase of proteins, ingredients and packaging, as well as services. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute). 2020 figure was restated due to printing errors. The effect is not material.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

106221

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Purchased machinery and similar capital goods. High in 2020 due to building of new facility at Wiri, New Zealand. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17198

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Transmission & distribution, well to tank emissions. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

78713

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Transport of goods from supplier to site. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13032

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from waste disposal and treatment. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Business air travel and reported road/rail travel. Low in 2020 due to COVID. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1998

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Employee travel from home to worksite. Teleworking is in optional scope. Low in 2020 due to COVID. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No upstream leased assets not included in Scope 1 & 2.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

126999

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Transport of goods from sites to distribution centre. Added third party retail spaces Estimated cooking and refrigeration emissions for food service products moved. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).from Category 10.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No processing of sold products is applicable

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

112840.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No direct emissions from products but indirect emissions from cooking & refrigeration are optional scope. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

29904.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Estimated emissions from waste resulting from products sold. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (World Resources Institute).

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No downstream leased assets not included in Scope 1 & 2.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No franchises

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No material investments not included in Scope 1 & 2.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No other (upstream) emissions

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No other (downstream) emissions
[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)

13495

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Hilton Foods reports carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions across a 100 year timescale (GWP100) aligned to the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report and the recommendations of the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the Science-Based Target initiative. We take an equity share approach. When calculating our Scope 1 emissions we use the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier specific emission factors where available.

Past year 1

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

17594

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2023

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Hilton Foods reports carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions across a 100-year timescale (GWP100) aligned to the IPCC's sixth Assessment Report and the recommendations of the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the Science Based Targets initiative. We have taken a financial control approach, with any holding less than 50% of shares excluded, however these are assessed as minor.

Past year 2

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

17542

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

In our assessing and reporting of scope 1 emissions we follow the GHG corporate protocol. We utilise the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier-specific emission factors.

Past year 3

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

20108

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

In our assessing and reporting of scope 1 emissions we follow the GHG corporate protocol. We utilise the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier-specific emission factors.

Past year 4

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

19022

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2020

(7.6.3) Methodological details

In our assessing and reporting of scope 1 emissions we follow the GHG corporate protocol. We utilise the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier-specific emission factors.
[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)

52214

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

37846

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Hilton Foods reports carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions across a 100 year timescale (GWP100) aligned to the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report and the recommendations of the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the Science-Based Target initiative. When calculating our Scope 2 emissions we use the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier specific emission factors where available.

Past year 1

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

60346

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

48286

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Hilton Foods reports carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions across a 100-year timescale (GWP100) aligned to the IPCC's sixth Assessment Report and the recommendations of the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the Science Based Targets initiative. We have taken a financial control approach, with any holding less than 50% of shares excluded, however these are assessed as minor. When calculating our 2 emissions we consider both location and market-based emissions and utilise the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier specific emission factors where available.

Past year 2

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

54544

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

41669

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

In our assessing and reporting of scope 2 emissions we follow the GHG corporate protocol. We consider both location and market-based emissions, and utilise the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier-specific emission factors. UK scope 2 (Market) emissions in 2021 are not zero due to the purchase of Fairfax Meadow, all other UK sites continue to use 100% renewable electricity. All 2021 UK data includes full year data for Fairfax Meadow, in addition to Hilton Foods UK (incorporating Hilton Foods Solutions), SVC and Hilton Seafood sites. Likewise, Global data includes full year data for Dalco. We follow the GHG corporate protocol to calculate our scope 1 and 2 emissions, using IEA emissions factors for our location based emissions and supplier specific factors to calculate our market based emissions.

Past year 3

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

64758

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

48273

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We followed the GHG corporate protocol to calculate our Scope 2 emissions, using IEA emissions factors for our location based emissions and supplier specific factors to calculate our market based emissions.

Past year 4

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

75730

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

56557

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We followed the GHG corporate protocol to calculate our Scope 2 emissions, using IEA emissions factors for our location based emissions and supplier specific factors to calculate 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)

11945585

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Hybrid method

☑ Average data method

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

6

(7.8.5) Please explain

Activity data (mainly: ingredients, packaging, proteins, other) for all sites within scope of the company's GHG Emissions Inventory were sourced from provided Scope 3 Model developed by HFG plc for selected scope 3 emissions sources. All activity was converted into tonnes CO2e using the appropriate conversion factor and covers the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2024 and 31st Dec 2024. Protein conversion factors were determined using the percentage weighting as stated in the Scope 3 Calculation reporting spreadsheet. Conversion factors were adjusted based on the proportion of beef and dairy herds within different source locations.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1557

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Asset-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have transitioned from a financial accounting approach using the WRI tool, which has been retired, and from 2024 will use an inventory-based approach. Emissions from IT purchases are calculated by allocating the number of units to the appropriate lifecycle assessment data for similar equipment, while other capital purchases are allocated to an appropriate emission factor, calculated from actual purchased equipment derived from the equipment purchased. This covers the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2024 and 31st Dec 2024.

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)

17298

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Hybrid method

☑ Average data method

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

51.6

(7.8.5) Please explain

The supporting fuel energy datasets have been used to calculate emissions from transmission & distribution (electricity, district heating), and well-to-tank GHG emissions (fuels, vehicle use).

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

41313

(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

All activity data covered the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2024 and 31st Dec 2024 and was provided in tonne km (tkm) then converted into tonnes CO2e using the appropriate conversion factors for refrigerated transport. Regarding Diesel, Conversion Factor used was a diesel All HGVs which is assumed to be average laden. This has been sourced from the 2024 version of the UK Government's Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (v1.0). Modelling approach based upon the number of truck movements, distances (in km), and the average load of vehicles. Conversion Factors used: UK DESNZ, 2024

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1986

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Waste conversion factors used in calculating EOL emissions were also appropriately sourced (Defra/BEIS 2023, Global waste factors). The application of waste conversion factors based on apportioning total waste arisings through different disposal routes (combustion, composting, landfill, and anaerobic digestion) for food waste and packaging waste (incineration, and landfill). Consumer waste disposal is modelled assuming an 11% post-consumer food waste rate (sourced from UNEP).

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1915

(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

For calculating Business Travel, the following categories were taken into account: Domestic, Flight, Short Haul, Long Haul, Car, Train. Global emission factors (DESNZ 2024) were used to convert km / p.km into CO2e.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2565

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Site-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

For calculating Employee Commuting, the following categories were taken into account: Car, Bus, Train, Tram, Motorcycle, Bike, Walking, Homeworking (incl. office equipment heating). Global emission factors (DESNZ 2024) were used to convert data (in km / p.km / FTE h) into CO2e.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant, out of scope

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

48910

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Hybrid method
☑ Fuel-based method
☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

For calculating Downstream Transport (outsourced logistics), electricity for refrigerating products, as well as transport of goods from sites to distribution centre (HGV - Refrigerated), as well as inland transport and retails specific data (e.g. were taken into account. Emission factors used: DESNZ 2024, Electricity Map 2024, WRI Scope 3 evaluator.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant, out of scope

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

27578

(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

Activity data for all sites within scope of the company's GHG Emissions Inventory were from provided Scope 3 Model developed by Hilton Foods using metrics & methodology for selected Scope 3 emissions sources. - All activity data covered the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2024 and 31st Dec 2024 and was provided in kilowatt hours (kWh) (for processing & use) then converted into tonnes CO2e using the appropriate conversion factors. Cooking preparation model assumes that the fuel used is electricity, and that average preparation instructions are used for products (pan fry for 6/12 minutes, electric oven used to bake/roast products). Use of products also includes estimations surrounding energy consumption from refrigeration (domestic and retail) which have been applied correctly based on a 7-day refrigeration period. This calculated emissions utilising country specific conversion electricity factors sourced from Resource Advisor Conversion factors used in the model were sourced from appropriate country resources (e.g., UK – DESNZ 2024, Australia – Australian Govt Factors 2024).

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)

22267

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Activity data for all sites within scope of the company's GHG Emissions Inventory were from provided Scope 3 Model developed by Hilton Foods using metrics & methodology for selected Scope 3 emissions sources. - All activity data covered the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2024 and 31st Dec 2024 and was provided in kilowatt hours (kWh) (for processing & use) then converted into tonnes CO2e using the appropriate conversion factors.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant, out of scope

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant, out of scope

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant, out of scope

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant, out of scope

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant, out of scope
[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

12/30/2023

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

12679362

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

3578

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

15296

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

42333

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

4684

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

1317

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

2506

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

17396

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

25515

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

26276

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Activity data for all sites within the scope of the company's GHG Emissions Inventory were sourced from provided Scope 3 Model developed by Hilton Foods plc using metrics & methodology provided by South Pole for selected Scope 3 emissions sources. All activity was converted into tonnes CO2e using the appropriate conversion factor, AR5 GWP values, and covers the 12-month period between 1st Jan and 31st Dec 2023. Protein conversion factors were found to be accurate and were determined using the percentage weighting as stated in the Scope 3 Calculation reporting spreadsheet. Conversion factors were adjusted based on the proportion of beef and dairy herds within different source locations.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2022

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

12561785

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

9835

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

16958

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

36952

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

10345

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

931

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

3339

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

19263

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

30274

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

62035

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Activity data for all sites within the scope of the company's GHG Emissions Inventory were sourced from provided Scope 3 Model developed by Hilton Foods plc using metrics & methodology provided by South Pole for selected Scope 3 emissions sources. All activity was converted into tonnes CO2e using the appropriate conversion factor, AR5 GWP values, and covers the 12-month period between 1st Jan and 31st Dec 2022. Protein conversion factors were found to be accurate and were determined using the percentage weighting as stated in the Scope 3 Calculation reporting spreadsheet. Conversion factors were adjusted based on the proportion of beef and dairy herds within different source locations.

