



Hilton Food Group plc

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

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

[Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP](#)

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

English

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

Select from:

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

The Hilton Foods business was established in 1994 to set up and operate a central beef and lamb retail packing facility in Huntingdon, England. Over the last 29 years business has grown and currently Hilton Foods is operating in more than 20 markets around the world. We have facilities across Europe, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand, each facility run by a local management team enhanced by specialist central leadership, expertise, advice and support. In Portugal the facility is operated under joint venture company in which Hilton Foods shares the profits. Recent strategic acquisitions have diversified our food categories and led to further integration in the supply chain service sector. Within our supply chain services pillar we own 65% of Foods Connected, an award-winning end to end supply chain management software platform, a joint venture with Agito Group offering automation solutions and investment in Cellular Agriculture Ltd, developing next generation, scalable solutions for alternative protein production. Hilton Foods operates large scale, extensively automated and robotised food processing, packing and logistics facilities for major international retailers on a largely dedicated basis. Developing robotics technology has been extended in recent years both in the production environment and to the sorting of finished products by retailer store order, achieving material supply chain efficiencies for our customers. Products from the Group's facilities are sold in 14 European countries, Australia, New Zealand, USA, Canada and to countries throughout Asia. Hilton Foods portfolio is primarily meat and fish based, with a growing proportion of prepared food and vegetarian proteins. Hilton Foods do not directly own or operate any primary agriculture, fisheries or slaughter facilities.

[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

12/31/2023

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

Select from:

Yes

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

Select from:

Yes

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

Select from:

3 years

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

Select from:

3 years

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

Select from:

3 years

[Fixed row]

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

(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?
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 Mälaren 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

41.519967

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-8.580611

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Cavado 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

38.959265

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

20.751715

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Achelous basin

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Dalco Oos

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.758062

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

5.51101

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Meuse 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, Humberston Rd

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.517139

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.0267

(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)

10936

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

Select from:

- No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- 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)

9.2

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

Select from:

No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- Palm 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)

260701.63

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

Select from:

No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

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)

93179.96

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

92469.51

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

656.55

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

Select from:

No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

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

- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain
- End-of-life management

(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

Select all that apply

- Recycling
- Waste to Energy
- Incineration
- Landfill
- Leakage

[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:

76-99%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

76-99%

(1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:

76-99%

(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 3 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%

(1.24.2.7) 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:

76-99%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

76-99%

(1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:

76-99%

(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)

2

(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)

6

(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both risks and opportunities	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Other

- Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- Drought
- Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- Wildfires

Chronic physical

- Water stress
- Sea level rise
- Declining water quality
- Water quality at a basin/catchment level
- Increased severity of extreme weather events

Policy

- Carbon pricing mechanisms
- 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

Liability

- Non-compliance with regulations

- Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

- Transition to lower emissions technology and products

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- NGOs
- Regulators

- Customers
- Employees
- Investors
- Suppliers
- Other commodity users/producers at a local level
- 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, as 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 believes that it is vital to strike the right balance between an appropriate and comprehensive control environment and encouraging the level of entrepreneurial freedom of action required to seek out and develop new business opportunities; but, however skilfully this balance between risk and reward is struck, the business will always be subject to a number of risks and uncertainties, as outlined below. 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 agreed in conjunction with the risk owner. 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

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

Areas important for biodiversity

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

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

key_biodiversity_areas_cdp.xlsx

[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

50000000

(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 and to determine actions that can reasonably and cost-effectively be taken to mitigate them. The Hilton Food Group has a Risk Management Committee that identify and monitor responses to key risks, which are compiled into a risk register. Definition of substantive financial impact: Hilton Foods defines substantive financial impact as an effect that has significant impact (greater than 1% reduction in profit) on the organization at the corporate level. In 2023 this would have been an impact of greater than 950,000. A risk with a greater than 30% probability of occurrence and impact greater than 1mil or a greater than 90% chance of occurrence and impact greater than 500,000 is considered substantive. Description of the quantifiable indicator(s): The size and relevance of these risks and opportunities are evaluated on the basis of the size of impact they would have on volume produced and the potential for shareholder or customer concern. If risks were to pose a greater impact than a 1% reduction in profits, they would be considered as 'substantive'. We also utilize customers' processes for identifying climate related risks by maintaining constant communication with our mutual CSR teams. Substantive impact on the business: an impact that has a considerable or relatively significant effect on an organization at the corporate level. This could include operational, financial or strategic effects that undermine the entire business or part of the business. A substantive financial or strategic impact on our business is defined in our risk management process as follows: either the effect on revenue is more than GBP 50 million and the probability of occurrence is above 25%, or the effect on revenue is GBP 10-50 million and the probability of occurrence is above 75%.

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

50000000

(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 and to determine actions that can reasonably and cost-effectively be taken to mitigate them. The Hilton Food Group has a Risk Management Committee that identify and monitor responses to key risks, which are compiled into a risk register. Definition of substantive financial impact: Hilton Foods defines substantive financial impact as an effect that has significant impact (greater than 1% reduction in profit) on the organization at the corporate level. In 2023 this would have been an impact of greater than 950,000. A risk with a greater than 30% probability of occurrence and impact greater than 1mil or a greater than 90% chance of occurrence and impact greater than 500,000 is considered substantive. Description of the quantifiable indicator(s): The size and relevance of these risks and opportunities are evaluated on the basis of the size of impact they would have on volume produced and the potential for shareholder or customer concern. If risks were to pose a greater impact than a 1% reduction in profits, they would be considered as 'substantive'. We also utilize customers' processes for identifying climate related risks by maintaining constant communication with our mutual CSR teams. Substantive impact on the business: an impact that has a considerable or relatively significant effect on an organization at the corporate level. This could include operational, financial or strategic effects that undermine the entire business or part of the business. A substantive financial or strategic impact on our business is defined in our risk management process as follows: either the effect on revenue is more than GBP 50 million and the probability of occurrence is above 25%, or the effect on revenue is GBP 10-50 million and the probability of occurrence is above 75%.

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
- Other, please specify

(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 a contamination event 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	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Forests	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Water	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Plastics	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Canada | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Portugal |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Australia |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sweden | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Netherlands |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Denmark | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Zealand |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ireland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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)

1556100

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

5320000

(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 2023 had the value of 26,600,000 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% 26,600,000 GBP 1.6 mil 20%* 26,600,000 GBP 5.3 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

1660000

(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 (25000 GBP) and the investment in Cellular Agriculture (1635000 GBP) Total cost of response to risk 25,000 1,635,000 1,660,000 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. The intention is to be able to implement this in our supply chain in the next three years.

(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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greece | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Portugal |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Australia |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sweden | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Netherlands |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Denmark | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ireland | |

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Gudena
- Meuse

- Rhine
- Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Achelous river basin (Greece), Cavado river basin (Portugal), Beaulieu, Derwent, Great Eau, Great Ouse, Lee river basins (England), Boyne river basin (Ireland), Lake Mälaren basin (Sweden), Collie/ Preston, Brisbane, Werribee river basin (Australia), Northern Wairoia river basin (New Zealand). 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)

286353

(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 (3,240,084,000 GBP) split evenly over the 31 independent production units and allocated for one day. $3,240,084,000/31/365$ 286353

(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 growth 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.

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)

47040000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This is the maximum fine that may be imposed (4% of EU revenue, GBP 1.176 bn in 2023) 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

8500

(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.

(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)

47040000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This is the maximum fine that may be imposed (4% of EU revenue, GBP 1.176 bn in 2023) 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

8500

(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.

(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)

47040000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This is the maximum fine that may be imposed (4% of EU revenue, GBP 1.176 bn in 2023) 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

8500

(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.

(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

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

Revenue

[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:

Less than 1%

(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 :Cavado

(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

(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

2

(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.

[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 was one incident of nonconformance in FY23 at our Wiri site in New Zealand due to an overflow of trade waste. The issue was reported to the local authorities and the corrective actions were carried out to close out the nonconformance.

[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 behaviors 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

- Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

- Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

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:

- No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

(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 (150595). $3.14 \text{ GBP} * 150595 \text{ MWh} = 495,868.3$*

(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 contract in Poland, UK, Ireland, Sweden to renewable supply. This has resulted in savings of 15,000 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 2023 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) $0.035 \times 0.5 \times 142067500$ 2 486 181

(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) $0.035 \times 0.5 \times 142067500 = 2486181$

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

(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)

11800

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

13000

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

11800

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

13000

(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 0.51 AUD/GBP.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Detailed cost evaluation still in progress.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Currently conducting site level civil surveys to assess the technical aspects of implementation. Plan to implement in most water-stressed sites.

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

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

Amazonas

(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. Visipeca 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. Used the methodology to calculate the transition to DCF soy feed in salmon in risk section-71909073 x 6 the average price of salmon per tonne 431,454,438.00

[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:

OPEX

(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

Non-executive directors or equivalent

Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

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)

[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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)

(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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding annual budgets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing the setting of corporate targets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify :Overseeing value chain engagement | |

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board has ultimate responsibility for sustainability, provides rigorous challenge to management on progress against goals and targets, and ensures the Group maintains an effective risk management and internal control system, including over climate-related risks and opportunities. The board works to build relationships with our communities and legitimate public interest groups. The Board convenes eight times a year and climate-related issues form part of the Board agenda. The Board has oversight of the progress against our Sustainability strategy. The Board has full responsibility to ensure the effectiveness of the risk management systems in place and undertakes an annual review of the principal risks that include climate change.

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)

(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 the setting of corporate targets
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
- Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
- Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- Other, please specify :Monitoring implementation and performance Reviewing and guiding business plans Reviewing and guiding corporate responsibility strategy Reviewing and guiding strategy Setting performance objectives

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board is formally updated on the progress of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan every three months and together with the Sustainability Committee has oversight over the implementation of Hilton Food's sustainability strategy throughout the business. This includes reviewing and guiding of annual budgets, business plans, strategy and monitoring implementation and performance. The Sustainability Committee discusses climate-related risks and opportunities 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 Audit Committee considers climate-related risks with a report and minutes from the chair of the Sustainability Committee. The board has a review of risks and Sustainability strategy progress scheduled annually. Agenda items for the Sustainability Committee October meeting, we updated on our progress on the Hilton Foods commitment across all geographies and did a legislation update in all of the geographies we operate in.

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)

(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 the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Main Board is updated on the progress of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan every three months. In collaboration with the Sustainability Committee, it oversees the implementation of Hilton Foods' sustainability strategy throughout the organisation. This includes the setting of and progress against our water target, monitoring compliance with our commitment to SDG 6 and Courtault Commitment. In addition to 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.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

- Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(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 the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board oversees our alignment to policies and commitments on biodiversity and our engagement in public policy development, which is linked to our commitment and advocacy around no deforestation and no conversion. Furthermore, they review our assessment process for risks and opportunities around biodiversity such as upcoming European legislation and other affecting external factors.

[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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 issues
- Implementing a climate transition plan environmental issues
- 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

Chief Sustainability Officer of Hilton Foods is responsible for a company's environmental impact, resources and plans and help Hilton Foods to evaluate the environmental impact and determine how to increase the sustainable practices in the future.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- 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 Sustainability and Quality Officer is also a member of the Executive Leadership Team. They are updated monthly alongside the CEO on the progress of our 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan and relevant forest-related issues including monitoring progress against our deforestation commitment and the management of the annual budget. They also report via the Chair of the Sustainability Committee to the board annually on our risk assessment and progress towards our commitments.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- 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 Sustainability and Quality Officer is also a member of the Executive Leadership Team. They are updated monthly alongside the CEO on the progress of our 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan and relevant water-related issues. They also report via the Chair of the Sustainability Committee to the board annually on our risk assessment and progress towards our commitments.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- 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

Hilton Foods delivers a future-ready food system where complex issues such as biodiversity are included in our targets and sustainability report. Our organization addresses biodiversity as we would like to enable farmers to reduce their emissions and improve biodiversity to promote more regenerative farming by reporting tools and enhance biodiversity on land by eliminating deforestation in our supply chains by 2025. Our Nature Positive Plan contains the following objectives: - Eliminate deforestation from the conversion of natural forests to agriculture or livestock production in Hilton Foods's supply chains - Maintain 100% of paper and board from certified sources - Planning and reporting tools provided to all farmers to support regenerative farming - 100% of seafood responsibly sourced to Hilton Foods standards (aligned to the Sustainable Seafood Coalition code and PAS 1550), and openly reporting supply chains through Ocean Disclosure Project - Hilton Seafood UK directly sourced wild-caught seafood 100% certified to the MSC standard or equivalent (by 2025) - Hilton Foods has partnered with technology start-up Chirrup.ai, through the Tesco-WWF Sustainability Innovation Fund. Chirrup.ai uses cost-effective technology to monitor birdsong as a biodiversity indicator for grassland-based farming. Acting like a robot ecologist, a Chirrup box is placed in an appropriate place on the farm, where ambient sound is recorded and used by artificial intelligence to identify the population of each of the species it detects. This allows us to assess the ecosystems, health, measure natural productivity and build improvement plans for the farms where Chirrup boxes are deployed.

[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

We have developed a Long-term Incentive Plan to demonstrate the importance of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan to the business and ensure leadership is held accountable to the progress we strive to make. 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 100% of high risk suppliers with 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

We have developed a Long-term Incentive Plan to demonstrate the importance of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan to the business and ensure leadership is held accountable to the progress we strive to make. The annual bonus for the Executive Directors is augmented by the personal element bonus which is calculated based on several metrics including increasing packaging recycled content, paper and cardboard form part of this metric.

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

We have developed a Long-term Incentive Plan to demonstrate the importance of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan to the business and ensure leadership is held accountable for the progress we strive to make. The annual bonus for the Executive Directors is augmented by the personal element bonus which is calculated based on several metrics including SMETA audits.

[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

Emission reduction

- Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

- Energy efficiency improvement

- Other resource use and efficiency-related metrics, please specify :Reduction of food waste

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

- Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The annual bonus for the Executive Directors is augmented by the personal element bonus which is calculated based on performance on the objectives set in respect of delivering the company strategy and planning for the future. The ESG related performance conditions covering the three financial years 2023-2025 are 1) Scope 1&2 (5% weighting), 35% reduction over 3 years 2) Scope 3 (5% weighting) 21% reduction over 3 years 3) percentage of suppliers with a valid SMETA audit (2%) 80% of higher risk suppliers

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

During 2022 we introduced ESG performance metrics into our Long Term Incentive Plan including emissions, packaging recycling and food waste targets to align our senior leaders with supporting the delivery of the Sustainable Protein Plan. The 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan is a fundamental part of our plan to generate sustainable value for all our stakeholders. This year, we have therefore further embedded sustainability as a driver of how we do business by announcing specific ESG targets in the Hilton Foods Long-Term Incentive Plan (LTIP). This is the first time the LTIP contains a significant ESG element. The changes are designed to demonstrate in practice the importance of the 2025 Sustainable Protein Plan to the business, and ensure leadership are held accountable to the progress we strive to make.

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:

- Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The performance conditions cover the three financial years 2022-2024 and cover 100% of direct operations. The ESG related performance conditions covering the three financial years 2023-2025 are 1) Scope 3 (5% weighting) 21% reduction over 3 years 2) percentage of suppliers with a valid SMETA audit (2%) 80% of higher risk suppliers

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

During 2022 we introduced ESG performance metrics into our Long Term Incentive Plan, the LTIP relies on ensuring no land conversion or deforestation to achieve this. This is essential in delivering our transition plan and decarbonising the animal feed in our supply chain.

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:

Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The performance conditions cover the three financial years 2022-2024 and cover 100% of direct operations. The minimum threshold to indicate successful performance is for 80% of suppliers to have relevant SMETA audit, of which water is a component.

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

During 2022 we introduced ESG performance metrics into our Long Term Incentive Plan, the LTIP includes water efficiency in the metrics. This is essential in delivering our transition plan and achieving compliance through our supply chain.

[Add row]

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

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.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 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
- Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)
- UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy
- Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
- Roundtable on Sustainable Soy (RTRS)
- Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)
- Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
- Global Roundtable for Sustainable Beef (GRSB)
- Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member

(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. Ensuring ingredients are responsibly sourced and from certified deforestation and conversion-free origins. This engagement spans our collaboration with the Cerrado Manifesto, Roundtable on Sustainable Soy, UK Roundtable on Sustainable Soy, Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, and Forest Stewardship Council. 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 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.

[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

hilton_ar23_web.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.
[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 requirements.

(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)

61450

(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

(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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risks & Opportunities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Value chain engagement |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emission targets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity indicators |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emissions figures | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public policy engagement |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commodity volumes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water accounting figures |

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

TCFD: 76-89 Biodiversity indicators: 67 Emissions, commodity and water data: 90-109

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Annual Report '23.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

N/A

[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

No, but we plan to within the next two years

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

Select from:

Lack of available methodologies

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

There are no standardised methodologies to apply scenario analysis to forest risk for relevant commodities.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- 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

- 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

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

We used scenarios based on WRI Aqueduct future scenarios for 2030, 2050, and 2080 based on Business and usual, Pessimistic and Optimistic assumptions. The Indicators applied were Water Stress, Water Supply/Demand, Interannual / Seasonal Variability. The analysis is to test short and long-term performance on our sites location.

(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:

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:

- 2.5°C - 2.9°C

(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, ie 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.

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:

SSP4

(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.

[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

- Target setting and transition planning
- Other, please specify :Impact on our supply chain, including the retail value of our produce and consequently our consumers' behavior.

(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 transition-scenario results point towards a possible rebalancing of protein sales from beef & lamb toward lower carbon & healthier alternatives such as plant-based & fish/seafood products. One of the results of the scenario analysis is that in a medium-term time horizon, beef & lamb products would receive the largest increase in pricing. Fish & plant products don't increase as significantly upon pricing in 2030 when applying either the stated policies scenario carbon price, or sustainable development scenario carbon price. Beef displays medium impact within the STEPS scenario in the UK & Ireland, but high impact elsewhere. Lamb displays medium impact in the STEPS scenarios. This directly influenced our decision to further diversify into convenience, plant based & fish products. This can be seen in our purchase of Foppen & Dalco in last 2 years. Time-horizon: medium-term. 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), so isn't considered to be climate-related. Our most pertinent physical risk exposure is global sea level rise, which under a baseline scenario presents a high or extreme risk to about a third of our total estate by 2100 (long-term horizon), concentrated in Grimsby & the Netherlands. Most of our sites in Netherlands are assessed to be in 'Extreme' risk zones from storm surge. But this is a widespread regional risk & most of these sites benefit from extremely robust standards of national flood protection, reflecting the Dutch governments' significant expenditure on maintenance & reinforcement programmes. While our 2 Foppen sites in Harderwijk are assessed to have less flood protection than our other Netherlands sites, we anticipate continued works by the government to mitigate risks to the Flevoland region & its surroundings. In response to the findings we have initiated an audit of our business continuity plans & have reinforced them appropriately. Recognising the significant economic & societal impact of Cyclone Gabrielle on New Zealand's North Island in February 2023, we modelled how tropical storms may affect our Auckland facility in the decades to 2100. Gabrielle had no direct impact on our site but highlighted the potential for disruption to supply. We have additionally modelled how 2 of our Australian sites are projected to be increasingly exposed to drought risk, & considered how these plants may mitigate these risks especially given the relatively high water consumption at Truganina plant which is already in a high water stress area.