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2021

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

13229866

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

7954

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

16230

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

77666

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

29199

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

180

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

2323

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

122791

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

92004

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

23389

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

In 2021 we have conducted a review of our Scope 3 emissions with support from the consultancy South Pole. This confirmed that the largest impact is from our scope 3 purchased goods and services, with cattle being the single largest sector. In our assessing and reporting of scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions we follow the GHG corporate protocol. We consider both location and market-based emissions, and utilise the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier-specific emission factors. Scope 3 emissions reported in this year's report differ from those reported in 2020 due to significant methodological change from financial screening to detailed LCA. This has subsequently been recalculated based on 2022 methodology.

Past year 4

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2020

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

14373792

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

106221

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

17198

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

78713

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

13032

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

5

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

1998

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

126999

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

112840

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

29904

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Our Scope 3 method of calculation was based on the Quantis tool from WRI (world resources institute). This has subsequently been recalculated based on 2022 methodology.
[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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

14

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

12; 15

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

12; 15

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(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: Purchased goods and services

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

11

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Capital goods

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

11

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 3

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ 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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

14

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 4

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

12

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 5

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

13

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 6

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Business travel

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

15

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 7

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

14

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 8

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

12

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 9

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

13

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 10

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products

(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

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

13

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2757

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

5.36

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Hilton Foods Holland moved to renewable electricity

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

274

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.42

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

All the other emissions reduction activities have a cumulative impact of CO2e, which is 0.42% of total Scope 1 and 2 HFG's emissions.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024, there was one divestment: Sphere Design Ltd., but it affected only our Scope 3 emissions.

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

During the period the Group acquired an additional 9.71% interest in Cellular Agriculture Ltd

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024, there were no material mergers.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024 there has been no change in output.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024 there has been no change in methodology.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024 there has been no change in boundary.

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024 there has been no change in physical operating conditions.

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024 no other reasons for emissions changes have been identified.

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024 there has been no alternative reason for change.
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

Cattle products

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8669819

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

Limited changes in volumes and calculation methods

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

121402

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

Limited changes in volumes and calculation methods

Poultry & hog

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1084801

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

Limited changes in volumes and calculation methods

Other commodity

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1760633

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much Higher

(7.14.6) Please explain

Increased sheep volumes

[Fixed row]

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

11022

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

12

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

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

7

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ HFCs

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

2454

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)
[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1562

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

25772

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

25772

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

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

854

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

4071

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

353

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

1968

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

3068

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1765

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

1192

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

0

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2740

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

5775

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

2417

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

749

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

652

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

652

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

980

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

6885

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

128

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

266

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

566

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

1592

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1

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

235

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

142

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5075

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

8313

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

2
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By activity

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Meat and Fresh Food*	*8552*
Row 2	*Plant-based Food*	*756*
Row 3	*Fish*	*4184*
Row 4	*Services*	*2*

[Add row]

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.

Row 1

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13313

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

This includes all Scope 1 emissions from across the group. Calculated using DEFRA emissions factors for fuels and refrigerants.

Row 2

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Distribution

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

182

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

This includes Scope 1 Emissions from sites that directly perform delivery operations. Calculated using DEFRA emission factors for fuels.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By activity

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Meat and Fresh Food*	*43580*	*32331*
Row 2	*Fish*	*6675*	*5487*
Row 3	*Plant-based Food*	*1480*	*0*
Row 4	*Services*	*54*	*28*

[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)

13496

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

52214

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

37846

(7.22.4) Please explain

Consolidated accounting group incorporates all Hilton Foods entities.

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

N/A
[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:
☑ Yes

(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary.

Row 1

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods UK Limited

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2243

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

4284

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Foppen Group BV

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1954

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

3506

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

5485

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 3

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods Holland BV

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

383

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

2757

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 4

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Foods Connected Limited

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

28

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 5

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods Ltd Sp z o.o.

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

980

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

6757

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 6

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods Australia Pty Limited

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1562

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

25760

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

25760

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 7

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods Danmark A/S

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

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

699

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

3916

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 8

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods New Zealand Limited

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

749

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

652

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

652

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 9

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Dalco Food BV

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

756

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

1480

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 10

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Fairfax Meadow Europe Limited

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

600

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

824

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 11

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods (Ireland) Limited

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1765

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

1192

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 12

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Hilton Foods Sverige AB

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1

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

93

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 13

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

SOHI Meat Solutions

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

265

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

561

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

1577

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 15

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Seachill UK Limited trading as Hilton Seafood UK

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2230

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

3167

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 16

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Agito Group

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

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

19

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

19

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 17

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Evolve 4

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1

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

2

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.

Row 18

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Cellular Agriculture Ltd

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

6

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Calculated using combination of our direct and supplier data. Scope 1 is calculated using direct data and relevant proxies. Scope 2 (location) is using relevant emission factor data. Scope 2 (market) based on supplier data.
[Add row]

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

16641791.81

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

352.15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Carbon dioxide, Natural gas, F-gas

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

16641791.81

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

689.39

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity and natural gas

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

16641791.81

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity and natural gas

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

16641791.81

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

33113.09

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Carbon footprint (LCA) of purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution emissions, waste generated in operations.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

63686013.84

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

960.76

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, F-gas, diesel, LPG, wood chip

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

63686013.84

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4952.8944

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity, natural gas, and district heating

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

63686013.84

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1029.2721

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity, natural gas, and district heating

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

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

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

63686013.84

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

863071.8286

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Carbon footprint (LCA) of purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution emissions, waste generated in operations.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2651164.77

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

878.94

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, F-gas, diesel, LPG, wood chip

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2651164.77

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1577.95

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity and natural gas

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2651164.77

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2468.13

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity and natural gas

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

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

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on another physical factor

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2651163

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

14333.31

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Carbon footprint (LCA) of purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution emissions, waste generated in operations.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Allocation is not published nor verified by third-party, but the overall data and emission calculation methodology is. For further details, please see our Annual Report on the Hilton Foods website.
[Add row]

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ We face no challenges

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

All emissions associated with the facilities that serve our customers have been incorporated into this module. At this site, all of the supplied products are directed towards a single customer, making it justifiable to include all emissions from this market in our submission. Any measures taken to decrease emissions will contribute positively to our customers' emission reduction goals. In Poland, a substantial portion of the production is delivered to the client. As a result, we have allocated a proportional share of emissions corresponding to the proportion of products supplied to these clients.
[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

(7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

All production processes and packing lines are utilized for one major client in the market reported above. Additional energy required for operating cutting and packing lines for the small proportion of other customers volumes would not significantly impact overall emissions. Nevertheless, we are planning to improve our allocation methodology, especially for sites with a mixed client base. We continue the rollout and ongoing improvement of our submetering programme, which will provide us with more detailed information on the efficiency of our manufacturing processes. Developing supply chain mapping, partnership in supply chains, learning process with suppliers.
[Fixed row]

(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:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:*

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
	☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

49.77

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

51699.44

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

51749.21

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

124114.31

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

33450.83

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

157565.14

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

4471.38

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

996.3

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

5467.68

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

4860.82

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

4860.82

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

128635.46

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

86146.57

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

214782.03
[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:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
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:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

49.77

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Wood chips is not used for energy, just for smoking for flavour.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

955.93

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Transport Fuel

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

50743.51

(7.30.7.8) Comment

LPG & Natural Gas

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

51749.21

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

4860.82

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

4860.82

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

4860.82

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

4860.82

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :Wind, solar, hydro

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

4678

(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:
☑ Ireland

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :Wind, solar, hydro

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

14943

(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

N/A

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Poland

(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:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :wind, solar, hydro

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

10726

(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:

☑ Poland

(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

N/A

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :wind, solar, hydro

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

40544

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ REGO

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

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/A

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Sweden

(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:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :wind, solar, hydro

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

9281

(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:

☑ Sweden

(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

N/A

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Poland

(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:

☑ Heat

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

534

(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:

☑ Poland

(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

Sustainable biomass is included in our contracts and comes from wood-waste. Criteria used comes from European Waste Catalogue (EWC) codes: 20 01 38

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(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:

☑ Heat

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

2974

(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:

☑ Sweden

(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

Sustainable biomass is included in our contracts and comes from wood-waste. Criteria used comes from European Waste Catalogue (EWC) codes: 20 01 38

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Australia

(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:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :Wind, solar, hydro

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

22850

(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:

☑ Australia

(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

N/A
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

35846

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

3476

(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)

39322.00

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6993

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

0

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

1580

(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)

8573.00

Greece

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5788

(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)

5788.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4678

(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)

4678.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17799

(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)

17799.00

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8951

(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)

8951.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10726

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

0

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

868

(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)

11594.00

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7074

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

1111

(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)

8185.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9281

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

0

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

3019

(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)

12300.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40277

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

274

(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)

40551.00
[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

0.0129

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

51341

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

3988300

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

22

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our revenues stayed on about the same level as in 2023, while our Scope 2 emissions experienced a slight decrease thanks to the progress towards our 100% renewable electric power sourcing target and due to energy efficiency measures implemented on sites in the reporting year. We also increased the proportion of renewable electricity to 79% (a 10% increase compared to 2023).