Water

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

Select all that apply

- Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- Organization-wide

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

Flooding in February 2023 in New Zealand has raised awareness of the potential risk to our facilities from storms and flooding. At present our Auckland facility is categorized as being at medium exposure to flash floods, and our modelling suggests increases in maximum 5-day precipitation at the site by 11% and 14% under 1.5C and 2.6C scenarios respectively (by 2030). When measuring wind speed severity, the site will remain at a low exposure (142-184km/h) to tropical cyclones, and medium exposure (121-160km/h) to extratropical cyclones under all future time horizons and scenarios. In addition, the Brisbane metropolitan area is historically prone to flash flooding and is under very high precipitation stress in all future time horizons and scenarios. While our modelling does not indicate a direct impact to our Brisbane facility, severe river flooding may impact local infrastructure, transport links and employees, affecting the normal operation of the site. While we project increased precipitation at our Auckland facility, such storms are challenging to model given their infrequency, high degree of random variability and complex interrelation of underlying smallscale physical processes. We will continue to proactively monitor projected changes to this risk and our business continuity plans at the site. In addition, the Auckland site has substantial disaster preparedness plans in the event of earthquakes which can also be enacted in the event of other physical hazards including storms.

[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. In light of current policy uncertainties around the use of biomass in a number of markets, this does not form a significant part of our decarbonisation roadmap. Hilton Foods actively engages with government on decarbonisation policy, both directly and as part of industry groups. The geographic focus of our transition plan is on Europe, Australia and New Zealand, in line with our current operations, however much of the implementation is relevant to other regions and will be implemented as we expand into new geographies, most immediately Canada. The plan has been developed to be robust to wider economic factors, including the labour availability challenges that the sector is currently experiencing. Costs of low carbon technologies, including solar panels, heat pumps and electric vehicles, have fallen precipitously in recent years. Consequently, cost modelling is likely to remain robust even if economic conditions change. The transition plan is fully deliverable to 2030 with existing commercially available technologies across Scopes 1, 2 or 3. Our long-term goals will require some scaling of emerging technologies, however where this is the case multiple technology pathways have been identified. Modelling has been conducted primarily on the basis of national average data, although supplier level data has been used where available and of sufficient quality. National level energy system operator data has been used for energy related assessments, where this is unavailable IEA data has been used. A further analysis of the impacts of changes in client or consumer demand was conducted in our 2021 TCFD. The outcomes of this work were included in the development of the transition plan to understand the impact on our strategic ambitions.

(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_ar23_web.pdf,hilton_ar23_web.pdf

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

Select all that apply

- Forests
 Plastics

(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.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

- Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

- Products and services
- Upstream/downstream value chain
- Investment in R&D
- Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

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. It is clear 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. Due to potential risk of consumer behaviour change towards products and services that have a lower environmental footprint, along with the strategy of diversify Hilton Foods product range, the decision was made to invest in 2021 in the vegetarian product manufacturer, Dalco. We have invested in businesses to gain market share in lower emission proteins, such as the outright purchase of Dalco, a producer of meat-alternative protein products, Foppen, a large producer of salmon products, Hilton Seafoods or our investment in Cellular Agriculture. Time-frame: short-medium Likelihood: Likely

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

Extreme weather impacts on upstream supply chains: Hilton Foods sources its products from around the world and recognises that extreme weather and the effects of changing temperature and precipitation may impact the growth of produce used in our vegetarian/flexitarian ranges, in addition to detrimental impacts on livestock through degradation of pasture, volatility in supply of animal feed, and potential impacts on welfare of livestock. For example, our detailed study on Australia indicates increased irregularity of precipitation and increased daily maximum temperatures may negatively impact supply of livestock, with projected declines in feed intake by 3-5% per additional 1C above cattle's comfort zone. Studies also indicate declining productivity of Australian rangelands of 17% under 2C of warming, with negative impacts on livestock stocking rates. Declines in productivity of cattle stations, and in particular sudden regional shocks to supply may increase volatility in food prices on international markets. Equally, climate change may affect the reliable supply of plant products; we note the shortages in early 2023 of certain vegetables in Europe

as a consequence of poor weather in Spain and North Africa and anticipate that such disruption may be more frequent and prolonged with climate change. Time horizon: Medium-long term Likelihood: Likely locally in at least one supply chain

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

There is a risk that we fail to take advantage of changing purchasing preferences for lower emission proteins. 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. 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. Therefore 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 committed to doubling production of plant-based and flexitarian proteins by 2025 and are actively expanding our plant-based facilities at several sites including a dedicated facility in the UK. 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 protein products, Foppen, a large producer of salmon products, or our investment in Cellular Agriculture. Hilton Foods has also partnered with Future by Insects, Fera and Greencore to accelerate the development of carbon negative aquaculture feed.

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

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

Our responsible business vision is to be the first-choice partner for sustainable proteins. One way Hilton Foods is reducing its environmental impact is via its resource efficiency. The Group is constantly working to upgrade its facilities and have seen major success in its latest efficiency projects for example implementing energy efficiency projects in production processes and in buildings, installing solar panels to reduce electricity usage from the grid and eliminating of the use of trailers to store products on site. Time horizon: short-term, medium-term, long-term

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

- Forests

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

Our market development strategy includes diversifying our portfolio of protein products over the next 10 years and this has already progressed rapidly with the growth of plant-based products and seafood. Our strategy to address deforestation is focused on farmed animal feed where soy is major component. We are signatories to the UK Soy Manifesto and sit in the steering group. We are members UK roundtable on sustainable soy and we are engaged in the physical supply chain working

group to address directly traceable verified DCF soy into the feed supply chains of the UK. We are founder members of the Soy Transparency Coalition which is targeted at large soy traders to be open about their soy sourcing and plans to achieve net zero deforestation and conversion free supply chain

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

- Forests

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

We are working with our beef suppliers in South America to verify the DCF status of every farm in the chain back to breeding farms. Through our membership of the UK Cattle Sustainability Platform, we have developed a soy working group. This group is building a UK cattle sector plan to achieve verified DCF soy supply chains for all UK cattle farmers that use soy in their feed

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

- Forests

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

The financial plan includes our investment in acquisitions and R&D to diversify our portfolio of protein products over the next 10 years. Recent examples include the acquisition of Dalco in the Netherlands, a plant-based protein specialist with global sales. We have also purchased Foppen, a salmon smoker in the Netherlands and Greece that also has a verified DCF supply chain for the soy used in its farmed salmon feed. 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

- Forests

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

We have a target to double the sales of plant based and flexitarian products by 2025 and to grow our seafood business to diversify our portfolio of protein products over the next 10 years. This will reduce our reliance on forest risk proteins. We have made a UK commitment to the Soy Manifesto to ensure that all the soy used in our livestock will be verified as DCF by the end of 2025 with a cut off date of 2020.

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

- Water

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

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. It is clear 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. Due to potential risk of consumer behaviour change towards products and services that have a lower environmental footprint, along with the strategy of diversify Hilton Foods product range, the decision was made to invest in 2021 in the vegetarian product manufacturer, Dalco. We have invested in businesses to gain market share in lower water footprint proteins, such as the outright purchase of Dalco, a producer of meat-alternative protein products, or our investment in Cellular Agriculture. Time-frame: short-medium Likelihood: Likely

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

- Water

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

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. Alternative farming methods are also being investigated to ensure the resilience and health of its fish stocks. Some Norwegian producers are moving to breed and raise smolt (juvenile salmon) of up to 1kg on land. This reduces the length of the marine stage, reducing the environmental concern and the requirement for treatment in a marine pen, which is more challenging. Other innovative solutions currently being taken by salmon farmers include farming on land for the entirety of the life cycle or moving sites to offshore locations. Time-frame: Medium-Long Likelihood: Likely

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

- Water

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

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. It is clear 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. Due to potential risk of consumer behaviour change towards products and services that have a lower environmental footprint, along with the strategy of diversify Hilton Foods product range, the decision was made to invest in 2021 in the vegetarian product manufacturer, Dalco. We have invested in businesses to gain market share in lower water footprint proteins, such as the outright purchase of Dalco, a producer of meat-alternative protein products, or our investment in Cellular Agriculture. Time-frame: medium Likelihood: Likely

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

- Water

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

We have conducted detailed risk assessments and facility audits on our facilities and as a consequence have put in water efficiency measures as identified. Time-frame: medium Likelihood: Likely
[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

(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 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- Revenues
- Direct costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- 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 5

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- Revenues
- Direct costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- 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
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

(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)

3989547000

(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)

-100

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

100

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

-5.3

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

-2

(5.9.5) Please explain

Whilst there was water related CAPEX in 2022, there was no water-related CAPEX in reporting year (2023) and we plan water related capex in 2024.
[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 1 - Purchased goods and services
- 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)

(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

(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:	Select all that apply

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forests <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plastics
Smallholders	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i>
Customers	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plastics
Investors and shareholders	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forests <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plastics
Other value chain stakeholders	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change

[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:

- 26-50%

(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 thresholds 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:

- No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

Water

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

Select from:

- No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

Plastics

(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

- Business risk mitigation
- Material sourcing
- Procurement spend
- Vulnerability of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We work with suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our requirements for suppliers. This reduces risks to our business around resilience, compliance and supply, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Material sourcing

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We work with suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our requirements for suppliers. This reduces risks to our business around resilience, compliance and supply, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Business risk mitigation

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We work with suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our requirements for suppliers. This reduces risks to our business around resilience, compliance and supply, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets.

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 suppliers on a range of environmental issues and include environmental requirements in our requirements for suppliers. This reduces risks to our business around resilience, compliance and supply, as well as ensuring we meet our group targets.

[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

- 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%

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

Select from:

Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(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%

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

Select from:

- Exclude

(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

- 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%

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

Select from:

- Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

- 1-25%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(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
- 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:

51-75%

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

Select from:

51-75%

(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

0

(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:

- No other supplier engagement

Plastics

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- Removal of plastic from the environment

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

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

0

(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

0

(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

0

(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

30

(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.
[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:

- 1-25%

(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:

- 51-75%

(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.

(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:

- 1-25%

(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.

(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:

- 76-99%

(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.

(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. In 2021 Hilton Food Group joined the United Nations Global Compact to further support the Ten Principles of the United Nations on human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption. One of the first actions of this commitment was to participate in the creation of the Practical guidance for the UNGC Sustainable Ocean Principles for Aquaculture which was developed in partnership with supply chain. An example of this climate-related engagement is our role as vice chair of the European Roundtable in Beef Sustainability (ERBS) and the group setting goals for the Global Roundtable for Sustainable Beef. We lead the environmental work within the UK Cattle Sustainability Platform (UKCSP) that includes all of our suppliers and customers. Within the UKCSP we have helped align all the members behind one single plan. As a result of our engagements, we have set an intensity reduction of 15% in GHG emissions of cattle by 2025, which is aligned to the targets set by the European Roundtable for Beef Sustainability.

(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 to assess footprint of products.

(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
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Flowrap

(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

Row 2

(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:

Ini2

(5.13.1.5) Initiative category and type

Innovation

Other innovation, please specify :Reduced downstream emissions

(5.13.1.6) Details of initiative

Blood plasma inclusion

(5.13.1.7) Benefits achieved

Select all that apply

Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

Reduction of downstream value chain emissions (own scope 3)

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

Select from:

No

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

Reducing the carbon footprint of the product

(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equity share	Aligned to prior reporting and Greenhouse Gas Protocol
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equity share	Aligned to our scope of change
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equity share	Aligned to our scope of change
Plastics	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equity share	Aligned to our scope of change
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

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

Evolve 4, Greenchain Solutions

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

In 2023, Hilton Foods acquired Evolve 4, a software business. The acquisition of Evolve 4 Group Limited provides an opportunity to deliver growth through new agreements with manufacturers in the foods and drinks industry across Europe and Australia, but also provides HFG a flexible and tailored ERP system to support increasing efficiencies of the core HFG operations. Hilton Foods is creating an innovative technology offer in its Greenchain Solutions division, including through the acquisition of Evolve 4, a software business which, in conjunction with existing capabilities and expertise, will leverage our supply chain capabilities and differentiates us from pureplay food businesses.

[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 boundary

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

When calculating our Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions we use the most appropriate public data for our supply chains combined with supplier specific emission factors where available. We take an equity share approach. Agito, Sphere, Cellular Agriculture and Evolve 4 were added to the boundary in 2023, including backward calculation. Foppen has been included since our acquisition in 2022, just as Fairfax Meadow and Dalco were added in 2021. At Hilton Foods we are constantly working to improve how we measure and report our Scope 3 emissions. In 2021 we moved from a financial accounting approach to an inventory approach. In 2022 we have refined this to use more regional and supply chain specific data. This has led to a change in our estimated emissions compared to what was reported in prior years. In 2023 there has been no major change in methodology, however following validation of our Science-Based Targets some changes have been made. Cooking of products in food service environments was previously reported in Scope 3 Category 10 and will now be reported in Category 9. Downstream distribution by retailers was not previously reported and will be reported in Scope 3 category 9. Transport emissions were not reported on a well to wheel basis and have now been reported in that way. Homeworking and use phase emissions have been reported separately as these are indirect Scope 3 emissions outside the target Scope. 5% of the footprint was calculated using primary data in 2023. We will also be reporting an estimate of our Scope 3 emissions by greenhouse gas for the last three years. Understanding this will allow us to better understand our warming impacts in the future. These are not included in the verification of our Scope 3 by GEP Environmental. Through our engagement with the Seafood Carbon Collaboration and Seafish, support of the Chirrup.ai project, and sponsorship of a DPhil at Oxford University, Hilton Foods is actively engaged in work to improve understanding and deployment of climate metrics. The recently released Seafish methodology for wild capture fish has not been included in our 2023 data, but we are striving to include it in 2024.

[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2, location-based
- Scope 2, market-based

(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%).

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

- Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

- 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 ISO14064 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 (GEPEnv) 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 (GEPEnv) 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 (GEPEnv) 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)

14392177

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 1 covers purchase of ingredients and packaging, as well as services. Our Scope 3 method of calculation is based on the Quantis tool from WRI (world resources institute).

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)

(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)

3

(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)

17594

(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. Emission Factor sets used: (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - 2023; Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) - 2023.

Past year 1

(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

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. Emission Factor sets used: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2022); (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) - 100 year

Past year 2

(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. Emission Factor sets used: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2021); (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) - 100 year

Past year 3

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

19022

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2019

(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. Emission Factor sets used: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2021); (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) - 100 year
[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)

60346

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

48286

(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. Emission Factor sets used for location-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA); International Energy Agency (IEA) (2023); Australian Government National Greenhouse Account Factors (2023). Emission Factor sets used for market-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2023); International Energy Agency (IEA) (2023); Australian Government National Greenhouse Account Factors (2023), RE-DISS Residual European Mix (2022)

Past year 1

(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) (if applicable)

41669

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(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. Emission Factor sets used for location-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2022); (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) - 100 year. Emission Factor sets used for market-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2022); (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) - 100 year; International Energy Agency (IEA) (2022); RE-DISS Residual European Mix (2021).

Past year 2

(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) (if applicable)

48273

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2021

(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. Emission Factor sets used for location-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2021); (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) - 100 year. Emission Factor sets used for market-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2021); International Energy Agency (IEA) (2021; RE-DISS Residual European Mix (2020), supplier specific emission factors.

Past year 3

(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) (if applicable)

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. Emission Factor sets used for location-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2020);; International Energy Agency (IEA) (2020) Emission Factor sets used for market-based calculation: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2020);; International Energy Agency (IEA) (2020), supplier-specific emission factors.
[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)

12680074

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Hybrid method

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

5

(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 2023 and 31st Dec 2023. 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)

3578

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Spend data were used for calculating emissions; it was converted into tonnes CO2e using the appropriate conversion factors and covers the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2023 and 31st Dec 2023.

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)

15296

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Fuel-based method

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

0

(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)

42352

(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 2023 and 31st Dec 2023 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 2023 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. This is a verified, sensible approach and provides an accurate overview of outsourced distribution. Conversion Factors used: UK BEIS, 2023

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

4685

(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). End of Life (EOL) treatment of waste modelled using World Bank Waste Treatment Data (2018) for countries where HFG plc operates. 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)

1317

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Distance-based method

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

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 (BEIS 2023) 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)

2506

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Hybrid method

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

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 (BEIS 2023) 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)

17422

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Hybrid method

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

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: BEIS 2023, Electricity Map 2023, 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)

25515

(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 HFG plc using metrics & methodology (same approach taken as per previous years from approach developed originally by South Pole) for selected scope 3 emissions sources. - All activity data covered the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2023 and 31st Dec 2023 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 – Defra/BEIS 2023, Australia – Australian Govt Factors).

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)

26442

(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 HFG plc using metrics & methodology (same approach taken as per previous years from approach developed originally by South Pole) for selected scope 3 emissions sources. - All activity data covered the 12-month period between 1st Jan 2023 and 31st Dec 2023 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

out of scope

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

out of scope

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

out of scope

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

out of scope

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

12/30/2022

(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)

0

(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 Southpole 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 2

(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)

0

(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 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2020

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

14392177

(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)

0

(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 5-6., 9., 11-20.

(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:

Increased

(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)

6617

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

11.19

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Total renewable energy consumption was 96,136,090 kWh in 2022, whereas Total renewable energy consumption was 112,227,663 in 2023. The difference of the two consumption is 16,091,573.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

583115

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

All the other emissions reduction activities have a cumulative impact of 583115 t of CO₂e, which is 4.5% of total Scope 1-3 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 2023 there have been no changes in emissions due to divestment.

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

We acquired an IT company, whose GHG emissions are relatively small, compared to wider Group emissions

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 2023 there has been no changes in emissions due to 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 2023 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 2023 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 2023 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 2023 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

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)

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2023 there has been no change in other operations.
[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)

9545126.19

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

We use a range of different sources for emissions factors based around UN FAO data and where possible this is augmented with locally specific or supply chain-specific data. This allows us to reflect differences in processes, including organic, and systems, including where dairy cattle are used. The emissions factors used in our database vary from 24 kgCO2e/kg beef to 59 kg CO2e/kg beef for our highest carbon products. Differences in emissions reflect differences in length of fattening period, weight at slaughter, and diet with enteric fermentation as the key source of methane driving the carbon footprint along with feed production.
<https://gleami.apps.fao.org/>

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)

131539.37

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

For farmed salmon the most comprehensive study was carried out in Norway in 2017 by Sintef and published in 2020 this shows that farmed salmon has emissions of 6.5 kg CO₂e/kg edible product as delivered to our site including transport and processing, and the equivalent emissions for frozen cod fillet are 1.8 (or 2.5 if processed from whole frozen fish in China). https://www.sintef.no/contentassets/25338e561f1a4270a59ce25bcbc926a2/report-carbon-footprint-norwegian-seafood-products2017_final_040620.pdf

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)

1006817

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

One of our largest pig suppliers has conducted detailed studies to evaluate the footprint of pig production. This allows us to use supply chain specific data for this supply chain. For other poultry and pig supply chains we use nationally specific data from FAO GLEAM augmented by practice data where available. The emission factors used vary from 4.7 kg CO₂eq -8.8 kg CO₂eq.