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.095

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

51341

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

540239

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

25

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(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 volumes increased by 4.4% in 2024, while our Scope 2 emissions experienced a slight decrease thanks to the progress towards our 100% renewable electric power sourcing target and due to energy efficiency measures implemented on sites in the reporting year. We also increased the proportion of renewable electricity to 79% (a 10% increase compared to 2023).
[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

13416

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

metric tonnes

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

year

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

53

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Given metrics is total Hilton Foods food waste for the reporting period. Food waste is a priority issue that indirectly impacts our greenhouse gas' emissions. In 2020 we identified food waste hotspots and we also have a reduction goal of halving our emissions until 2030. Although, we could identify a significant increase in food waste generation compared to last year, we are still on track as we have already decreased our food waste generation by 47% compared to our base year (2019). [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

Hilton Foods Group - Near-Term Approval Letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/29/2023

(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

12/30/2020

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

19022

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

56557

(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)

75579.000

(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

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

95

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

3778.950

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

13495

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

37846

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

51341.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

33.76

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

In 2020 Hilton Foods committed to setting science-based targets through the Science Based Targets initiative and signed the Business Ambition for 1.5°C pledge to net-zero by 2048. We updated our ambition by submitting revised targets in 2023 (approved 2024). The requirement on setting a science-based target on Scope 1 and 2 is that the target should cover at least 95% of the company's footprint. In this context, Hilton Foods' updated targets include emissions from all subsidiaries in the emissions reduction target. Consequently, there are presently no exclusions from this target. All acquisitions made since submission have been incorporated into the target scope. Our existing '1.5°C' targets are to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 95% by 2030 from a 2020 base year.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Hilton Foods aims to be net-zero by 2048 and has set a goal to reduce absolute Scope 1 & 2 Greenhouse gas emissions by 95% by 2030 with 2020 as the base year. Alongside our current efforts to meet these targets, we are actively working to revise our goals to elevate our ambition to the '1.5°C' pathway and align with the new Forestry, Land, and Agriculture (FLAG) guidance.

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

To ensure we meet these targets, we have developed detailed site level decarbonisation plans for each of our operations, to ensure efficiency (in line with ISO 50001), purchasing and capital expenditure decisions are aligned to our decarbonisation targets. We are actively seeking opportunities for investment and grant support to expedite the implementation of low-carbon technologies across heating, cooling and electricity. We are working with key suppliers and other partners to develop and implement decarbonization plans for our supply chain.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Hilton Foods Group - Near-Term Approval Letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/29/2023

(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 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2020

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

14373792

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

13032

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

126999

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

14513823.000

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

14513823.000

(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

(7.53.1.39) 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

(7.53.1.43) 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

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

98.54

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

99

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

45

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

7982602.650

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

11945585

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

1986

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

48910

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

11996481.000

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

11996481.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

38.54

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

In 2023 (approved 2024) we revised our SBTi target to align to the updated FLAG guidance. No businesses are presently excluded from this target, and all acquisitions made since submission have been incorporated into the target scope.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

– Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, waste generated in operations and downstream transportation and distribution 45% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. – Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions from Forestry, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) 45% by 2030 from a 2020 base year

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

Our approach to Scope 3 mitigation has involved a comprehensive review of technologies and interventions, supported by literature and research projects. See our Sustainability Report for more information

(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

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

☑ Net-zero targets

☑ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

03/30/2020

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/30/2020

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

26227.033

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

19.4

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2027

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

79

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

73.95

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Abs 1

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The Science Based Target covers scope 1,2,3 emissions for the whole company. We have taken a financial control approach, with any holding less than 50% of shares excluded, however these are assessed as minor.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

The goal is to achieve 100% renewable electricity across all our own operations in Europe by end of 2025 and globally by 2027.

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

We increased the proportion of renewable electricity to 79% by the end of 2024. Hilton Foods Holland was the most recent European site to switch to 100% renewable electricity, with our other European sites set to join them in 2025
[Add row]

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

12/30/2016

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Country/area/region

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ metric tons of waste generated

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

32303

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

16151

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

18802

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

83.5871718673

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

No

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :UN SDG goal 12 / Champions 12.3

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This is part of our Champions 12.3 food waste commitment, to reduce food loss and waste by at least 50% by 2030. This target covers our global operations. Progress was made in redistributing more material to charity, animal feed and bio-material processing. Waste to sewers is excluded from this data.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

The aim of this target is to reduce food loss and waste in our own UK operations by 50% by 2030. We have made progress by redirecting more materials to charities, animal feed, and bio-material processing. Some of our sites have even achieved zero food waste.

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

We are working with our retail partners to provide product choices to consumers that help them to reduce food waste, and the use of energy and water in their homes. We are implementing projects at sites to increase valorization of by products and reduce waste through efficiency. We have begun projects with our supply chain to share this learning through our supply chain.
[Add row]

(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

08/28/2023

(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

☑ Abs3

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/30/2048

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.3.7) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Hilton Foods Group - Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf

(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)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Central to our sustainability strategy is our revised Science-Based Targets and a group-level commitment to be net zero by 2048 across Scope 1, 2 and 3. Based on this ambition and our emissions exposures, we have developed a comprehensive net zero Transition Plan, involving actions at our own sites, commodity-level strategies, and collaborative efforts throughout our value chain to reduce emissions in accordance with the Paris Agreement goals. Our updated SBTi targets dramatically increase the pace of our ambition, aligning our operational and value chain emissions to 1.5ºC pathways, and are applicable to all our Scope 3 emissions. Our targets now see the near elimination of our operational emissions by 2030 and align our business to Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) sector guidance from the SBTi. We have set energy and water efficiency targets for our sites and continue to engage in global collaborative action for decarbonisation of our key raw materials. As we have taken a financial control approach, any holding less than 50% of shares are excluded (these exclusions are assessed as minor).

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

– Reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 95% by 2030 from a 2020 base year – Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, waste generated in operations and downstream transportation and distribution 45% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. – Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions from Forestry, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) 45% by 2030 from a 2020 base year

(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, but we 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

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization at the end of the target

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

In the long-term, Hilton Foods commits to reduce absolute energy & industrial Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 98% by 2048 from a 2020 base year. Hilton Foods also commits to reduce absolute energy & industrial Scope 3 emissions by 90% within the same timeframe. Hilton Foods commits to reduce absolute Scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 100% by 2048 from a 2020 base year. This target includes FLAG emissions and removals. In spite of the fact that Hilton Foods did not anticipate using offset carbon credits in 2024, inset carbon credits will likely to be used to achieve our long-term ambitions. The exact substance of these credits is not yet clearly defined but we anticipate they will be substantiated by some form of direct removal.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Targets are reviewed on a 5 yearly basis or if any acquisitions are made to increase the business' baseline footprint by more than 3% or cumulatively by 5%.
[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
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*0*	*0*
Implementation commenced	*5*	*29*
Implemented	*4*	*274*
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
☑ Compressed air

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

55

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

17102

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

35377

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(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)

50

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

15519

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1978

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/A

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)

167

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

124700

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

15000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/A

Row 4

(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)

2

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 2 (location-based)
☑ Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

5418

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

5000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/A
[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:
☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Existing and proposed regulatory requirements in each of Hilton Foods operating countries are considered, to determine compliance requirements. These include emissions and deforestation controls and product environmental labelling.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Energy efficiency is seen as the way forward for our business both in terms of cost and carbon reductions. These efficiencies will be vital in helping us to meet our emission reduction targets in the future.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Hilton Foods is able to achieve decreased operation costs and improved efficiency form the basis of driving investment in emission reductions. Hilton Foods invests across all areas of its business, including increased processing efficiency and storage solutions and updating our IT infrastructure which have direct benefit for decreasing operation costs and assuring best class performance.
[Add row]

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Row 1

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable animal feed

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Part of our efforts to ensure the sustainable production of animal feed are published in our Hilton Foods Deforestation Commitment. Our commitment is underpinned by being signatories of the UK Soy Manifesto and are working to ensure that all soy imported to the UK or used in feed for animals is from farms that are deforestation and conversion free by 2025. We are working to prepare for the EUDR and to ensure that any beef placed on the European market does not contain embedded soy which contributed to deforestation. We are working collaboratively with aquaculture feed mills to advance the sustainable use of marine ingredients by reducing dependency on forage fish through increased utilization of fishery by-products and alternative raw material ingredients, and by promoting the adoption of certification schemes that ensure responsible sourcing and traceability across the supply chain.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Procurement