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)

1455781

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

SHEEP. We are members of the Centre for Innovation and Excellence in Livestock. They produced a report in 2020 titled Net Zero Carbon UK Livestock <https://www.cielivestock.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/CIEL-Net-Zero-Carbon-UK-Livestock-FINAL-interactive-revised-May-2021.pdf>. This report summarises the most accurate data available for the footprint of UK beef and lamb. The mean carbon footprints for lowland, upland and hill sheep enterprises were 10.9kg CO2eq, 12.9kg CO2eq and 17.9kg CO2eq per kg liveweight, respectively.

[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)

14447.404

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

CH4

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

0.134

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

N2O

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

0.113

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

HFCs

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

3015

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2239

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

31042

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

31042

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

178

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

1176

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

4328

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1737

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

1947

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

3025

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1234

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

1335

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

0

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3925

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

7585

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

7055

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

674

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

1207

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

1207

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

823

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

6930

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

0

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

284

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

519

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

1525

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16

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

405

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

101

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6485

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

8196

(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	10011
Row 2	Plant-based Food	2316
Row 3	Fish	5253

[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)

17594

(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)

(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	<i>Meat and Fresh Food</i>	50770	42828
Row 2	<i>Fish</i>	6969	5418
Row 3	<i>Plant-based Food</i>	2564	0

[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)

17594

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

60343

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

48286

(7.22.4) Please explain

In 2023 HFG's scope 1 emissions weren't affected significantly. Scope 2 increased by 10.8% for location-based and 15.7% for market-based emissions

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

3

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

Evolve 4
[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)

1381.5

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

3997.56

(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)

2804.4

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

33651.85

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

5420.15

(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)

677.42

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

4146.86

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

5826.26

(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)

6.35

(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

(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)

822.61

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

6929.77

(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)

2223.89

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

31009.75

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

31009.75

(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)

178.22

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

1175.79

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

4328.03

(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)

673.7

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

1206.75

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

1206.75

(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)

2315.74

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

2564.11

(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)

2655.48

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

873.4

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

0.0

(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)

1234.04

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

1335.09

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

0.0

(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)

15.99

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

404.74

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

101.39

(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 –Distribuição de Carnes, S.A.

(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)

283.67

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

518.38

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

1523.8

(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 14

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Olympic Eel & Salmon Industry SA

(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)

1737.03

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

1946.54

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

3024.89

(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

(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)

2448.17

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

3319.17

(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 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

HF Holland's 93.39% of emissions is allocated to Ahold, as 21.2% of Foppen and 23% of Poland facility.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on mass of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

58867

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

5501.99

(7.26.10) Uncertainty ($\pm\%$)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity and district heating

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. Quantities of goods provided to the requester is in metric tonnes.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

For further details please see our annual report on Hilton Foodss website.

Row 2

(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:

- Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

HF Holland's 93.39% of emissions is allocated to Ahold, as 21.2% of Foppen and 23% of Poland facility.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

58867

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

813737.83

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

(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:

Yes

(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 could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. Quantities of goods provided to the requester is in metric tonnes.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

For further details please see our annual report on HFGHilton Foodss website.

Row 3**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

HF Holland's 93.39% of emissions is allocated to Ahold, as 21.2% of Foppen and 23% of Poland facility.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

58864

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

1289.83

(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:

Yes

(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 could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. Quantities of goods provided to the requester is in metric tonnes.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

For further details please see our annual report on Hilton Foodss website.

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

56.9% of Foppen's emissions is allocated to Costco.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2851

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1595.7

(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:

Yes

(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 could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. Quantities of goods provided to the requester is in metric tonnes.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

For further details please see our annual report on Hilton Foodss website.

Row 5

(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:

Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

56.9% of Foppen's emissions is allocated to Costco.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2851

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

3084.07

(7.26.10) Uncertainty ($\pm\%$)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity and district heating

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Emissions have been allocated proportionately to volume. This could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. Quantities of goods provided to the requester is in metric tonnes.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

For further details please see our annual report on Hilton Foodss website.

Row 6

(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:

- Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

56.9% of Foppen's emissions is allocated to Costco.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2851

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

28300.8

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

(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:

Yes

(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 could be done to a greater level of accuracy by allocating on a SKU basis. This assumes the customer is taking a subset of product aligned to the facility's wider production. Quantities of goods provided to the requester is in metric tonnes.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

For further details please see our annual report on Hilton Foodss 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

88220.78

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

88282.73

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

105727.31

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

58702.03

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

164429.34

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

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

71.07

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

71.07

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

4409.98

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

4409.98

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

110208.24

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

146994.88

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

257193.12

[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

70.95

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Woodchips

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

20992.56

(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

67229.22

(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

NA

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

88292.73

(7.30.7.8) Comment

NA
[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)

4409.98

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

4409.98

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

4409.98

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

4409.98

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)

4213.94

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Contract

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

Select from:

Ireland

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

Select from:

No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

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)

16290.49

(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

NA

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)

10654.38

(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

NA

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)

39749.56

(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:

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

NA

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)

7788.29

(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

NA

Row 10

(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)

999.86

(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

NA

Row 11

(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)

2848

(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

NA

[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)

18561

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

2256.08

(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)

20817.08

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7029.28

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

0

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

3941.3

(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)

10970.58

Greece

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5692.52

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

5692.52

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4213.93

(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)

4213.93

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26932.08

(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)

26932.08

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8914.58

(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)

8914.58

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10654.38

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

0

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

999.86

(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)

11654.24

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6859.52

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

1922.14

(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)

8781.66

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7788.29

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

0

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

2848

(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)

10636.29

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

39775.94

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

107.01

(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)

39882.95
[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

0.0165

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

65880

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

3989547

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

13.5

(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

Acquisitions

Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our revenues increased 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 64% (a 2% increase compared to 2022).

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.127

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

65880

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

517347

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

22.7

(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

Acquisitions

Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our volumes increased 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 64% (a 2% increase compared to 2022).

[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

8742.12

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

metric tonnes

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

year

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

30.1

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Given metrics is total Hilton Foods food waste for the reporting period. At Hilton Foods we identified food waste as priority issue that impacts our greenhouse gases' emissions indirectly. We identified food waste hotspots and reducing it gradually since 2020.

[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)

17594

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

48286

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

65880.000

(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

13.51

(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 1.5C pledge to net-zero by 2050. 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 '1.5C' 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 '1.5C' 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)

14392177.0

(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)

14532208.000

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

14532208.000

(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)

97

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100.0

(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)

7992714.400

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

12680074

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

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

17422

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

12702181.000

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

12702181.000

(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

27.98

(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 1.5C pledge to net-zero by 2050. We updated our ambition by submitting revised targets in 2023 (approved 2024), aligned to the updated FLAG guidance. In this context, Hilton Foods' updated targets include emissions from all subsidiaries in the emissions reduction target. Consequently, no businesses are presently excluded from this target. All acquisitions made since submission have been incorporated into the target scope. Our existing '1.5C' targets are split into FLAG and Energy & Industrial emissions. Energy & Industrial: Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions 45% by 2030 from a 2020 base year across purchased goods and services, waste generated in operations and downstream transportation & distribution. Relevant emissions in other categories of Scope 3 are excluded from this target. FLAG: Hilton

Foods commits to reduce absolute scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 45% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. No relevant categories of Scope 3 are excluded from this target.

(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. This has been enhanced in 2023 through research projects conducted with the University of Lincoln on manure management and enteric emissions abatement. Through risk assessments, we have developed decarbonisation pathways for our key species (beef, lamb, pork, chicken, salmon, tropical aquaculture, and wild capture), which form the basis of our Transition Plan for FLAG commodities. Of these, the most material emissions sources relate to terrestrial livestock, although there is also more commonality and therefore overlap between terrestrial species pathways. Our species pathways include impacts from drivers such as genetic and health improvements as well as process and operational changes such as feed basket transition, manure handling improvements, enteric emissions abatement, and land-based sequestration. A range of potential impact from each driver has been quantified, with a range estimated for its efficacy where relevant, but we have not included financial modelling due to the high degree of uncertainty involved. Nevertheless, our results indicate that multiple scenario options are available to reduce emissions in line with the 2030 target, even with no change to the species mix in our products, and therefore that there is a pathway for livestock, particularly cattle (outlined further below), to form part of a net zero future. We continue to invest in low carbon proteins to mitigate risks of a shift in protein demand as seen by our recent acquisitions of Dalco and Foppen, investment in Cellular Agriculture, as well as the expansion of the food-park model and our Greenchain Solutions technology services platform. With regard to the Energy and Industrial emissions in our supply chain, we have developed decarbonisation roadmaps for packaging and conducted decarbonisation modelling on Downstream Transportation and supply chain energy use. We will develop roadmaps for service-based businesses in the coming year, however emissions associated with these businesses are a small part of our overall footprint.