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

European legislation and supplier policies will be used to ensure that soy used in livestock feed of our European supply chains is deforestation free. Engagement with retailers and suppliers to align with our deforestation commitment and set their own policies will support progress in third countries. We are working with the UK feed industry to develop a certification scheme to ensure sustainable soy production. We require sustainability reporting from suppliers, including forage fish dependency ratios and certification status of marine ingredients in aquaculture diets.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

☑ Other, please specify :protection of carbon sink

(7.68.1.7) Comment

All ticked benefits are expected. More information in Transition Plan and Sustainability Reports

Row 2

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Livestock management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

All livestock measures detailed in our transition plan are designed to support climate change mitigation. These include waste reduction and valorisation; genetic and health improvement; energy and industrial transition; manure and fertiliser management; changes to feed; and enhancements to land.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Other, please specify :Advocacy, mapping effectiveness

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

• Advocate for supportive policies that drive system wide change. • Support industry research and development through collaboration with institutes such as Oxford and Lincoln Universities. • Work with supplier and retailer farming groups to implement mitigation measures to demonstrate that our targets are achievable. • Work with industry coalitions, such as the ERBS, in a precompetitive space to enhance and share knowledge • Explore options with value chain partners to enhance the feasibility of and catalyse those efforts that are costly to implement

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

☑ Reduced demand for fossil fuel (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

All ticked benefits are expected. More information in Transition Plan and Sustainability Reports

Row 3

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We support industry research with universities such as Oxford and Lincoln to better inform and understand mitigation efforts internally and to share these learnings with the wider sector. We work in the precompetitive space with groups such as the ERBS to align around common goals within the European value chain and deliver measurable and positive impact on key sustainability priorities. As part of the UK Seafood Federation, Hilton Foods have collaborated with Seafish to develop their Seafood Carbon Emissions Profiling Tool (SCEPT). Launched in the summer of 2024, the easy-to-use tool allows businesses across the supply chain to calculate the footprint of their products to a standardised methodology. This collaboration has enabled the industry to coalesce around a single tool, reducing the burden on farmers and fishers posed by multiple tools and enabling them to better focus on action.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Procurement

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Learnings from research institutes can be used to directly inform our transition plan; to form the basis of wider projects; or to be published and shared with the wider community. The outcomes from engagement with the ERBS are used to demonstrate progress on sustainability issues at scale and share learnings internationally.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

All ticked benefits are expected. More information in Transition Plan and Sustainability Reports
[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Biodiversity

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

We are working to create fully traceable physical supply chains for verified Deforestation and Conversion Free (DCF) soy for use in feed for all of our livestock species globally.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

We are committed to collectively verify that the supplying farms used by the traders are free from deforestation and conversion with a cut-off date of January 2020, ask direct suppliers to adopt and cascade the same commitment and build this requirement into contractual requirements through the supply chains.

Row 2

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Climate

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Encouraging the wider use of methane reducing animal feed additives and to advocate for support for their use at scale at a global level.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Sharing global knowledge of research and development of feed additives with suppliers and through them to farmers.

Row 3

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

☑ Water

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Actively supporting the introduction of regulations that ban trading in products sourced from illegally deforested farms.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Enabling farmers to reduce their emissions and improve biodiversity, to promote more regenerative farming, by providing planning and reporting tools.
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:
☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Cradle to gate comparison LCA.

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Cooking
☑ Other, please specify :Range of mince products that were previously 100% meat or fish.

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

Vegetables have been added to a range of mince products that were previously 100% meat or fish.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Estimating and Reporting the Comparative Emissions Impacts of Products (WRI)

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

500g pack of mince

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

500g of beef mince.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

0.0145

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

Comparative LCA of vegetables' inclusion mince and 100% beef mince.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

1

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No
Cattle products	*Select from:* ☑ No
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Timber products	*14707*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*14707*

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Palm oil	*13*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*13*
Cattle products	*279250*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*279250*
Soy	*104057*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*104057*

[Fixed row]

(8.2.1) Provide details on any soy embedded in animal products sourced by your organization.

Soy

(8.2.1.1) Disclosure of embedded soy

Select from:

☑ Some or all of our embedded soy volume is included in our “Sourced volume” as reported in column 4 of 8.2

(8.2.1.2) Description of embedded soy use and soy tiers

Soy is embedded in livestock, farmed fish and shellfish we purchase, as well as in our added ingredients (e.g. milk for fishcakes) and plant-based range.

(8.2.1.3) Volume calculation methodology

Seafood: soy reporting questionnaires are completed by all suppliers, showing feed conversion ratios (FCR), soy certification and volumes of soy included in the feed. Because we are secondary processors, calculations are performed to ensure the weight of the whole species is accounted for (Whole fish equivalent), to not understate the soy use. Example calculation = purchased weight x conversion factor to whole fish x FCR x disclosed embedded soy content in feed. Livestock calculations are similar to seafood; we calculate embedded soy based on estimated lifetime mass gains of each species and apply an FCR to estimate the volume of feed. This is multiplied by the soy % of food to estimate the soy embedded in animals. This calculation also considers volumes not processed at abattoirs.

Ingredients: we include diary and egg products into our embedded soy calculation. We use procurement data and relevant soy proxies for embedded soy calculation in our ingredients.

(8.2.1.4) Embedded soy disclosure volume (metric tons)

103476

(8.2.1.5) % of sourced volume that is embedded soy

99

(8.2.1.6) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a traceability system for our embedded soy

(8.2.1.7) Description of traceability system

Soy in aquaculture feed is sourced through certified traceability systems like Europe Soya, RTRS, ProTerra or USSAP. Each of these certifications ensures traceable and verifiable sourcing from origin to aquafeed production, with documentation available to support compliance with sustainability and due diligence requirements such as chain of custody and third-party audits. Declarations from our suppliers of seafood is submitted and reviewed every year.

(8.2.1.8) % of embedded soy disclosure volume traceable to country/area of soy production

10

(8.2.1.9) % of embedded soy disclosure volume for which the soy production origin is unknown

90

(8.2.1.10) DF/DCF status assessed for embedded soy

Select from:

☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.2.1.11) % of embedded soy disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

95

(8.2.1.12) Methodology used to determine DF/DCF status

We assessed DCF status for embedded soy based on European Soy Monitor report (2021). Otherwise, we didn't verify the DCF status of our embedded soy.
[Fixed row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Unknown origin

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

14706.73

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

All our timber products are FSC certified. Due to Certification nature, we do not have information on timber origin within our products, however it is 100% DCF

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Guatemala

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2.98

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Palm oil in ingredients

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Buenos Aires Provence; Santa Fe Province;

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

128.45

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Unknown origin

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

103476.49

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Other, please specify :Estimated figure for embedded soy

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy, embedded animal proteins and ingredients. Will be coming from contracted suppliers but we have limited traceability for this soy.

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Namibia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Okahandja South

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1808.3

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Uruguay

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Durazno; Colonia; Tacuarembo; San Jose; Canelones; Cerro Largo; Montevideo

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2688.73

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Australia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

West Australia, Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

100115.02

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

South East of Sweden and Gotland County

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

22965.05

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All area

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

67254.14

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ New Zealand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All the country, mainly from Auckland

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

7664.89

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Ireland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All country

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

32173.1

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Poland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

West of country, Lubelskie Voivodship, Podlaskie Voivodship

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

6878.83

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All Country

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

16799.5

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Denmark

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Central, North, South Denmark Regions

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2349.35

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Spain

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Castilla and Leon, Aragon, Catalonia, Community of Madrid, Castilla la Mancha

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2538.44

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Portugal

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All country

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

7720.22

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Bavaria, Baden-Wuerttenberg, Thuringia, Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2739.42

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sao-Paulo, Minas Gerais, Rio De Janeiro

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1029.89

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Paraguay

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All country

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

736.73

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Austria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All country

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1376.81

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

All country

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1429.91

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Czechia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Pardubice, Olomouc, South Moravia, Vysocina

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

423.47

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Latvia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Vidzemes, Rigas, Zemgales

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

273.89

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Lithuania

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Kaunas, Vilnius, Marijampole, Siauliai, Taurage, Panevezys, Utena

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

113.06

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Cattle products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

41.97

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ China

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

15.4

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

10.9

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.73

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3.16

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Australia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3.81

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Austria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.17

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Serbia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

7.45

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Portugal

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2.6

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Unknown origin

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

534.28

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Direct soy

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.82

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Palm oil in ingredients

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Papua New Guinea

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.3

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Palm oil in ingredients

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.31

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Palm oil in ingredients

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ France

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2.86

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

Palm oil in ingredients

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.27

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Palm oil in ingredients

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Honduras

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.26

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Palm oil in ingredients

[Add row]

(8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel?

Select from:
☑ No

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Timber products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-conversion target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

Palm oil

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a no-conversion target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

Cattle products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-conversion target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

Soy

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-conversion target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity
[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Timber products

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

Eliminating the use of timber from converted natural ecosystems in supply chains by January 2020 or earlier.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:
☑ 2018

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Sector-wide agreement/recommendation

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2020

Palm oil

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

Eliminating the use of timber from converted natural ecosystems in supply chains by January 2020 or earlier.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2020

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Legal requirements

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2024

Cattle products

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

Eliminating the use of cattle from converted natural ecosystems in supply chains by January 2020 or earlier.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2020

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Legal requirements

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:
☑ 2024

Soy

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

Our definition of no-conversion is aligned with the UK Soy Manifesto which defines "no-conversion" as eliminating the use of soy from converted natural ecosystems in supply chains by January 2020 or earlier.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:
☑ 2020

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:
☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:
☑ Legal requirements

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:
☑ 2024

Soy

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

Our definition of no-conversion is aligned with the UK Soy Manifesto which defines "no-conversion" as eliminating the use of soy from converted natural ecosystems in supply chains by January 2020 or earlier.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2020

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Legal requirements

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2024

[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ FSC Chain-of-Custody certification (any type)

☑ PEFC Chain-of-Custody (any type)

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

08/31/2018

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2018

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2023

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.00

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

100% certified timber products in our operations

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Through the Foods Connected platform, we can monitor our suppliers against our policies and ensure we are sourcing from 100% certified origins. Storing all information required to maintain the visibility of our supply chains.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

N/A

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 4

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RSPO supply chain certification – Identity Preserved

☑ RSPO supply chain certification - Mass Balance

☑ RSPO supply chain certification – Segregated

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/30/2018

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2020

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

98.59

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2023

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.00

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

100% certified palm oil products in our value chain

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Through the Foods Connected platform, we can monitor our suppliers against our policies and ensure we are sourcing from 100% certified origins. Storing all information required to maintain the visibility of our supply chains.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

N/A

Cattle products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

☑ % of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

☑ Production unit

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/30/2020

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

63

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Achieved

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.00

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We are working towards 100% of cattle products being deforestation free by the 30th of Dec 2025.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

All cattle products from low risk geographies have been declared as deforestation free. For high risk geographies we have worked with suppliers on mitigation strategies to ensure these cattle products are also compliant.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

N/A

Soy

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Europe Soja – Segregated

☑ ProTerra certification – Segregated

☑ ProTerra certification – Mass balance

☑ ProTerra certification – Identity preserved

☑ RTRS chain-of custody standard – Segregated

☑ RTRS chain-of custody standard – Mass balance

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

11/08/2021

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

10.21

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

93

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

92.20

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
☑ Paris Agreement
☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We are working towards 100% of soy products being deforestation free by the 30th of Dec 2025.

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

We are mapping soy usage and origin to allow us to conduct risk assessments for each of our supply chains, and to develop appropriate deforestation due diligence. We are also engaged in collaborative action to achieve verified DCF soy supply chains, including being members of The Soy Transparency Coalition and UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soya. Additionally, we are also signatories to the Business Statement of Support for the Cerrado Manifesto (Cerrado SoS).

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

N/A
[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Timber products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply
☑ Chain-of-custody certification
☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

All wood-fibre derived packaging materials are FSC or PEFC certified. This is monitored by an internal traceability system.

Palm oil

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply
☑ Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Supplier engagement/communication
☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

All products are RSPO certified

Cattle products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply
☑ Chain-of-custody certification
☑ Value chain mapping
☑ Supplier engagement/communication
☑ Internal traceability system
☑ Landscape and jurisdictional approaches

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

All cattle from sourcing regions are registered on their respective national cattle traceability database which records births, deaths and cattle movements between premises. In the majority of geographies this is mandatory as directed by legislation. In those sourcing areas where this is not legislative any cattle that are to be exported to the EU must be registered on a traceability database. In Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay, our suppliers utilise third party verification to confirm animal location.

Soy

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

☑ Chain-of-custody certification

☑ Supplier engagement/communication

☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

The Foods Connected Supplier Compliance solution simplifies supplier data capture and compliance checks through a clear and user-friendly format. The solution centralises supplier approval lists, questionnaires, approval and compliancy tracking and supplier documentation. In one central location, users can manage supplier compliance through supply chain mapping and risk assessments, supplier ranking and KPIs. The platform provides dashboard reporting, audit schedules and automated notifications to help users manage the supplier compliance process.
[Fixed row]

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

0

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

0

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

100

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00

Palm oil

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

0

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

0

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

100

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00

Cattle products

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

100

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

0

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00

Soy

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

0

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

9.64

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0.02

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

90.34

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00
[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

100

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

0

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ No

Palm oil

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

100

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

0

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ No

Cattle products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

100

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

0

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

2.38

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

97.62

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ Yes

Soy

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

93.31

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

9.66

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

83.65

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ No
[Fixed row]

(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.

Timber products

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification
☑ FSC Chain-of-Custody certification (any type)

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.1.3) Comment

100% of our paper and board is certified FSC or PEFC. So, we have split the total purchased volume of paper and board equally to the two certification schemes.

Palm oil

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification
☑ RSPO supply chain certification – Segregated

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

100

(8.9.1.3) Comment

100% of our Palm oil is RSPO certified

Soy

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification
☑ RTRS standard for Responsible Soy Production

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

0.01

(8.9.1.3) Comment

RTRS certification

Soy

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification
☑ Europe Soja – Segregated

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

9.65

(8.9.1.3) Comment

Seafood embedded soy, Ingredient embedded soy
[Add row]

(8.9.2) Provide details of third-party certification schemes not providing full DF/DCF assurance.

Cattle products

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ Other forest management/producer certification, please specify :Low risk origin as per EUDR

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

97.62

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ No

(8.9.2.4) Comment

Low risk areas as per EUDR
[Add row]

(8.9.3) Provide details of production unit monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Cattle products

(8.9.3.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

2.38

(8.9.3.2) Production unit monitoring approach

Select all that apply

☑ Geospatial monitoring or remote sensing tool

(8.9.3.3) Description of production unit monitoring approach

Satellite mapping is used to cross check locations of cattle production against areas of deforestation to ensure that cattle are not reared on land which contributed to deforestation with a cut-off date of Dec 2020.

(8.9.3.4) DF/DCF status verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.3.5) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ First party

☑ Second party

(8.9.3.6) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit and is verified as DF/DCF

1.33

(8.9.3.7) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

Satellite mapping is used to cross check locations of cattle production against areas of deforestation to ensure that cattle are not reared on land which contributed to deforestation with a cut-off date of Dec 2020. This is used to produce a certificate which confirms deforestation free status.
[Fixed row]

(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Cattle products

(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area

97.62

(8.9.4.2) Monitoring approach used for determining that sourcing areas have no or negligible risk of deforestation or conversion

Select all that apply

☑ Pre-existing current and credible risk profiles/indexes

(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment

We assess the country and supplier risk profile according to EUDR data and thus identify a sourcing as per deforestation-risk

(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin

Select all that apply

☑ Spain
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Australia
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Germany
☑ Ireland
☑ Portugal

(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas

Cattle are sourced from the national herd in each of the specified countries. This means animals can be sourced from anywhere in those countries.

(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified

Select from:

☑ No

(8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

All specified sourcing geographies are risk assessed to have a low level of risk of commodity driven deforestation and forest degradation. Therefore there is considered to be no or negligible risk of association with deforestation. When EUDR is enforced we will capture geolocation data of where cattle have been reared. If required this can be assessed to verify that those origins have not contributed to deforestation or forest degradation with a cut-off date of 30th Dec 2020.

Soy

(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area

83.65

(8.9.4.2) Monitoring approach used for determining that sourcing areas have no or negligible risk of deforestation or conversion

Select all that apply

☑ Pre-existing current and credible risk profiles/indexes

(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment

We assess the country and supplier risk profile according to EUDR data and thus identify a sourcing as per deforestation-risk

(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin

Select all that apply

☑ Spain
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Australia
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Germany
☑ Ireland
☑ Portugal

(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas

This soy is embedded in the meat of animals we process. Those animals are coming from low-risk region for deforestation. According to European Soy Monitor report 93.9% of cattle on European market are deforestation-free

(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified

Select from:
☑ No

(8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

Across our sourcing areas soy will be used in some cattle diets, not all. The level of certified deforestation free soy used in animal diets will vary country by country and this can be understood from FEFAC data. A proportion of soy used in animal feed will therefore not be certified deforestation free. However in those markets, such as the UK, a risk based approach to responsible soy purchasing will be used which will focus on lowering the risk of deforestation and conversion rather than sourcing certified sustainable soy. In our sourcing geographies we continue to work with feed suppliers to move beyond the purchasing of a credit based certification system to achieve a physically verified deforestation and conversion free supply chain.
[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Cattle products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint.

Timber products

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ During the last 5 years

(8.10.1.7) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint during the last five years (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We ensure that all the paper and board we purchase is certified as DCF by FSC or PEFC so we do not have a deforestation footprint for those products. The packaging also contain a high proportion of recycled content. We do not have a measure for the footprint from our use of wooden pallets.

Palm oil

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ During the last 5 years

(8.10.1.7) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint during the last five years (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We ensure that all the palm oil that we purchase is certified as DCF by RSPO so we do not have a deforestation footprint for those products.