(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

64

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

55.33

(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 goal is to achieve 100% renewable electricity across all our own operations in Europe by end of 2025 and globally by 2027. 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 64% by the end of 2023, which means a 2% increase compared to 2022.
[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

12/31/2016

(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

12/30/2019

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

2432

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

1216

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

1959.35

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

(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% in our own UK operations by 2030. This target is set against a baseline for our UK site and the target considers only that business. We have expanded this methodology to all sites globally, although they are excluded from this scope. Progress was made in redistributing more material to charity, animal feed and bio-material processing. Some of our sites now operate at zero food waste.

(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. This target is based on a baseline established for our UK site and applies exclusively to that part of the business. While we have applied this approach to all our global sites, they remain outside the current scope. 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.

*[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

08/29/2023

(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. This year we revised our Science-Based Targets including updates to our new near-term targets to ensure alignment with our net zero commitment. These have now been validated by the SBTi. Our new targets dramatically increase the pace of our ambition, aligning our operational and value chain emissions to 1.5°C 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:

No

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

Select from:

No, we do not plan to mitigate emissions beyond our value chain

(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 (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	0	Numeric input

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
To be implemented	0	0
Implementation commenced	0	0
Implemented	19	583115
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)

52941

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

9788

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

<1 year

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Compressed Air optimization - air leaks reduction

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Insulation

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

36000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

6264

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

2175

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

<1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Insulation: Thermo-survey & Action Plan Implemented

Row 3

(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)

29360

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

- Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

- Voluntary

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

5109

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

1740

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

- <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

- 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) - Installed automated switch for AHU 20230113 - AHU is now optimized by clock schedule

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Other, please specify :Optimized flow rates for nozzles - nozzles changed from 27l/min to 15l/min

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

16464

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

6960

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

2610

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

<1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Optimized flow rates for nozzles - nozzles changed from 27l/min to 15l/min

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Other, please specify :Other- Heat recovery system installed on ammonia system, preheating by heat recovery from compressed ammonia

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

10866

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

9895

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

17400

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Other- Heat recovery system installed on ammonia system, preheating by heat recovery from compressed ammonia

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

Resource efficiency

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

32125

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

24843

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Resource efficiency - Production optimization - baking on ovens on trolleys with 32 trays instead of 16 trays

Row 7

(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)

69905

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

60817

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

1-2 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Compressed Air optimization - air leaks reduction

Row 8

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

Other, please specify

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

36750

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

31973

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

13050

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Refrigeration optimization with several projects implemented: -Rooms temperatures increased in specific areas -New air bags for the bay doors -Savings on cooler months -1 Compressor is turned off and the setpoints are manually changed with the time of year. - Endocool additive added to one compressor - makes the heat exchange from liquid to air more efficient and reduces energy consumption

Row 9

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

Resource efficiency

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

3150

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

2741

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

1-2 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Production equipment optimization - switch off equipment when not in use

Row 10

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Process optimization

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

82104

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

82002

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Process optimization - temperature on the crates washing machine optimized from 55 Celsius degrees to 45

Row 11

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Insulation

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

11400

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

23800

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

26100

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Insulation improvement - Installation of electric doors in order to separate rooms with different temperatures.

Row 12

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

- Resource efficiency

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

54364

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

- Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

- Voluntary

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

31026

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

8700

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

- <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

- 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Optimization of water temperature for room washing - 50% of the hot water process/50% cold water. With this initiative we reduce gas consumption.

Row 13

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Other, please specify

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

60000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

121800

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

182700

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Purchase of a more efficient refrigeration compressor.

Row 14

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Other, please specify

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

1796

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

3750

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

4350

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Change current defrosting process from electrical heaters to hot gas on our production crusters used to freeze meat

Row 15

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Other, please specify :New air compressor installation - Kaeser Compressor

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

23310

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

22211

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

99093

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

New air compressor installation - Kaeser Compressor

Row 16

(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)

4410

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

5307

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

435

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

<1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Optimization of the air blowers. System was re-designed to turn on and off when needed

Row 17

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

- Process optimization

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

5250

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

- Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

- Voluntary

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

5481

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

- No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Production process changed and freezers are switched ON 1h later than previously.

Row 18

(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)

42000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

39150

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

261000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

New refrigeration system innstalled to supply the old building but also the new cold store

Row 19

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Process optimization

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

10920

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

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

10440

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

1-2 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Hydraulics improvement - current system changed from 3 hydraulics always on to one which is supplying two breaders and one fryier
[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 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

- Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Hilton Foods has a dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D.

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

We are signatories to and on the steering group of the UK Soy Manifesto which is a collective industry commitment to ensure that all of the soy imported to the UK or used in feed for animals is from farms that are deforestation and conversion free by 2025. In 2023 the group has committed to produce a quarterly soy deforestation risk register for UK soy imports, tracking the UK's progress in the importation of deforestation and conversion free soy. We also agreed to a joint transition plan, coordinated by a high-level cross-supply chain governance group, with support of expert stakeholders to monitor and review the transition, ensuring the risk and responsibilities are shared. Furthermore, great progress has been made in the agreement of the joint transition plan to enable our farmers to purchase 100% deforestation and conversion free (DCF) soy in the UK. We have aligned our UK commitment to the manifesto requirements and publish progress annually. This year

we published our UK Commitment to Sourcing Deforestation and Conversion Free Soy which details our commitment and implementation roadmap. We've already made progress. All of our salmon comes from segregated DCF sources. In 2023 a significant proportion of our warm water prawn supply chains sourced from segregated sources and we are working towards 100%. We are signatories of support to the Cerrado Manifesto and founder sponsor members of the Soy Transparency Coalition. We are encouraging the uptake of novel proteins and oils in aquaculture feed that have a lower carbon and broader environmental footprints.

(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

Purchasing of RTRS credits and collaborative engagement with the supply chain, including feed suppliers who supply the farmers. We are joining a small working group (10 people) within the UK RTRS to deliver physically traceable supply chains of certified soy to ensure the UK retailers can deliver their commitments. We are working side by side with Tesco to ensure this driver of deforestation is understood throughout our industry. We are working with the UK Feed Industry to develop specifications which include sustainable soy.

(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

n/a

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

Encouraging the wider use of methane-reducing animal feed additives and advocating for support for their use at scale at a global level. We follow our species-specific decarbonization plans for beef, lamb, pork, and salmon, via:– Improved feed conversion rates via nutrition, genetics and health– Reduced on-farm energy use– Lowering the footprint of animal feed via the uptake of green fertilizers and improved application methods; increased inclusion of waste crops– Reduced enteric emissions via changes in feed types and additives– Improved manure managementEngagement in forums where best practice is shared in a pre-competitive environment addressing shared challenges such as encouraging supply chains to set science-based targets.We are involved in a number of industry working groups to influence the progression of sustainability in the supply chain. Our Aquaculture & Fisheries Manager is Co-Chair of the Global GAP Aquaculture Committee within others. The work in aquaculture feed as part of the development of the Aquaculture standards as well as the direct engagement with suppliers has helped to incentivize the industry to move towards deforestation-free soy. The land use change in soy, as in other crops, is one of the important factors in reducing carbon sequestration. The encouragement of deforestation-free soy in fish feed will contribute to carbon reduction in our supply chains.

(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

We encourage implementation by helping mapping the various solutions available and their efficiency. We are working collaboratively to share this knowledge via our suppliers and national or global forums. In our role in ERBS we have commissioned a survey of the interventions used by major meat and dairy companies to reduce the GHG output including asking which feed additives are the most cost effective. The resulting report will advise farmers on the potential GHG reduction impacts they can achieve and hopefully to demonstrate how they have also improved feed efficiency. We will use this knowledge to advocate for governments to support their use. Sharing global knowledge of research and development of feed additives with suppliers and through them to farmers.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
- Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

n/a

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

Engagement in forums where best practice is shared in a pre-competitive environment addressing shared challenges such as encouraging supply chains to set science-based targets. We are involved in a number of industry working groups to influence the progression of sustainability in the supply chain. Our Aquaculture & Fisheries Manager is Co-Chair of Global GAP Aquaculture Committee within others. The work in aquaculture feed as part of the development of the Aquaculture standards as well as the direct engagement with suppliers has helped to incentivize the industry to move towards deforestation-free soy. The land use change in soy, as in other crops, is one of the important factors in reducing carbon sequestration. The encouragement of deforestation-free soy in fish feed will contribute to carbon reduction in our supply chains.

(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

We have joined the UNGC and the UN Sustainable Oceans Business Platform where we are learning from businesses across many sectors how they are working to achieve their science based targets. We presented at the World Economic Forum Virtual Ocean Dialogues in 2020. The session addressed how fish provide essential nutrients for over 1 billion people. The need to rethink and rebuild our economic system presents an opportunity that society must seize today. At the same time, we

must address the gaps in ocean management and take action to reverse unsustainable ocean economy practices. We have contributed to the forthcoming UNGC report advising seafood companies globally how to set and achieve science-based targets.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

- Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)
- Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

n/a

[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 4

(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 5

(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 canceled 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Palm oil	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Cattle products	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Soy	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	10936	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	10936

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Palm oil	9.2	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	9.2
Cattle products	260701629.45	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	260701629.45
Soy	102705.05	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	93179.86

[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

This outlines the volume of soy used in our operations for vegetarian and vegan products, as well as in the farmed fish and shellfish we purchase. We have a good understanding of the proportions of soy in the feed and the feed conversion ratios for these products. All our farmed salmon, sea bass, basa, and prawns are fed soy from farms certified as Deforestation and Conversion-Free (DCF) by Proterra or the Round Table on Responsible Soy (RTRS), or other low risk sources. Additionally, all salmon feed is non-GMO and Identity Preserved. We have reliable data on usage and origin for these supply chains. For our plant-based products, all soy comes from countries with no deforestation risk, and we have accurate usage and origin data for this soy as well. We are currently mapping the soy used in all livestock across our supply chains and its origins. This is part of our effort to ensure 100% verified DCF soy supply chains for every country we purchase from.