Cattle products

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We estimate the deforestation and conversion footprint based on sourcing area

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Since a specified cutoff date

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2020

(8.10.1.6) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since the specified cutoff date (hectares)

4608

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We estimate our deforestation footprint based on origin data, where we have supply chains that are in risk areas. We take a conservative approach to calculation using national deforestation figures from Global Forest Watch and overlaying that with the amount of production in risk areas. We are developing traceability systems that allow us to continue working with farmers that do not contribute to deforestation.

Soy

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Since a specified cutoff date

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2020

(8.10.1.6) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since the specified cutoff date (hectares)

3073

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

We estimate our deforestation footprint based on origin data, where we have supply chains that are in risk areas. For this year we have used the most conservative possible measure of soy deforestation risk, assuming all non-DCF soy is grown on newly deforested land, this is not likely but in line with the precautionary principle. This has been done by considering our consumption (both though direct soy purchase and embedded soy) against global average yield per hectare, to give an upper bound for our deforestation footprint. We are developing traceability systems that allow us to continue working with farmers that do not contribute to deforestation. [Add row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes.

Soy

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Engaging and working collaboratively in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

55

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Development of certification and sustainability standards

☑ Greater enforcement of regulations

☑ Greater stakeholder engagement and collaboration
☑ Greater supplier awareness/engagement
☑ Involvement in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

We are supporting industry initiatives such as the UK Soy Manifesto and the Retail Soy Group to ensure that soy used in UK-supplier animal feed is deforestation-free. We are working with suppliers in all geographies to raise the level of awareness around the issue of embedded soy in cattle. We are also signatories to the Business Statement of Support for the Cerrado Manifesto (Cerrado SoS) which calls for industry, civil society and government to work together to balance sustainable agricultural development and protect the Cerrado. For aquaculture and ingredients sections of our business, we have annual engagement with suppliers to capture their soy usage; including direct and embedded soy volumes, and certification status.
[Add row]

(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.

Timber products

(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.12.2) Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

Select from:
☑ Yes

Palm oil

(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.12.2) Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

Select from:

☑ Yes

Cattle products

(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years

(8.12.5) Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.12.6) Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted

Third party tools are only now becoming readily available and they currently only exist for geographies that have a high deforestation intensity. Where certification exists we will aim to adopt it. However for European countries (where the deforestation intensity is low or negligible) there is no third party certification available.

Soy

(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.12.2) Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

Select from:

☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

(8.12.1) Provide details of the certified volumes sold to each requesting CDP Supply Chain member.

Row 1

(8.12.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(8.12.1.2) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Soy

(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity

Select all that apply
☑ Embedded soy

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

901

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification
☑ Europe Soja

(8.12.1.7) % of the total volume of commodity sold to requesting member that is certified

100

(8.12.1.8) Comment (optional)

N/A

Row 2

(8.12.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(8.12.1.2) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Soy

(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Embedded soy

☑ Soy derivatives

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

2370

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification
☑ Europe Soja

(8.12.1.7) % of the total volume of commodity sold to requesting member that is certified

0

(8.12.1.8) Comment (optional)

N/A

Row 3

(8.12.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(8.12.1.2) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Timber products

(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity

Select all that apply
☑ Primary packaging
☑ Secondary packaging
☑ Tertiary packaging

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

245

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ FSC Forest Management certification

(8.12.1.7) % of the total volume of commodity sold to requesting member that is certified

100

(8.12.1.8) Comment (optional)

N/A

Row 4

(8.12.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(8.12.1.2) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Primary packaging

☑ Secondary packaging

☑ Tertiary packaging

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

469

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification
☑ FSC Forest Management certification

(8.12.1.7) % of the total volume of commodity sold to requesting member that is certified

100

(8.12.1.8) Comment (optional)

N/A

Row 5

(8.12.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(8.12.1.2) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Palm oil

(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm kernel oil derivatives

☑ Palm oil derivatives

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

0.16

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ RSPO producer/grower certification

(8.12.1.7) % of the total volume of commodity sold to requesting member that is certified

100

(8.12.1.8) Comment (optional)

N/A

Row 6

(8.12.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(8.12.1.2) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Soy

(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Embedded soy

☑ Soy derivatives

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

12233

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ RTRS standard for Responsible Soy Production

(8.12.1.7) % of the total volume of commodity sold to requesting member that is certified

3

(8.12.1.8) Comment (optional)

N/A

Row 7

(8.12.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(8.12.1.2) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Primary packaging

☑ Secondary packaging

☑ Tertiary packaging

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

499

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ FSC Forest Management certification

(8.12.1.7) % of the total volume of commodity sold to requesting member that is certified

100

(8.12.1.8) Comment (optional)

N/A
[Add row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

	GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Cattle products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members

[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

☑ Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

☑ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting

☑ Human rights protected under international law

☑ Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ First party audits

☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial monitoring

☑ Third party audits

(8.14.5) Please explain

We are currently mapping the implementation of geospatial monitoring in the supply base in South America and building a requirement for its implementation into commercial agreements. For certified soy, its deforestation and conversion-free guarantee is assessed as part of its certification.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Risk of water stress
☑ Access to new markets
☑ Response to regulation
☑ Risk of biodiversity loss
☑ Risk of human rights issues
☑ Commodity sourcing footprint
☑ Stakeholder/investor request
☑ Current and future sourcing risk
☑ Opportunity to build resilience at scale
☑ Organization has operational presence in area
☑ Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems
☑ Recognized as priority landscape by credible multi-stakeholder groups or industry platforms

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Through our Sustainable Protein Plan we have committed to ensuring that we eliminate deforestation from the conversion of natural forests to agriculture or livestock production in our supply chains. We began my mapping where our products that have the highest risk of deforestation or conversion. Where this risk extends beyond no or negligible risk we began working collaboratively with our suppliers, customers and wider industry to build supply chains together where we can demonstrate the product hasn't contributed. This includes a formal risk assessment and risk mitigation measures. We are working with our suppliers in South America to gain full traceability of our supply chains. We are signatories to the Business Statement of Support for the Cerrado Manifesto (Cerrado SoS) which calls for industry, civil society and government to work together to balance sustainable agricultural development and protect the Cerrado.
[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ1

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Cerrado

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Cerrado

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

200000000

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

2020

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:
☑ Not defined

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental
☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

Social
☑ Rights to land and resources recognized and protected, and related conflicts reduced

Production
☑ Increased uptake of certification
☑ Reliable commodity traceability and landscape monitoring/data collection system

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment
☑ Co-design and develop goals, strategies and an action plan with timebound targets and milestones for the initiative
☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation
☑ Help establish a transparent governance platform responsible for managing the initiative and its activities with clear roles, responsibilities and balanced decision-making

☑ Identify and act on opportunities for pre-competitive collaboration with your sector

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities
☑ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation

Link value chain action to landscape/jurisdictional initiative through private sector collaboration
☑ Collaborate on commodity traceability
☑ Use preferential sourcing to support landscape/jurisdictional initiatives that are demonstrating progress

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply
☑ Financial institution
☑ National government
☑ NGO and/or civil society
☑ Producers
☑ Private sector

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

Development of incentives for farmers not to convert natural landscapes.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:
☑ Yes, progress is collectively monitored using a shared external framework, please specify :Cerrado SoS

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

We have engaged with government, soy traders, and trader associations for the establishment of biome wide protection for the Cerrado and support the development of farmer incentives not to deforest including access to low interest loans linked to sustainable production verification.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Add row]

(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.

Row 1

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ1

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, and we are able/willing to disclose volume data

(8.15.3.3) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Cattle products

(8.15.3.4) % of disclosure volume from this landscape/jurisdiction

0.4

Row 2

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ1

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:
☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, and we are able/willing to disclose volume data

(8.15.3.3) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Soy

(8.15.3.4) % of disclosure volume from this landscape/jurisdiction

0.21
[Add row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Cattle products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

☑ Funding research organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

We are members of SAI platform and active participants in working groups including the European Roundtable for Beef Sustainability As members of the Global Roundtable for Sustainable Beef we participate directly in the global goal setting group and support the development of global tools to evaluate the footprint of cattle farming. We are leading on the environmental workstreams for the UK Cattle Sustainability Platform.

Row 2

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

We are founder members The Soy Transparency Coalition, where we participate in the annual survey of actions by soy traders to develop and verify the DCF status of their farmers. Through this forum we also co-fund the soy trader benchmarking surveys and reports. We are active participants in the physical supply chain and data transparency working groups for the UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy. We are full participants in the UNGC and have participated in their global ocean platform, where we contributed to their guidance that included addressing sustainable feed sourcing including deforestation-free soy.
[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Agriculture

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

☑ Securing continued supply of agricultural commodities

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Chirrup are Earthshot Prize nominees and run birdsong bioacoustics technology. By using artificial intelligence to monitor ecosystem health, Chirrup helps ease ecologists load, thus freeing up time to support farmers in the areas they need it most. Chirrup is now verified as effective as experienced ecologists for identifying birds, so an accelerated roll out of Chirrup boxes to farms across our supply chain is expected.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2022

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

609

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

4536

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

54.329

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

5.716

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

109000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

☑ Securing continued supply of agricultural commodities

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Chirrup's bioindicators provide information on the relevant trophic and ecosystem health indicators which then inform on wider commodity resilience measures better ensuring the continuity of supply of key agricultural commodities.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

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

Select from:
☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

At all of our sites there are water withdrawal meters installed

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(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

Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

We have a meter installed for each source we get the freshwater from

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Most of our water comes from water suppliers where it is a legislative requirement to comply with local water standards. Furthermore, our Foppen sites measure water withdrawal quality.

Water discharges – total volumes

(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

Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

We have a meter installed for all water discharged.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(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

Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of our discharged water go to local water treatment supplier

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We are doing: Filtration, Flotation, pH correction, Sedimentation and temp correction, Anaerobic treatment ponds, Fat and oil separation, interceptors

(9.2.4) Please explain

We don't do water treatment at all of our sites. 100% of water discharged will be delivered to local water treatment companies

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Grease traps installed

(9.2.4) Please explain

Grease traps will capture extensive fat in discharge water, which will increase the quality of discharged water. Extensive fat captured will be utilised as food waste.

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

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

As a food processing business, we don't use hazardous substances

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of our discharge water goes to water treatment supplier. Water temperatures will be between the contract boundaries

Water consumption – total volume

(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

Meter balance

(9.2.4) Please explain

We use a mass-balance method to calculate for our water consumption

Water recycled/reused

(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

Meter balance

(9.2.4) Please explain

We have a meter installed for water we recycled / reused

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

Site Audit

(9.2.4) Please explain

Internal site audits will check if WASH services provision is complying with our working condition standards and legislation compliance.
[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)

1318

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(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:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We didn't implement any improvements to decrease the volumes of water withdrawn, meaning total withdrawals is about the same as the previous reporting years

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

1005

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(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:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Improvements we delivered on 2023 are not significant at our scale level meaning total discharge is about the same as the previous reporting years

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

313

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(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:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Fluctuation in total water consumption is due to change in business activity. We have a target in place to improve water efficiency in Hilton Foods production facilities by at least 10% compared to our 2020 baseline by 2025 and achieved 9.5% in 2024.
[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)

386

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

29.29

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Our sites in Greece, (very high), Queensland and Victoria in Australia, site in Portugal and sites in Maas river basin in Netherlands (High)
[Fixed row]

(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Cattle products

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

Increase in total amount of beef purchased from areas of water stress due to improved traceability system that has been implemented this includes Beef purchased from Australia and Namibia. We anticipate reducing this number in the future. This metric will be used internally to monitor the amount of cattle product sourced from areas of water stress

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 0%

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

Though our facility is located in areas with high water stress, the aquaculture is not sourced from the regions. The figure is expected to decrease or remain the same. However, the management recognizes the water impact of the company's seafood facility and plans to decrease the water impact in the facility regions. Primarily, by implementing sustainable options for water withdrawals.

Poultry & hog

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 0%

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

We don't source poultry from areas with water stress

Other commodity

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ No, we do not have this data and have no plans to obtain it

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

No other commodities applicable
[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 don't withdraw fresh surface water including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We don't withdraw from seawater or brackish surface water

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

150

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We have a groundwater withdrawal on our recently acquired sites. One of the sites this is withdrawing groundwater is located in a region of water stress. We have prioritised to solve this issue in next 2 years

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We don't withdraw freshwater from non-renewable groundwater sources

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We don’t withdraw entrained water

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1167

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We are supplied freshwater from local water supplier companies for most of our sites
[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)

24.69

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Not applicable as this is the first year of reporting

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We only discharge fresh surface water at our facility in Portugal

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We don't discharge water to brackish surface water or seawater

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We don't discharge water to groundwater

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

980.01

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

All of our discharge water is delivered to local water treatment suppliers
[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

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

414.67

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:
☑ 41-50

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Our seafood sites have secondary treatment in place. As they are water withdrawal / discharge hotspots, the volume of water discharge is significant.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

590

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 51-60

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Rest of the facilities have primary treatment for grease removal as this is typical contaminant in meat processing

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

N/A

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

N/A

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

N/A
[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

19

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:
☑ 76-99

(9.3.4) Please explain

All production facilities of our direct operations. Offices are not included

Upstream value chain

(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

444

(9.3.4) Please explain

We have assessed all our protein suppliers for dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities for our upstream value chain.
[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 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Australia, Heathwood

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify :Australia - East Coast, Brisbane

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-27.64442

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

152.98786

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

129.21

(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

129.21

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

90.03

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

90.03

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

39.18

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Australia, Truganiana

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify :Australia - East Coast, Werribee

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.82731

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

144.76459

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

96.45

(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

96.45

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

80.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

80.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

16.31

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SoHi, Portugal

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

Portugal

☑ Other, please specify :Portugal - Tagus basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.25103

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-8.71181

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

71.4

(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

16.56

(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

54.84

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

24.69

(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

24.69

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

46.71

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Foppen Greece

(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
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

Greece
☑ Other, please specify :Greece - Achelous

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.98846

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

20.7237

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

89.1

(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

67.55

(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

21.55

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

91.93

(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

91.93

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-2.83

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Dalco Oosterhout, Netherlands

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

51.63092

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

4.88611

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

32.14

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(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

32.14

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

32.54

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(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

32.54

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-0.4

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Fairfax Meadow, Enfield

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Other, please specify :UK- Lee

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

51.64896

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.02873

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(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

0.01

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.29

(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

2.29

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-2.28

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Australia, Bunbury

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify :Australia - Collie/Preston minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.36219

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

115.68725

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

35.6

(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

35.6

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

23.5

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

23.5

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12.1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Denmark

(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
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(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

Denmark
☑ Gudena

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

56.10054

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

10.07394

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

42.34

(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

42.34

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

32.97

(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

32.97

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

9.37

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Fairfax Meadow, Derby

(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
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Other, please specify :UK - Derwent minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.90266

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-1.44767

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.04

(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

0.04

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.64

(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

2.64

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-2.6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Ireland

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Other, please specify :Ireland - Boyne

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

53.72431

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-6.32649

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

25.75

(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

25.75

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

25.66

(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

25.66

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.09

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Fairfax Meadow, Eastleigh

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Other, please specify :UK -Beaulieu

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.9787

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-1.38867

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0

(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

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(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

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-0.14

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Seachill, ER2

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Other, please specify :UK -Great Eau minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

53.57661

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.10941

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

170.76

(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

170.76

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

69.65

(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

69.65

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

101.1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Foppen, Netherlands

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

☑ Other, please specify :Netherlands - Zuiderzee minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.36256

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

5.64642

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

75.95

(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

74.52

(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

1.42

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

66.49

(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

66.49

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

9.46

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Sweden

(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
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

Sweden
☑ Other, please specify :Sweden - Lake Malaren

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

59.58509

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

16.47534

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

70.09

(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

70.09

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

70.09

(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

70.09

(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

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods New Zealand

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

New Zealand

☑ Other, please specify :New Zealand - Northern Wairoa minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.00163

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

174.85416

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

61.67

(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

61.67

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

61.67

(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

61.67

(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:

☑ Much lower

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Holland

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

☑ Other, please specify :Netherlands - Zuiderzee minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.42526

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

4.80971

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

98.62

(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

98.62

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

51.51

(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

51.51

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

47.11

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods UK

(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

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Other, please specify :UK - Great Ouse minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.34687

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.18989

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

99

(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

99

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

24

(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

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Central Europe, Poland

(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
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(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

Poland
☑ Wisla

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.09866

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

19.04204

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

105.61

(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

105.61

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

92.9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

92.9

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12.71

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods Seachill, LFR

(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
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Other, please specify :UK -Great Eau minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

53.5821

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.12026

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

169.02

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(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

169.02

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

161.88

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(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

161.88

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

7.14

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement
[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 don't verify this parameter through third-party

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We don't verify this parameter through third-party

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We don't verify this parameter through third-party

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We don't verify this parameter through third-party

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We don't verify this parameter through third-party

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We don't verify this parameter through third-party

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We don't verify this parameter through third-party

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We don't verify this parameter through third-party
[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:

☑ Yes, CDP supply chain members buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

(9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member.