(8.2.1.3) Volume calculation methodology

For the seafood we have direct figure of embedded soy. For cattle, pork, and poultry we recalculate embedded soy based on their weight, including the weight having at the birth, to calculate the mass animal gained throughout the life. We also account for mass that is not processed at abattoir, but is part of the animal. then we apply a food conversion ratio to estimate the food, animal has eaten and eventually applying the soy % of food estimate the soy embedded in animals. Additionally we include diary and egg products into 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)

92469.51

(8.2.1.5) % of sourced volume that is embedded soy

99.24

(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

1. Direct Soy Purchases: All soy purchases are traceable to the factory and country of origin. Suppliers only provide soy from non-forest risk countries. Supplier traceability systems record the country and supplier or farm of origin. We verify that the soy comes from approved suppliers and meets specifications during intake checks and audits. 2. Soy in Salmon Feed: All soy protein concentrate (SPC) for our salmon feed comes from Proterra-certified farms with a deforestation cut-off of Jan 2020. Proterra verifies the origin, and the SPC processing plant checks against approved farms during intake. Each batch of soy is traceable through production to the finished product, with labelling verified by Proterra and independent audits. Salmon feed manufacturers only purchase certified SPC from farms meeting the deforestation cutoff. Batches are checked for compliance, recorded in production records, and tracked in electronic systems integrated with salmon farmer's traceability systems. Verification audits are conducted at feed plants and salmon farms.

(8.2.1.8) % of embedded soy disclosure volume traceable to country/area of soy production

7

(8.2.1.9) % of embedded soy disclosure volume for which the soy production origin is unknown

93

(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

99.04

(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 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)

10936

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.11

(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 Province; Santa Fe Province;

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

50.12

(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:

Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.57

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

- Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients

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

Western Australia; South Australia; New South Wales; Victoria

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

101050.96

(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; Matto Grosso; Goias

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

7.09

(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:

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)

893.31

(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; Tacuarembó; San José; Canelones; Cerro Largo; Montevideo

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2903.16

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

N/A

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Cameroon

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.07

(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:

Colombia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.24

(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:

Costa Rica

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.14

(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:

Côte d'Ivoire

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.07

(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:

Ecuador

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.07

(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:

Gabon

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.06

(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:

Guatemala

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.15

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.24

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.24

(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:

Liberia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.06

(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:

Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3.95

(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:

Netherlands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.3

(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:

Panama

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.06

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.24

(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:

Peru

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.13

(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:

Solomon Islands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.14

(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:

Thailand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.1

(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:

Austria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2060.48

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

236.3

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

53.85

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2299.7

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

- Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

61176.1

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

- Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

- Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1722.02

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

25119.7

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

23279.93

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

7467.65

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

4020.4

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

6646.15

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

540.85

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

20754.13

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

84.63

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(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)

92469.51

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Other, please specify :Estimated figure for embedded soy

(8.5.7) Please explain

7.32% of this soy is European segregated soy. 92.78% of this soy is embedded soy in our meat products. As per European Soy Monitor (2021) 93.9% of this soy will come from low-risk origin.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Unknown origin

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

895.54

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy coming from potentially high-risk sources

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Australia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.03

(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:

Austria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

17.55

(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)

65650

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

Mass balance certification

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3.27

(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:

Cameroon

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Canada

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.03

(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:

China

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

9.39

(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:

Colombia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.11

(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:

Costa Rica

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.07

(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:

Côte d'Ivoire

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Czechia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.38

(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:

Gabon

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Guatemala

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.04

(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:

Honduras

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.11

(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:

India

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.13

(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:

Japan

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.27

(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:

Liberia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.11

(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:

New Zealand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Pakistan

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Panama

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Papua New Guinea

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1.11

(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:

Peru

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Poland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Serbia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2.05

(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:

Solomon Islands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.07

(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:

Thailand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.02

(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:

Netherlands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3.96

(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:

Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

Not disclosing

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Soy in ingredients. 0 means less than 5 kg from that origin is included in ingredient.

[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"

We define "no-conversion" as 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"

We define "no-conversion" as eliminating the use of palm oil 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"

We define "no-conversion" as 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:

Disclosure 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)

(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 Foods Connected, a supply chain software company 65% owned by the Group, we can utilise the platform to 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:

Disclosure 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 - Mass Balance

(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

98.59

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.00

(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 Foods Connected, a supply chain software company 65% owned by the Group, we can utilise the platform to 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:

Disclosure 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

98.5

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

95.95

(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.

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

We have compiled a risk assessment in accordance with the EU Deforestation Regulation and are confident for low risk geographies that we can declare cattle products deforestation free. For high risk geographies we are working with suppliers on mitigation strategies to ensure cattle products are compliant by the end of the 2024.

(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:

Disclosure 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

Forest management unit/Producer certification

ProTerra certification

(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

92.67

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

91.71

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

98.84

(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

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:

- Disclosure 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

Forest management unit/Producer certification

- RTRS standard for Responsible Soy Production

(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

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

0.01

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

0.01

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(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 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

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 (direct operations only)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

Disclosure 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

(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

0.73

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

7.32

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

7.32

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(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 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

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:

Disclosure 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

ProTerra certification – Identity preserved

(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

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

0.01

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

0.01

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(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 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

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:

- Disclosure volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

- % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

- Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

11/08/2021

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

0.01

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

0.01

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(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 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

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:

Disclosure 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

Forest management unit/Producer certification

RSPO producer/grower certification

(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

0.75

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2023

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

1

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

0.75

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.00

(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 Foods Connected, a supply chain software company 65% owned by the Group, we can utilise the platform to 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:

Disclosure 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 – 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

0.66

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2023

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

1

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

0.66

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.00

(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 Foods Connected, a supply chain software company 65% owned by the Group, we can utilise the platform to 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

[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

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

Supplier engagement/communication

Internal traceability system

(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 and Argentina 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

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

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

Palm oil

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

97.33

(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

1.41

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

1.26

(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

0.01

(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

7.32

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

92.67

(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

98.5

(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

0

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

98.5

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

No

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

99.03

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

8.15

(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

91.85

(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

3.01

(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

Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :IT/inSYTE

(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

0.0005% of soy in our ingredients is IT/inSYTE certified

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

7.32

(8.9.1.3) Comment

Seafood embedded soy

Soy

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

ProTerra certification – Identity preserved

(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

*0.005% is Identity preserved
[Add 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

98.50

(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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spain | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Czechia |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Denmark |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sweden | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Germany |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Austria | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ireland |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Belgium | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Portugal |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Australia | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Netherlands | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Zealand | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | |

(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

91.85

(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

Czechia

Denmark

Germany

Ireland

460

- Belgium
- Australia
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Palm oil	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Cattle products	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Soy	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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)

428

(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 through 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
Cattle products	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Soy	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

Cattle products

(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

1.8

(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 across entire landscapes/jurisdictions
- Greater enforcement of regulations
- Greater supplier awareness/engagement
- Investment in monitoring tools and traceability systems
- 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

For South American beef where our exposure to deforestation is the highest risk, we have run pilot programmes with suppliers trialling a third-party certification service. The service provides a monitoring tool that firstly compares satellite images over a given time period to monitor for deforestation on the geolocations where cattle were kept and secondly uses a national organisation to monitor for reports of conflict with Indigenous people to ensure that the land used for keeping cattle was used in accordance with Indigenous peoples rights. 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.

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

0.5

(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 across entire landscapes/jurisdictions

- 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 (of which we are signatories) and the Retail Soy Group (RSG) to ensure that Soy used in animal feed is deforestation-free. Our industry target is ensure that by the end of 2025 all soy used in the UK is verified deforestation and conversion-free. We are working with suppliers in other geographies to raise the level of awareness around the issue of embedded soy in cattle and the need for compliance with the EU Deforestation Regulations. In South America one of our suppliers in utilising a third party satellite monitoring tool to ensure that any soy used in the animal feed in is DCF. 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.

[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

8392.54

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:

Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

Europe Soja – Segregated

(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 3

(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

Soy derivatives

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

9.06

(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

92

(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

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

325

(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 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

(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member

183.79

(8.12.1.5) Metric

Select from:

Metric tons

(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

Europe Soja – Segregated

(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Palm oil	Select from:

	GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Cattle products	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Soy	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

(8.14.4) Indicate if you collect data regarding compliance with the Brazilian Forest Code

Select from:

- Yes

(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
- Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems
- Recognized as priority landscape by credible multi-stakeholder groups or industry platforms
- Commodity sourcing footprint
- Stakeholder/investor request
- Current and future sourcing risk
- Opportunity to build resilience at scale
- Organization has operational presence in area

(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

5827

(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

Lobbying and 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 directly lobbied 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

0.01

[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 and through this forum we 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 founder members of 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. We are full participants in the UNGC and participate in their global ocean platform that includes a workstream on sustainable aquaculture 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:

No, but we plan to implement a project(s) within the next two years

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:

Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Most of our water is coming from water suppliers; it will be a legislative requirement to comply with local water standard. Groundwater sources had a pre-assessment done before getting the well drilled. Entained water and rainwater capture infrastructure will have treatment included.

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:

Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We don't do water treatment on 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 water 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)

1436.15

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Improvements we delivered on 2022 are not significant at our scale level, thus primary reason of change will be business activity change

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

1099.39

(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:

Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We didn't do any improvements to decrease the volumes of water discharged

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

336.76

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Improvements we delivered on 2022 are not significant at our scale level, thus primary reason of change will be business activity change
[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)

(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

24.72

(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:

Less than 1%

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

Beef from Namibia. This is expected to decrease in the future periods, as Hilton Foods position is to decrease the impact of business processes on water, specifically with the main commodity of the company. In future we expect this trend to remain the same or become lower.

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 recognises the water impact of 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:

Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

20

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Facility expansion

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We invested in capturing rainwater infrastructure for our sites located in Portugal and Australia, prioritising on the sites located in high water stress areas

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)

129

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We have a groundwater withdrawal on our recently acquired sites. One of the sites is withdrawing groundwater is located in water stress region. 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:

Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

20

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We installed entrained water intake equipment for facilities with significant water stress

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1287

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

*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:

Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We don't discharge water to fresh surface water

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)

1099

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

All of our discharge water is delivered to local water treatment suppliers

[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

20

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

76-99

(9.3.4) Please explain

All production facilities of our direct operations

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

We have a plan on assessing water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities for our upstream value chain later in 2024
[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 facility in Queensland, Australia

(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 :East Coast, Brisbane

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-27.644156

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

152.988381

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

132.81

(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

132.81

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

87.73

(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

87.73

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

45.08

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in Victoria, Australia

(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 :East Coast, Werribee

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.827292

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

144.764544

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

104.86

(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

104.86

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

87.46

(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

87.46

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

17.4

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in 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 :Cavado

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.519967

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-8.580611

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

71.16

(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

20.12

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

71.16

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

56.81

(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

56.81

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

34.47

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in 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 :Achelous

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.959265

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

20.751715

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

142.51

(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

62.89

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

79.63

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

78.15

(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

78.15

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

64.36

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in 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:

- No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Site didn't operate during the reported period

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Netherlands

- Meuse

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

51.758062

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

5.51101

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in Oos, 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

51.631647

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

4.88383

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

97.65

(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

97.65

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

77.78

(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

77.78

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

19.87

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in North London, United Kingdom

(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 :Lee

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

51.648527

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.028584

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3.74

(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

3.74

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.73

(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

2.73

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

(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 :Collie / Preston minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.362538

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

115.684289

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

32.88

(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

32.88

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

22.13

(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

22.13

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

10.74

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in 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

56.100449

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

10.072655

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

47.8

(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

47.8

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

40.85

(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

40.85

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

6.95

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in Derbyshire, United Kingdom

(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 :Derwent minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.901655

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-1.44901

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

20.39

(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

20.38

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

17.39

(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

17.39

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

(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

Ireland

- Other, please specify :Boyne

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

53.725577

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-6.329312

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

22.34

(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

22.38

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

19.06

(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

19.06

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3.28

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in Hampshire, United Kingdom

(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 :Beaulieu

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.979228

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-1.388035

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.29

(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

2.29

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.21

(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

1.21

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.08

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in Lincolnshire, United Kingdom

(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 :Great Eau minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

53.574875

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.11728

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

232.62

(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

232.62

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

164.86

(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

164.86

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

67.76

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

(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 :Zuiderzee minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.362686

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

5.646332

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

67.74

(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

65.89

(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

1.85

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

50.98

(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

50.98

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

16.76

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in 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 :Lake Mälaren

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

59.585482

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

16.474782

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

58.87

(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

58.87

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

58.87

(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

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year*Select from:* About the same**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 17**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number***Select from:* Facility 19**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)***Hilton Foods facility in 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 :Northern Wairoa minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.002631

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

174.854346

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

101.69

(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

101.69

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

91.98

(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

91.98

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

9.7

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

(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 :Zuiderzee minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.425012

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

4.808647

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

101.5

(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

101.5

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

94.68

(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

94.68

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

6.82

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in Buckinghamshire, United Kingdom

(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:

- No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Site didn't operate during reporting period

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Other, please specify :Great Ouse minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.010681

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.700073

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 20

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in Cambridgeshire, United Kingdom

(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 :Great Ouse minor basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.348046

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.189412

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

74.12

(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

74.12

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

58.4

(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

58.4

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

15.72

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

Row 21

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hilton Foods facility in 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

50.098443

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

19.043979

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

101.06

(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

101.06

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

88.31

(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

88.31

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12.75

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The reason of this year figures for consumption, withdrawal and discharge is different because of change in business activity (primarily by volume and category of processed proteins)

[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 8

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Hilton Foods facility in Greece

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

44.57 mln l of water withdrawn and 27.37 mln l discharged is related 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 facility in Poland

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

23.24 mln l of water withdrawn and 20.31 mln l of water discharged is related to products sold 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 facility in Netherlands

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

94.79 mln l of water consumed and 88.24 mln l of water discharged is related to Ahold Delheize brands

(9.4.1.5) Comment

Based on mass proportion

Row 6

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 13

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Hilton Foods facility in Netherlands

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

119.63 mln l of water withdrawn and 73.47 mln l of water discharged is related to Costco 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.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	3989	2.78	<i>We have actions in plan to reduce water intensity for our products. Growing inflation would also cause the water withdrawal efficiency to decrease.</i>

[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)

1.91

(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

We have the water meter installed. Total water withdrawals is the number we have placed for monitoring. We are processing big number of products and meat is weight-measured, thus the denominator is metric tons. We are implementing water efficiency across the group thus the figure is expected to be lower every next period. We increase our efficiency of total water withdrawn at our cattle processing facilities, which is very material to us. Thus, the figure is planned to remain

relatively the same or decrease slightly. Management recognises the water impact of operations and plans to reduce the water impact, using the sustainable technology with focus on water-stress areas.

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)

19.2

(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

We have the water meter installed. Total water withdrawals is the number we have placed for monitoring. We are processing big number of products and meat is weight-measured, thus the denominator is metric tons. We are implementing water efficiency across the group thus the figure is expected to be lower every next period. Our seafood facilities cover bigger Value chain piece than processing. This includes breeding aquaculture and other water-consuming operations. Thus, the water figure intensity is significantly higher. comparing to other sites. The figure is planned to remain the same in upcoming periods, as management recognises increased water stress of aquaculture facilities.

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

We have the water meter installed. Total water withdrawals is the number we have placed for monitoring. We are processing big number of products and meat is weight-measured, thus the denominator is metric tons. We are implementing water efficiency across the group thus the figure is expected to be lower every next period. Sites that process poultry and pork are processing it in together with other product, thus it is hard to separate pork and poultry water intensity. However, company is looking to establish that number in next two 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)

2.23

(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

We have the water meter installed. Total water withdrawals is the number we have placed for monitoring. We are processing big number of products and meat is weight-measured, thus the denominator is metric tons. We are implementing water efficiency across the group thus the figure is expected to be lower every next period. This metric is the total water for production sites which don't process beef or seafood. This number will include pork, poultry, plant-based products, veal and venison. Compared to water intensity of beef this number is higher, as it will include many different products.

[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 group produce

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

2.23

(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
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<i>As a food business we do not produce hazardous products.</i>

[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
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to address this within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judged to be unimportant, explanation provided	<i>This is not currently a customer priority and certification frameworks are limited.</i>

[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

04/04/2021

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

1020850

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

928045.45

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

1000148

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

22

(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, Netherlands, Greece, and Portugal.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

We havved our water consumption at Hilton Foods Ireland and decreased water consumption by 13% at Hilton Foods Holland (vs. 2020 baseline)
[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:

No

(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]

(10.5) 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)

19342

(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

36

(10.5.4) % virgin renewable content

0

(10.5.5) % pre-consumer recycled content

0

(10.5.6) % post-consumer recycled content

64

(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

70

(10.5.1.4) % of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice at scale

70

(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.

Production of plastic

(10.6.1) Total weight of waste generated during the reporting year (Metric tons)

0

(10.6.2) End-of-life management pathways available to report

Select all that apply

Recycling

(10.6.4) % recycling

0

(10.6.12) Please explain

We don't produce plastic

Commercialization of plastic

(10.6.1) Total weight of waste generated during the reporting year (Metric tons)

19342

(10.6.2) End-of-life management pathways available to report

Select all that apply

Recycling

(10.6.4) % recycling

70

(10.6.12) Please explain

70% recyclable

[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

[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we use indicators	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State and benefit indicators

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pressure indicators

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Yes
UNESCO World Heritage sites	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No
Ramsar sites	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Yes
Key Biodiversity Areas	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Yes
Other areas important for biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Yes

[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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

- 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

Cured meat 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity

on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

(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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global

biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

Cured meat 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity

on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

(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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global

biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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

While our facilities may generate limited noise, smell, and light pollution, we have implemented global best practices to minimise these impacts. Our operations have not been identified as major sources of biodiversity risk. A biodiversity risk assessment revealed that most of the biodiversity impact occurs at other stages of our value chain, such as cattle breeding, grazing, and potentially at abattoirs. As a result, the direct biodiversity risk from our facilities is considered low. In terms of mitigation, we store waste in enclosed spaces, ensuring that it does not escape and affect the surrounding environment. While we do not directly monitor biodiversity on our sites, we actively support biodiversity monitoring at our suppliers' sites through several programs. We work closely with NGOs and participate in global biodiversity initiatives to further assess and mitigate our impact. Additionally, we utilise 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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, focused upon the sites which are the highest consumers of electricity and natural gas that are in scope the GHG Emissions Inventory (please see Annex 1 for further details on sampling strategy). (verification attached)

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

Row 2

(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

- Renewable 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 process the verifier was given access to the electricity supply contracts and other green electricity products proof for validation of the used market-based emission factors. (verification attached)

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

240408 GEP Report for HFG plc (GHG Verification) v1.0.pdf

[Add row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

	Additional information
	N/A

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Financial Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

[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