Row 1

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Foppen, Netherlands

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

34.16 ML of the water withdrawn and 29.91 ML of the water discharged at this facility is related to Costco brands

(9.4.1.5) Comment

Based on mass proportion

Row 2

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 13

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Foppen, Netherlands

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

13.85 ML of the water withdrawn and 12.12 ML of the water discharged at this facility is related to products sold to Ahold Delheize brands

(9.4.1.5) Comment

Based on mass proportion

Row 3

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 10

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Hilton Foods Central Europe

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

23.91 ML of the water withdrawn, and 21.04 ML of the water discharged at this facility is related to Ahold Delheize brands

(9.4.1.5) Comment

Based on mass proportion

Row 4

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 20

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Hilton Foods Holland

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

98.53 ML of the water withdrawn and 51.46 ML of the water discharged at this facility is related to Costco brands

(9.4.1.5) Comment

Based on mass proportion

Row 5

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 14

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Dalco Oosterhout, Netherlands

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

14.97 ML of the water withdrawn and 15.16 ML of the water discharged at this facility is related to Friesland Campina brands

(9.4.1.5) Comment

Based on mass proportion
[Add row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

3988300000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

3026024.28

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

We have actions in plan to reduce water intensity for our products. Growing inflation would also cause the water withdrawal efficiency to decrease. Note: In previous year's report, the Revenue (currency) figure was provided in millions
[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

Cattle products

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

1.67

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Total water withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.9.6) Please explain

The water intensity value for 2024 was lower in comparison to the previous reporting year due to reduced levels of water withdrawals when looking at site level data. This metric is used internally to help to identify and monitor areas of the business where improvements can be made in this area. We are continuously looking to implement water efficiency measures across the group, and we expect our water intensity figure for cattle to be lower in the next reporting period as we look to increase the efficiency of total water withdrawn at our cattle processing facilities. Our management team recognises the water impact of operations and plans to reduce the water impact, using the sustainable technology with focus a on cattle purchased from areas of high water-stress.

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

15.73

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.9.6) Please explain

The water intensity value for 2024 was lower in comparison to the previous reporting year due to a decrease in water withdrawals in our seafood processing sites. This metric is used internally to help to identify and monitor areas of the business where improvements can be made in this area. We are continuously looking to implement water efficiency measures across the group, and we expect our water intensity figure for fish and seafood from aquaculture to be lower in the next reporting period as we look to increase the efficiency of total water withdrawn at our processing facilities. Our management team recognises the water impact of operations and plans to reduce the water impact, using the sustainable technology with focus on areas of high water-stress.

Poultry & hog

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ No, not currently but we intend to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.6) Please explain

Sites that process poultry and pork are also handling other products, making it difficult to accurately determine a specific water intensity value for pork and poultry. We are looking to have a system in place to enable this figure to be calculated within the next 2 years.

Soy

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ No, not currently but we intend to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.6) Please explain

Sites that handle soy are also handling other products, making it difficult to accurately determine a specific water intensity value. We are looking to have a system in place to enable this figure to be calculated within the next 2 years.

Other commodity

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

0.9

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.9.6) Please explain

The water intensity value for 2024 was much lower in comparison to the previous reporting year due to the closure of one of our sites. This metric is used internally to help to identify and monitor areas of the business where improvements can be made in this area. We are continuously looking to implement water efficiency measures across the group, and we expect our water intensity figure for other commodities to be lower in the next reporting period as we look to increase the efficiency of total water withdrawn at our processing facilities. Our management team recognises the water impact of operations and plans to reduce the water impact, using the sustainable technology with focus on areas of high water-stress.
[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Average product Hilton foods produces

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

2.32

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water withdrawn

(9.12.4) Denominator

tonne of product produced

(9.12.5) Comment

n/a
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*As a food business we do not produce hazardous products.*

[Fixed 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, but we plan to address this within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Judged to be unimportant, explanation provided	*This is not currently a customer priority and certification frameworks are limited.*

[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, but we plan to within the next two years

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

As the meat processing, our water pollution comes from organic components in the water. 100% of our water is discharged and treated by the local water treatment companies. We already have installed grease traps to limit the amount of organic components in discharged water (primarily dissolved fat) to decrease our impacts on discharged water.

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

N/A
[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

04/03/2021

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

927215

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

834494

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

839050

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

95

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :WRAP Courtauld 2030

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers all our facilities with focus on production, however in calculations acquisitions since 2020 are excluded

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

Implement the best water management policies and practices, with primary focus on sites with significant water stress. This will include, but not limited to our sites in Australia, Greece, and Portugal.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

We have decreased our total equivalent water consumption by 9.5% (V.S 2020 Baseline), this excludes new acquisitions made since 2020
[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

☑ Reduce the total weight of plastic packaging used and/or produced

☑ Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is reusable

Plastic goods/products

☑ Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic goods/products

(10.1.3) Please explain

Targets by 2025: (1) Reduce direct packaging waste by 30% compared to a 2020 baseline; (2) Drive demand for circular tray-to-tray recycling and actively prioritise the use of circular material; (3) All our retail packaging will be fully reusable, recyclable or compostable; (4) Achieve a minimum of 50% average recycled content across all plastic packaging; (5) Reduce the weight of our plastic packaging while ensuring it remains fit for purpose.
[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:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We don't have this plastic activity within our direct operations

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We don't have this plastic activity within our direct operations

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

We have reusable plastic trays in our operations for logistic purposes

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We don't have this plastic activity within our direct operations

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Our products are packaged in plastic before they go to the retail

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 don't have this plastic activity within our direct operations

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We don't have this plastic activity within our direct operations

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We don't have this plastic activity within our direct operations

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We don't have this plastic activity within our direct operations
[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.

	Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)	Raw material content percentages available to report	Please explain
Durable goods and durable components used	*343.43*	*Select all that apply* ☑ None	*We do not currently monitor the raw material content of durable goods.*

[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

32800.12

(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

43.69

(10.5.4) % virgin renewable content

0

(10.5.5) % pre-consumer recycled content

0

(10.5.6) % post-consumer recycled content

56.3

(10.5.7) Please explain

We use recycled plastic in packaging
[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

Plastic packaging used

(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

0

(10.5.1.3) % of plastic packaging that is technically recyclable

81

(10.5.1.4) % of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice at scale

81

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

We don't differentiate between recyclable in practice and technically recyclable in accounting. Only material which is likely to be recycled in the market where the product is sold is counted as recyclable. This is to ensure packaging design decisions reflect the local disposal context rather than theoretical disposal systems. Systems for reuse are not currently in place in any markets where we operate.
[Fixed row]

(10.6) Provide the total weight of waste generated by the plastic you produce, commercialize, use and/or process and indicate the end-of-life management pathways.

Usage of plastic

(10.6.1) Total weight of waste generated during the reporting year (Metric tons)

2703

(10.6.2) End-of-life management pathways available to report

Select all that apply
☑ Preparation for reuse
☑ Recycling
☑ Incineration

(10.6.3) % prepared for reuse

2

(10.6.4) % recycling

32

(10.6.7) % incineration

(10.6.12) Please explain

Percentages were determined from site level data.
[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water protection

☑ Land/water management

☑ Species management

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Law & policy

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ State and benefit indicators

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
		☑ Pressure indicators ☑ Response indicators

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

HF Australia (Bunbury), HF Denmark, Fairfax Meadows (Enfield), HF UK, HF Australia (Truganina) and HF New Zealand, Foppen seafood (Greece) and HF Sweden

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:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

No

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:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

No

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:
☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Fairfax Meadows (Enfield), HF Seachill, Foppen Seafoods

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

HF Ireland, Fairfax Meadows (Enfield), HF Seachill and Foppen Seafoods

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:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

No
[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:
☑ Ireland

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Boyne estuary

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Ramsar sites

☑ 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

Lea Valley

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing and warehouse

(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:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Australia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Unnamed WA40552

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 4

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Zealand

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Wiri Station Road

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat and seafood processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 5

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category Ia-III

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Zealand

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Wiri Lava Cave

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat and seafood processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 6

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

2005151 Sex ekar

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Processing of meat, soup, porridge, pizza

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 7

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Greece

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

NISOI PAXOI KAI ANTIPAXOI KAI EVRYTERI THALASSIA PERIOCHI

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Seafood processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 8

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Denmark

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Aarhus Kommune

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites

through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 9

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Veluwerandmeren

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Seafood processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 10

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

NNN-NB

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 11

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

NNN-NH

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 12

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(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

Chingford Reservoirs

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing and warehouse

(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:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 13

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(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

Weelsby Woods Park

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Seafood processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 14

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(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

Humber Estuary

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Seafood processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites

through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 15

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(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

Great Stukeley Railway Cutting

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 16

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Ireland

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Scheduling
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 17

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

2005159 En hänggran

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Processing of meat, soup, porridge, pizza

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 18

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Greece

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Periochi Perivallontikou Elegchou Ethnikou Parkou Ygrotopon Amvrakikou (Zoni C)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Seafood processing

(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:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Scheduling
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 19

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category Ia-III

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Australia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Angliss Grassland (Laverton North) N.C.R.

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain.

Row 20

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Denmark

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Aarhus Kommune Privat

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Meat processing

(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:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Scheduling

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Whilst our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. Our facilities may still generate limited noise, smell and light pollution and we have implemented global best practices to help minimise these impacts. In terms of mitigation, we also store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. Whilst we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers’ sites through several programs. We continuously work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilize geospatial monitoring to continuously evaluate biodiversity impacts, ensuring that we maintain a responsible approach across our supply chain. [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

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards

☑ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

For the purposes of the verification, the verifier was given access to Hilton Foods energy data on the portal with invoices attached. This allowed for detailed sampling and verification to take place. It focused upon the sites which are the highest consumers of electricity and natural gas that are in scope of the GHG Emissions Inventory. (verification report attached)

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

317609 Hilton Food Group- FY 2024 GHG Verification Report v4.0 (2).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 Quality and Sustainability Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute