Wilmar International Limited

CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2026

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.

09/17/2026, 09:25 am

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:
☑ English

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

Select from:
☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Wilmar International Limited, founded in 1991 and headquartered in Singapore, is today Asia's leading agribusiness group. Wilmar is ranked amongst the largest listed companies by market capitalisation on the Singapore Exchange. At the core of Wilmar's strategy is an integrated agribusiness model that encompasses the entire value chain of the agricultural commodity business, from origination, to processing, branding, merchandising and distribution of a wide range of edible food and industrial products. The Group's business activities include oil palm cultivation, oilseed crushing, edible oils refining, flour and rice milling, sugar milling and refining, manufacturing of consumer products, ready-to-eat meals, central kitchen products, specialty fats, oleochemicals, biodiesel and fertilisers as well as food park operations. It has over 1,000 manufacturing plants and an extensive distribution network covering China, India, Indonesia and some 50 other countries and regions. Through scale, integration and the logistical advantages of its business model, Wilmar is able to extract margins at every step of the value chain, thereby reaping operational synergies and cost efficiencies. As a leading agribusiness group, Wilmar recognises that we have a fundamental role to play in developing quality products required by the world while ensuring we have a responsible and sustainable manner of production. We adopt a holistic approach to sustainability that is fully integrated with our business model. Guided by the philosophy that our business must enhance stakeholder value while minimising our environmental footprint, our business practices are aligned with universally acceptable social and environmental standards. Wilmar's No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation (NDPE) Policy and NDPE Sugar Policy, introduced in 2013 and 2021 respectively, underpin our aspiration to make a positive impact and drive transformation across the palm oil and sugar sectors.

[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.

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2025	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

70420000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

(1.5.1) Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.5.2) How does your reporting boundary differ to that used in your financial statement?

We are using operational control approach for our reporting boundary (joint ventures or associates which we do not have operational control over are excluded).
[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

SG1T56930848

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

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Fiji
☑ China
☑ Ghana
☑ India
☑ Zambia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Philippines
☑ South Africa
☑ New Caledonia
☑ Papua New Guinea
☑ United States of America
☑ Morocco
☑ Myanmar
☑ Nigeria
☑ Ukraine
☑ Ethiopia
☑ Singapore
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Mozambique
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Tanzania (The United Republic of)

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes, for all facilities	*No comments*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Palm facilities

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.450426

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.897164

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Due to the large number of facilities, the sample geolocation provided is for one of our Malaysian palm refineries and for the rest, please refer to our Global Presence Map (https://www.wilmar-international.com/about-us/global-presence) for our palm operations.

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sugar facilities

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-6.021033

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

105.964208

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Due to the large number of facilities, the sample geolocation provided is for one of our Indonesian sugar refineries and for the rest, please refer to our Global Presence Map (https://www.wilmar-international.com/about-us/global-presence) for our sugar mills and refineries.
[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 (including own land)

Processing/ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Distribution

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Produced and sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Production

☑ Processing

☑ Trading

☑ 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)

7850000

(1.22.8) Of the total commodity volume, state how much is post-consumer recycled content (metric tons)

0

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.12) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Fresh fruit bunches (FFB)

(1.22.13) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(1.22.14) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 41-50%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.20) Please explain

The % revenue dependent on palm oil commodity is calculated based on the revenue of Oil Palm Plantation from the "Plantation and Sugar Milling" segment and Tropical Oils from the "Feed and Industrial Products" segment.

Soy

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Trading

☑ Retailing

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

Select from:

☑ Mixture of embedded soy and direct soy

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

Select from:

☑ No, other reason, please specify :We do not produce soy as we do not operate soy plantations (we trade soy).

(1.22.12) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Embedded soy

☑ Soybean meal

☑ Soybean oil

☑ Soy derivatives

☑ Whole soybeans

(1.22.13) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(1.22.14) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

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

Select from:
☑ No, not disclosing

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.22.17) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(1.22.19) Explanation for not disclosing

We do not operate soy plantations, nor is it produced in any of our plantation areas. As such, we focus our initiatives on areas where we have control on deforestation potential. The procurement spend percentage is not publicly disclosed so it is not applicable in our disclosure.

(1.22.20) Please explain

Refer to explanation provided
[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:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Not significant contribution to total revenue

Farmed seafood / Aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Not significant contribution to total revenue

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:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

There is a wide range of other oilseeds sourced including rapeseed, canola, shea butter, cottonseed etc. which individually contributes less than 10% each but as a total, would contribute more than 10% combined.

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Not significant contribution to total revenue

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Less than 10% contribution to our overall revenue.

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Produced and sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

Sugar contributes more than 10% of our total revenue and this is derived from our sugar milling, processing, merchandising and distribution.

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:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:
☑ No

(1.23.4) Please explain

Less than 10% contribution to our overall revenue.

Wild-capture seafood

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No
[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:
☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:
☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:
☑ Smallholders relevant and included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Wilmar has focused its attention on traceability to mill because the mill is a good indicator of the approximate location of its suppliers. Wilmar has prepared maps of all of its own mills in Malaysia and Indonesia, showing all estate boundaries and the location of each smallholder and dealer, and is pursuing options to help its third-party suppliers to do likewise. Wilmar's current approach to traceability back to plantation is based on having considerable detail on all smallgrowers and estates, that includes: Parents company name, estates/growers/dealers name, GPS coordinates, number of growers, certification status and % (volume) from this source. If any information is missing, that source is considered not traceable. This may result in more conservative results than other definitions which may have lower data-qualifying requirements. Wilmar considers each source individually and hence reports the actual percentage (%) of the FFB that is traceable. Since 2015, Wilmar has maintained 100% TtP for all Wilmar-owned mills across our global operations. We are also targeting to reach 100% traceability to oil palm plantations across our global operations as soon as possible. As of end December 2025 (basis FY2025 volumes), approximately 90.0% of our global supply chain is traceable to plantation level. This translates to about 24.9 million MT of palm and lauric products traceable to plantations across our global operations. Our concession maps are publicly available on the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil-GeoRSPO and the Global Forest Watch map platforms. Throughout the year, we have made tremendous inroads in ramping up our TtP efforts by engaging with our suppliers to gather information based on their sourcing. This includes voluntary disclosure of concession maps by our direct third-party suppliers, engaging relevant stakeholders to identify deforestation risks for smallholders' fresh fruit bunches (FFB) supplies and requesting information from direct third-party mills, refiners, traders and bulkers through self-assessment tools.
[Fixed row]

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

	Plastics mapping	Value chain stages covered in mapping
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other, please specify :Own direct operations

[Fixed row]

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

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 2 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 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
[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)

2

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

Aligns with the annual budget cycle and near-term operational plan where capital planning and operational targets are set.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

2

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Aligns with the major capital investment planning horizon and our near-term SBTi targets, where strategic decisions on asset deployment, market positioning and technology adoption are made.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

(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

Aligns with asset useful lives for key infrastructure and net-zero target year, where long-term business model evolution and resilience (esp. with chronic climate risks) are considered.

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 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

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards, please specify :Australia's NGERs, China's National Greenhouse Gas Emission Factor Database, Malaysia's Suruhanjaya Tenaga, New Zealand's Ministry for the Environment Emissions, Singapore's EMA

☑ Other databases, please specify :Agri-footprint, Eco-invent, Intensel, INFORM Risk Index, IEA, IGES

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

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

☑ Wildfires

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land/freshwater/ocean use

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

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Changes to regulations of existing products and services

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

☑ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders

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

Technology

☑ Lack of access to data or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations and legislation

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Local communities

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

Our integrated risk management approach is underpinned by our robust Group-wide risk management framework. Board oversight is provided by the BSC, Risk Management Committee and Executive Risk Committee. Operational teams identify and monitor risks in their respective departments, with our Independent Sustainability Advisors providing specialist guidance on stakeholder expectations and global sustainability trends where necessary. Our risk assessment covers both transition risks, including current and emerging regulations, technology, legal, market and reputation risks, as well as acute and chronic physical risks. To evaluate these risks, Wilmar uses internationally recognised data sources and projections such as the NGFS, the IPCC, Intensel as well as internal data on emissions, energy and other factors. Risks are identified and prioritised based on likelihood and impact, consistent with Wilmar's risk management practices and risk matrix framework that is applied across operational, financial and strategic risks. Risks with potential annual financial implications exceeding our materiality threshold are escalated to the Sustainability Department for further assessment. In collaboration with relevant teams, mitigation and adaptation strategies are tailored and rolled out across Wilmar. Responsibility for implementation is assigned to relevant departments and team leads, with support from the Sustainability Department and senior management as needed. Where necessary, cross-department working groups coordinate action plans, oversee solutions and monitor effectiveness and progress towards our emissions-reduction targets. Climate-related risks are subject to the same governance approach as other enterprise risks, including quarterly reviews at the Board level.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(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

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

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

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :High Conservation Value (HCV) Approach

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

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

☑ Wildfires

Chronic physical

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Other policy risk, please specify :Changes in reporting obligations

Reputation

☑ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

In addition to above process, Wilmar also adopted both the High Conservation Value (HCV) and High Carbon stock (HCS) approach in biodiversity and conservation across our operations. These frameworks provide guidance for assessing nature and biodiversity risks, avoiding sensitive ecosystems, maintaining habitat connectivity, and preserving essential ecological functions, particularly in the context of new development or operations. We enhanced our nature and biodiversity risk assessment by integrating the LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess, Prepare) approach from the Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD), alongside our existing HCV and HCS frameworks. Through LEAP, we have strengthened our ability to identify, assess, and manage biodiversity and broader nature-related risks and opportunities across our operations. We promote effective, long-term biodiversity and nature management by adopting the Science Based Targets Network's (SBTN) Action Framework— Avoid, Reduce, Restore and Regenerate, and Transform (AR3T). This framework guides us in avoiding future impacts, reducing current ones, restoring affected areas, and taking transformative actions to manage and sustain biodiversity and areas of conservation importance.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:
☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

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

(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

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools
☑ WRI Aqueduct

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical
☑ Water stress

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

We use the Aqueduct tool annually to map out our operational sites as well as their Tier 1 suppliers (palm & sugar) against the water stress areas to determine which operations or suppliers are of importance to focus our management efforts on.

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ 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

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(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

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

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

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :High Conservation Value (HCV) Approach

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

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

☑ Wildfires

Chronic physical

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Other policy risk, please specify :Changes in reporting obligations

Reputation

☑ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

Wilmar has been a pioneer in adopting both the High Conservation Value (HCV) and High Carbon stock (HCS) approach in nature and biodiversity conservation across our operations. These frameworks provide guidance for assessing nature and biodiversity risks, avoiding sensitive ecosystems, maintaining habitat connectivity, and preserving essential ecological functions, particularly in the context of new development or operations. We enhanced our nature and biodiversity risk assessment by integrating the LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess, Prepare) approach from the Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD), alongside our existing HCV and HCS frameworks. Through LEAP, we have strengthened our ability to identify, assess, and manage biodiversity and broader nature-related risks and opportunities across our operations. We promote effective, long-term biodiversity and nature management by adopting the Science Based Targets Network's (SBTN) Action Framework— Avoid, Reduce, Restore and Regenerate, and Transform (AR3T). This framework guides us in avoiding future impacts, reducing current ones, restoring affected areas, and taking transformative actions to manage and sustain biodiversity and areas of conservation importance.

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

We identify, assess and manage environmental dependencies and impacts via EIA, ESIA and HCV assessment to identify key ecosystem, environment and biodiversity sensitive area and its risks. We manage environment sensitive areas to protect biodiversity and its ecosystem services. Management of the identified areas are audited yearly via National certification and RSPO scheme. Alongside with our existing assessment, we integrate the LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess, Prepare) approach from the Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD). Through LEAP, we have strengthened our ability to identify, assess, and manage nature-related risks and opportunities across our operations. We evaluate the impacts of our operations on biodiversity and nature, as well as our *dependence on them. Potential impacts (e.g., land use, water consumption, and effects on ecosystem services) and dependencies (e.g., climate regulation, pest and disease control, and erosion control) were evaluated using a heatmap based on ENCORE's rating system. Material risks (e.g., flooding, disruption to water supply) and opportunities (e.g., improved water captured/usage, investment in effective integrated pest management) were assessed using a five-level scoring matrix that considers exposure, vulnerability, probability and anticipated benefits. We identified fire and water-related risks as interconnected risks for both climate and nature. [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

☑ Areas of high ecosystem integrity

☑ Areas of importance for ecosystem service provision

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

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

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

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We conducted HCV assessment or integrated HCV-HCS assessment for our operation areas to identify key ecosystem, environment and biodiversity sensitive area and manage it as conservation areas to protect biodiversity and its ecosystem services. We take the guidance from TNFD LEAP approach to identify priority locations, alongside with our existing HCV and HCS frameworks. We have set aside over 31,000 ha of areas identified as being of HCV and HCS, which crucial for biodiversity. Through the implementation of TNFD LEAP approach, we identified 25 key material assets across our business segments. These assets were assessed for their proximity (within 30 km) to various ecosystems and protected zones to determine their interface with priority areas for biodiversity and nature conservation. We promote effective, long-term biodiversity and nature management by adopting the Science Based Targets Network's (SBTN) Action Framework— Avoid, Reduce, Restore and Regenerate, and Transform (AR3T). This framework guides us in avoiding future impacts, reducing current ones, restoring affected areas, and taking transformative actions to manage and sustain biodiversity and areas of conservation importance.

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Profit before tax

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Wilmar's Group-wide Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process assesses climate-related risks or opportunities on a regular basis. Starting in 2022, the BSC regularly reviews all ESG matters, including climate change. These reviews cover the overall risk management guidelines, policies and systems to determine the potential financial or strategic impact of the risks or opportunities identified. Any risk which poses a financial impact over an internally set threshold is required to be reported, reviewed and managed adequately through the Group's Risk Management structure. It is followed by development of adaptation and mitigation measures, and continuous monitoring. The implementation and monitoring of these strategies are delegated to the respective departments and team leads. The classes of risks/opportunities assessed include both transition risks/opportunities (e.g. current regulations, emerging regulations, technology, legal and market) as well as physical risks (e.g. acute risks such as extreme weather events, and chronic risks such as increased pressure on fertile soils).

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Profit before tax

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Wilmar’s Group-wide Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process assesses climate-related risks or opportunities on a regular basis. Starting in 2022, the BSC regularly reviews all ESG matters, including climate change. These reviews cover the overall risk management guidelines, policies and systems to determine the potential financial or strategic impact of the risks or opportunities identified. Any opportunity which could have a financial impact over an internally set threshold is required to be reported, reviewed and managed adequately through the Group's Risk Management structure. It is followed by development of measures to explore the opportunity and continuous monitoring. The implementation and monitoring of these strategies are delegated to the respective departments and team leads. The classes of opportunities assessed include current regulations, emerging regulations, technology, legal and market.

[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) Details of policies and processes in place to identify and classify potential water pollutants

As set out in our Environmental Policy, each site or/and facility is required to comply with local environmental regulations, including quality of wastewater discharged out of our operations. The wastewater must be treated effectively to ensure that the water discharge meets regulatory thresholds. Any violation with the regulatory limits of wastewater discharge may result in potential detrimental impact on the water ecosystem and human beings. As the local regulations may vary across different countries, we develop a set of standard water parameters for all the sites and facilities to test, monitor and comply with. The sites and facilities are also required to observe their local regulations and identify the additional parameters which are not in the Group's standard. The parameters include pH, COD, BOD, TSS, FOG, Total Nitrogen, Total Phosphorus and others.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:
☑ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

There are two key oxygen demanding indicators i.e. COD and BOD which are closely monitored by the sites and facilities, especially the palm oil/sugar mills and refineries. High COD or BOD in the water returned to the environment will cause oxygen depletion for the aquatic organisms and this condition will also be detrimental to other ecosystems, food supply chain and human beings.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Water recycling

☑ Resource recovery

☑ Improving wastewater treatment processes/capacity

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

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

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with discharge permits / regulatory limits

☑ 100% of wastewater treated

☑ Zero incidents (spills, exceedances, waterborne disease cases)

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

The wastewater generated from our sites and facilities is treated via either on-site treatments plants or third-party treatment companies. The treated water must meet the regulatory thresholds before discharge out of the operations and also ensure mitigation measures are in place if any breach is detected. We regularly conduct site audits to check on safety, SOPs and compliance-related issues specific to effluent treatment. Dedicated persons-in-charge (PIC) in each region have overall responsibility for effluent treatment plants and provide monthly update reports summarising the quality of treated effluent as well as the status of projects and other updates. We have deployed Production Information Management Systems throughout Wilmar's global operations to monitor critical ETPs data online. We view wastewater recycling as an important element towards achieving our sustainability goals and have expanded our current wastewater recycling initiatives. We closely monitor the number of significant violation with environmental regulations for each site and report via sustainability report.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

(3.1.3) Please explain

We have identified the contribution of plastic packaging use to our overall Scope 3 emissions and assessed that it is not significant enough to have potential substantive effect on the organization.
[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

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Severe flooding may damage our infrastructure and assets (including bearer plants), leading to increased insurance premiums and additional spending on repairs and maintenance. Supply chain disruptions due to flooding could also adversely impact raw materials supplies and transportation, potentially resulting in lowered utilization for our sites.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-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

Reduced yield due to crop damage, leading to reduced revenue and disruption of operations. Increased cost for field rehabilitation and repair as well.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase investment in R&D

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

27000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

An estimated US$27 million (average cost of RSPO certification & maintenance (US$ 18 per MT CPO) with total production for the year) to implement sustainable management and production practices, invest in R&D for more resilient crops, as well as to enhance infrastructure and resilience against potential physical damages.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Investments into Research & Development (R&D) to develop palm seedlings with better resilience to diseases, pests and drought tolerant. Our Indonesian R&D laboratory focuses on biotechnology research to enhance our competitiveness and sustainability in the oil palm industry. By educating and preparing the staffs to deal with climate related incidents - crisis management preparation, having in place protocols and periodic drills to maintain the capability to handle such emergencies effectively and restore operations promptly, taking into account all necessary safety precautions. For suppliers, the company actively engages and shares best management practices to ensure supply chain continuity. The idea is to alleviate climate change impacts based on principles of sustainable management & production while improving our infrastructure to make it resistant against negative climate impacts. These are embedded in our recurring operational cost.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Declining ecosystem services

(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

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Wilmar has oil palm planted area situated in countries with a wet tropical climate necessary to support the cultivation of oil palm, a crop that has a high-water requirement. Therefore, climate-related risks such as changes in precipitation patterns due to climate change in these tropical countries, can have a huge impact on crop growth and oil palm fresh fruit bunches (FFB) yield in all of our planted areas. In addition, our plantations are exposed to risks related to the decline in ecosystem *services that may occur due to deforestation, land use change and loss of biodiversity, which are issues faced in all four countries where our plantation operations are based. These risks can impact crop resilience, thereby reducing our FFB yield. Moreover, both risks can also impact our suppliers' production of palm in Malaysia, Indonesia and other geographical regions exposed to these risks, thereby disrupting our supply chain of FFB for our mills, along with trickle down effects on the rest of the downstream supply chain.*

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-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

Ecosystem degradation can reduce crop yields by disrupting essential ecosystem services such as pollination, soil fertility, water regulation, and natural pest control. This would incur higher costs to rehabilitate degraded ecosystems or implement mitigation measures to maintain productivity and operational resilience.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ More ambitious environmental commitments and policies

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This response pertains to running our operations and managing our supply chain, which are currently considered part of our overall operational costs. These actions are integrated within our operations and costs of operations and not separately quantified.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We manage climate, deforestation & biodiversity risks in our operations and supply chain via implementation of our sustainability policies, eg. No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation (NDPE) Policy (since 2013), Grievance Procedure and Supplier Guidelines. These support our NDPE commitments which cover our global operations, including joint-ventures and third-party suppliers. Commitments include: - No development on and conservation of HCV & HCS areas - No development on and the conservation of peatlands of any depth - No burning for new plantings, replanting or other developments - Reduce energy use & GHG emissions; increase use of renewable energy sources - Improve water management, especially in water-stressed areas: increase reuse To ensure NDPE compliance, our Supplier Group Compliance Program (SGCP) monitors over 24.4 million ha of land via satellite imagery. In support of the broader industry, Wilmar partnered with nine other palm oil producers and buyers in 2019 to support and fund the development of Radar Alerts for Detecting Deforestation (RADD) and verification protocols for when RADD alerts are triggered. The system detects forest changes across 44 countries in high resolution using radar-based monitoring, enabling early identification of deforestation and prompt response. RADD alerts are publicly accessible through the World Resources Institute's Global Forest Watch (GFW) platform. Our operations also undergo 3rd party sustainable palm oil certification audits (e.g. RSPO, ISCC, MSPO, ISPO), which covers no deforestation requirements.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Drought

(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

☑ Australia

☑ India

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Godavari

☑ Krishna

☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmatim Australia (East Coast)

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Operations that are exposed to high water stress (i.e. total water withdrawals compared to available renewable surface and groundwater supplies) are identified based on WRI Aqueduct tool. The operational components of the mill/refinery which rely on water (e.g. boilers, process water etc.) would be adversely impacted if there is insufficient water to operate. This would result in us needing to source for alternative water sources or sources from a further distance, resulting in increased operating costs.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(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

Increase in operating cost will result in lower revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Adopt water efficiency, water reuse, recycling and conservation practices

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

65000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This is an estimated future response cost for India (average cost of treatment [USD 0.066 per litre water in The Economic Times' report] multiply by total volume of wastewater produced) and the subsequent operational cost to manage the risk.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

For India mills that have distilleries and co-generation plants in their vicinity, we have implemented a zero-discharge approach where the excess process condensate can be used for cooling towers after secondary treatment. The remainder discharge is mostly used for green belt irrigation within the mills' premises and supplied to neighbouring farmers. For certain plants, we have installed a zero-discharge facility where all water withdrawn is treated and re-used back in the operations. We have also installed a secondary reverse osmosis plant to treat the rejected water from the primary plant to convert into raw water. In India, we have become a member of Federation of Kutch Industries Association (FOKIA), a government-aided organisation to support industries in the region to mitigate water scarcity issues by installing common desalination plants. For relevant sugar refineries in Australia, we continuously employ practices to minimise water use through installation of new technology to improve water use efficiency. We have installed a pan calandria which resulted in an increase of condensate return to our boiler station, further reducing water usage by eliminating wastage of surplus hot water.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Italy

☑ Malaysia

☑ Indonesia

☑ Netherlands

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Evolving preferences of customers and stakeholders towards more climate-conscious competitors resulting in potential loss of business

(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

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-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

With a shift in stakeholder demand or preferences (e.g. specific climate requirements in terms of lower product carbon footprint), a loss of existing and potential sales is possible which can lead to loss of revenue for organization. This is generally initiated by downstream stakeholders, impacting upstream operations and suppliers.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Promotion of best practice and awareness in the value chain

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Wilmar recognises this as an integrated market risk, with the associated cost of response incorporated into our business-as-usual operational expenses and thus not separately quantified.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We continue working closely with our suppliers to implement our NDPE commitments and expand the range of sustainable products for customers. Wilmar's marketing and sustainability teams will work closely to keep abreast of customer requirements, identify solutions and inform traders of these evolving preferences.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☑ Palm oil

(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:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Wilmar is one of the world's largest oil palm plantation owners. Land concessions in countries of operation can include territories that face conflict of land ownership and occupancy rights from claims made by local/indigenous communities. These conflicts that lead to litigative risks, reputational risks as well as our social license to operate.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:
☑ Closure of operations

(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

Increased capital expenditure and operating cost due to the need to invest & operate on new operational sites to meet the production demand.

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

Select from:
☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement
☑ Engage with local communities

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This response pertains to running our operations and managing our supply chain, which are currently considered part of our overall operational costs. These actions are integrated within our operations and costs of operations and not separately quantified.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We are committed to respect and uphold legal and customary land tenure rights of communities and individual rights of Indigenous and local communities. Prior to any new planting, Free, Prior & Informed Consent (FPIC) must be granted to ensure local communities have clear, specific avenues to negotiate the conditions of any project. This is in accordance with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP), the High Carbon Stock Approach (HCSA) toolkit and the RSPO Principle & Criteria (P&C). We expect the same of our suppliers. In land-related planning, participatory mapping is carried out to involve affected communities and their representatives, relevant stakeholders and, where appropriate, supporting NGOs and independent experts. We will respond to any disputes or conflicts that arise in a timely and transparent manner following the steps stipulated in our Grievance Procedure and take action to remediate any adverse human rights impacts we have caused or contributed to. Where feasible, we seek to support food security in local communities by helping farmers grow other crops and establish food production businesses. Wilmar also actively participates in the RSPO's Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) and co-chairs the FPIC sub-group within the HRWG. The HRWG seeks to ensure the implementation of the RSPO P&C relevant to the protection of human rights while the sub-group explores practical solutions relating to the application of FPIC within the sector.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Reputation

☑ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders

(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

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Stakeholder concerns regarding palm oil production and sourcing practices may affect the company's reputation, stakeholder relationships, market access, and ability to attract sales.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption to sales

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(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

Increased in resources and expenditure for engagement, monitoring, and remediation activities.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Market expansion

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

No cost incurred for response as it would be a matter of expanding market or diverting the products to other markets that can accept it.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Those products specified as primary generation would be sold into the food market instead.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Wildfires

(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

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Forest fires pose a huge risk for both our employees and the communities living in and around our estates. It also jeopardizes the livelihoods and health and safety of the local community, and impacts operations requiring resources to be diverted to suppress any fires. Forest fires especially on high carbon stock forests releases significant GHG to the atmosphere and impacts the habitat of the flora and fauna. Severe forest fires lead to haze and transboundary haze which impacts the health and safety of citizens of surrounding countries. This may lead to reputational damage.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Constraint to growth

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ 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

Wildfires may result in reduced production volumes, asset damage, restoration and replanting costs, supply chain disruptions, and regulatory penalties. Fire-related haze and environmental degradation may also affect the health, safety, and productivity of employees, contractors, smallholders, and local communities, leading to additional operational costs and potential impacts on business performance.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with local communities

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This response pertains to running our operations and managing our supply chain, which are currently considered part of our overall operational costs. These actions are integrated within our operations and costs of operations and not separately quantified.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Wilmar's NDPE Policy applies to all operations, including subsidiaries and suppliers, and incorporates a strict No Burning commitment. Land development is carried out using mechanical methods, with biomass retained onsite to decompose naturally and replenish soil nutrients. To support fire prevention and detection, Wilmar operates a 24/7 monitoring system that utilises satellite imagery to monitor hotspots within and up to 5 km beyond its concession boundaries. All hotspot alerts are verified on the ground by dedicated response teams, which take immediate action to extinguish confirmed fires. Wilmar also collaborates with the RSPO to share fire-related data and verify hotspot notifications. Beyond its own operations, Wilmar monitors fires within suppliers' concessions through its Supplier Group Compliance Programme. Upon receiving alerts from monitoring platforms or media reports, the Group engages suppliers to seek clarification and assess the situation. Wilmar's concessions are equipped with firefighting infrastructure, equipment, and trained onsite fire brigades. Field personnel receive regular training to ensure they remain vigilant and are able to respond swiftly and effectively to fire incidents. Recognizing that slash-and-burn practices remain prevalent among some smallholder farmers and local communities, which can contribute to uncontrolled fires, Wilmar complements its monitoring and response efforts with community outreach, awareness program, and multi-stakeholder partnerships. The Group works closely with community leaders and local authorities to promote responsible land management practices, provide basic fire management training, and support local firefighting capabilities through the provision of equipment and resources.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Forests commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Technology

☑ Inability to increase yield of existing production areas

(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

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Reduced land expansion may constrain production growth and future revenue opportunities, while increasing reliance on productivity improvements and operational efficiencies to meet demand.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Constraint to growth

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

Limitations on land expansion would likely affecting yield growth, revenue generation, and long-term business growth. Requiring additional investment in yield enhancement and sustainable intensification measures.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This response pertains to running our operations and managing our supply chain, which are currently considered part of our overall operational costs. These actions are integrated within our operations and costs of operations and not separately quantified.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Internal R&D continues to invest in the development of high-performing clonal varieties, field testing of optimal male-to-female planting ratios, and the optimization of fertilizer program to support sustainable yield improvement and production efficiency.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Netherlands

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Implementation or tightening of carbon pricing schemes (e.g. carbon tax, emissions trading scheme)

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

Any increase in carbon tax rates will directly translate into an increase in costs. In addition, the price of purchased commodities may be higher, further increasing operational costs.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

38000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

With an estimated cost of about USD 2 million for a covered lagoon system to capture and utilise the biogas from Palm Oil Mill Effluent, the total capital cost to implement the system in our remaining mills without biogas capture plants (19) in Malaysia, Indonesia, Nigeria and Ghana would be estimated to be around USD 38 million.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We will continue to focus on developing and implementing initiatives to reduce operational GHG emissions and improve energy efficiency, optimising energy structure and reducing fugitive emissions. This can be achieved by enhancing collaboration between our technical, operational and sustainability teams to identify and assess the feasibility of initiatives from planning to implementation

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

(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

☑ Ghana

☑ India

☑ Myanmar

☑ Nigeria

☑ Malaysia

☑ Australia

☑ Indonesia

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increase in input costs due to climate change-driven changes in weather conditions, inducing stress on raw material and commodity prices

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-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

Rising raw material costs and commodity price volatility may lead to changes in the pricing of our products. Should Wilmar be unable to maintain price competitiveness or be required to absorb additional costs, these factors could result in reduced sales revenue or lower profit margins, ultimately impacting overall business performance

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with suppliers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Wilmar recognises this as an integrated market risk, with the associated cost of response incorporated into our business-as-usual operational expenses.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Wilmar's risk, trading and procurement teams will work closely to implement appropriate solutions including securing favourable long-term contracts, adopting proactive pricing strategies and applying appropriate hedging measures. At the operational level, we will prioritise efficiency improvements and robust inventory management to minimise waste. We will also seek to strengthen supplier relationships through regular engagement and by providing the necessary information and tools to build a reliable and sustainable supply chain
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ OPEX

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ OPEX
[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 :East Coast

(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

10

(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

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify :South Coast

(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:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify :West Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Amur

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company's total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Huang He (Yellow River)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

4

(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

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Bo Hai - Korean Bay, North Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

5

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(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

15

(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

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Gobi Interior

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(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

6

(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

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 10

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 12

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Godavari

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 13

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Krishna

(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

7

(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

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company's total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 14

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 15

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :Yasai

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 16

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Cisadane

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 17

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java - Timor

(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

14

(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

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 18

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Sumatra West Coast 2

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 19

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Morocco

☑ Other, please specify :Africa, North West Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 20

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Limpopo

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 21

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Ukraine

☑ Other, please specify :Black Sea, North Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 22

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :California Calaveras

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company's total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 23

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Viet Nam
☑ Saigon

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company's total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.

Row 24

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe
☑ Zambezi

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Global operations under our operational control are subject to annual screening of water stress risk via WRI Aqueduct tool. "% company-wide facilities this represents" was calculated based on "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total number of operations under the scope. "% company’s total global revenue that could be affected" was estimated based on the revenue from "Number of facilities exposed to water risk" under this river basin over total revenue in reporting period.
[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:

☑ No

(3.3.3) Comment

Each site or facility is required to report any fines and/or penalties with significant impact (internal threshold) for water-related regulatory violations via Enablon system annually. In 2025, there was no water-related violation that incurred a significant financial impact for the Group.
[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:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Hubei pilot ETS
☑ Beijing pilot ETS
☑ Tianjin pilot ETS
☑ China national ETS
☑ Shanghai pilot ETS
☑ Shenzhen pilot ETS
☑ Chongqing pilot ETS

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

Beijing pilot ETS

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

0

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

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

0.13

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

6007

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

28

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

5980

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

As compliance & trading period has not yet commenced or entities have surplus allowances from previous years, no carbon transactions have taken place so far (i.e. no allowances purchased).

China national ETS

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

26.6

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ No compliance obligation for scope 2 emissions

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

0

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

0

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

2423006

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

No allowances yet issued.

Chongqing pilot ETS

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

0.26

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

0.83

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

0

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

23388

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

37216

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

No allocation yet issued.

Hubei pilot ETS

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

0.01

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

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

1.2

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

43030

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

969

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

55519

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

As compliance & trading period has not yet commenced or entities have surplus allowances from previous years, no carbon transactions have taken place so far (i.e. no allowances purchased).

Shanghai pilot ETS

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

0.03

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

0.95

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

44998

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

3048

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

43044

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

As compliance & trading period has not yet commenced or entities have surplus allowances from previous years, no carbon transactions have taken place so far (i.e. no allowances purchased).

Shenzhen pilot ETS

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

0.02

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

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

1.3

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

49817

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

1911

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

57935

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

As compliance & trading period has not yet commenced or entities have surplus allowances from previous years, no carbon transactions have taken place so far (i.e. no allowances purchased).

Tianjin pilot ETS

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

0.13

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

2.1

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

77279

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

12151

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

96009

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

Allowance is allocated in two batches with current allowance being the first batch only. As compliance & trading period has not yet commenced or entities have surplus allowances from previous years, no carbon transactions have taken place so far (i.e. no allowances purchased).
[Fixed row]

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

China's carbon pricing system is based on a cap-and-trade model, in which emitters — initially only coal- and gas-fired energy plants — are allocated a certain number of emission allowances up to a set limit, or cap, and then either trade or buy allowances if they remain below or exceed this. Currently there are a number of our sites in China being involved with the ETSs and while the various ETSs are in different degree of implementation phases (e.g. no allowances issued, compliance/trading period not started etc.), we are preparing ourselves for the eventual expansion of scope nationally by developing a roadmap consistent with our own development plans to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Shift in consumer preferences

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Italy

☑ Malaysia

☑ Indonesia

☑ Netherlands

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

With raising awareness by consumers on climate change and sustainability issues, there is a growing demand for sustainable products with reduced negative environmental and social impact. To better align with shifts in buyer preferences, there is an opportunity to enhance sustainable practices in the production of our *existing products, thereby increasing our market share in current markets. Wilmar is also actively investing in research and development efforts to identify environmentally friendly solutions and address the growing demand for sustainable products.*

(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

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(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:

☑ High

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

Revenue generated on climate-related opportunities associated with shift in consumer preferences and sale of low-carbon products contribute to approximately 7% of our total revenue generated in financial year 2025.

(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

Increase in overall revenue for the company in near- to long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Revenue generated on climate-related opportunities associated with shift in consumer preferences and sale of low-carbon products contribute to approximately 7% of our total revenue generated in financial year 2025.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

14050000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Wilmar has allocated RMB100.0 million (approximately US$14.0 million) for scientific R&D in China. An additional US$40,000 to US$50,000 has been spent on ISCC and INS certifications as well as aligning with biofuel standards

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We will continue to invest in R&D and collaborate widely to develop new and innovative products.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Forest commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Cost savings

(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

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Our operations rely on energy, water and other resources to run; therefore we actively recognize, explore and implement opportunities in minimizing the environmental footprint of our operations and supporting sustainable production through the efficient use of natural resources. We implement efficiency measures to reduce our energy and water use and, where possible, we reuse, recover and recycle waste. We put in place and actively review our Wilmar Integrated Management System (WIMS), which follows the requirements of ISO 14001 and other relevant environmental standards, in order to continuously monitor and improve our performance. WIMS complements the Wilmar Environmental Policy and is supported by four in-house developed environmental standards for our factories, palm oil mills and crushing plants (i.e. Environmental Programme Standard, Stormwater & Wastewater Standard, Spill Prevention, Control, & Countermeasure Standard, and Environmental Inspection & Reporting Standard). In our palm and sugar upstream operations, Wilmar practices a circular economy approach of reusing waste biomass for energy wherever possible in order to improve resource efficiency. For our palm oil mills, the primary energy sources are by-products from the milling process, such as empty fruit bunches (EFB), kernel shells and mesocarp fibre. For our sugar milling operations in Australia and India, the main source of fuel to power our mills is cane bagasse.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Improved company financial health and potential growing reputation in near-term horizon

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Part of existing operational cost.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

While the full potential impact from our efficiency measures has not been quantified financially, as a conservative figure, Wilmar has generated cost savings of more than USD 150 million annually from the recycling of biomass for energy production in our palm upstream operations (mills). The financial impact is estimated by calculating the power generated and cost savings by replacing the grid electricity with diverted empty fruit bunches (EFB), mesocarp fibre and palm kernel shells used for energy in our mills across our global palm oil mill operations (i.e. Malaysia, Indonesia, Ghana and Nigeria). Energy content of the diverted biomass is calculated based on GHG Protocol, and assuming 45% efficiency of the power plants, for the conservative estimate.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Use of recycling

(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

☑ India

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Godavari

☑ Krishna

☑ Other, please specify :Australia (East Coast)

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The sugarcane milling process generates effluent water that is suitable for reuse in irrigation systems after treatment. In India, during drought seasons, this effluent water is diverted to rain-fed farms to supplement any additional water needs. For our sugar operations in Australia, most effluent is discharged via land application for irrigation purposes on farms surrounding mills and is not governed by a specific discharge limit. In India, with our facilities operating in water-stressed areas, there is a focus on reusing water from the milling and distillery processes. Wastewater is treated and reused in cooling towers as well as to irrigate the green belts within the mill compounds to reduce the overall water discharge.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Improved company financial health and potential growing reputation in near-term horizon

(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)

500000

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

700000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

We estimated around 2,350,000 m3 wastewater were produced in Australia and India. Instead of sourcing fresh water for irrigation, the reuse of wastewater can potentially help save around US$ 500,000-700,000 based on estimated water tariffs in Australia and India.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Part of existing cost for efficiency drive.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Implement water savings and recycling initiatives

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source
☑ Use of low-carbon energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Australia
☑ China
☑ India

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Use of excess biomass from palm & sugar operations to generate additional electricity for sale to grid. Installing rooftop solar to reduce our reliance on grid electricity allows us to lower our operating costs and exposure to carbon taxes, with sale of surplus electricity to national grids creating new revenue streams.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

With lower operating cost, this can help us reduce our cost of goods sold which can potentially result in better profit margins.

(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

Improved company financial health and potential growing reputation in near-term horizon

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Revenue generated on climate-related opportunities associated with shift in consumer preferences and sale of low-carbon products contribute to approximately 7% of our total revenue generated in financial year 2025.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Part of existing operational cost with the average cost of implementing new solar installations estimated at US$0.5-0.6 per kWp of installed capacity.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Depending on the feasibility of rolling out more rooftop solar projects wherever feasible, Wilmar is actively looking at installing more of the panels to maximize this opportunity. All of these projects will be assessed across our technical project, energy supply and sourcing teams on the suitability of such fuel switching.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Forest commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Increased upstream value chain resilience

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

As an integrated agribusiness that encompasses the entire value chain of the agricommodity business, from cultivation and milling of palm oil; to processing, branding and distribution of food products and industrial agri-products, Wilmar has the operational capital and influence to realise opportunities that improve resilience particularly in the palm supply chain. As part of our group-wide strategy, Wilmar incorporates the risk mitigation practices in our supply chain by applying rigorous due diligence for 100% of our potential supplying mills before they are eligible to enter our supply chain. Wilmar assesses all mills in our supply chain annually to ensure ESG risks remain properly managed to ensure the continual resilience of our supply chain. We use our Supplier Reporting Tool (SRT) to screen suppliers for socio-environmental risks, covering both direct suppliers and Wilmar-owned mills, which we identify based on the previous year's procurement data. Suppliers also receive a report with an individualised action plan for follow-up to mitigate any potential risks raised. This supports the improvement of sustainability performance of our direct third-party suppliers.

(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:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(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

Increase in overall revenue for the company in near- to long term

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Wilmar recognises this as an integrated business opportunity, with the associated cost of response incorporated into our business-as-usual operational expenses to support our suppliers.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Continue our support & engagement programmes with direct suppliers to maintain the goodwill and help build the capacity of our suppliers to provide us with sustainably-sourced commodities.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Forest commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Driving sustainability certifications for our products in our palm value chain is an opportunity as it plays an important role in providing our customers with the confidence that our palm products meet high sustainability standards, supports a market for certified palm products, and is an enabler for driving positive change in the palm oil value chain. In addition, certifications are an important aspect in Wilmar's sustainability practices, in order to support our due diligence processes in minimising deforestation, peat, human rights and other ESG risks, as well as in improving the efficiency and productivity of our palm operations. We benchmark our internal operations globally against various national and international sustainability standards and certifications to support the trade of sustainable palm oil and its derivatives in the market. The certifications we work towards achieving include certifications by the RSPO, Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO), Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSPO) and the International Sustainability Carbon Certification (ISCC) for palm oil.

(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

Increase in overall revenue for the company in near- to long term

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Wilmar recognises this as an integrated business opportunity, with the associated cost of response incorporated into our business-as-usual operational expenses to support our suppliers.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Continue our smallholder programmes to support them with their certification journey in order to increase our own pool of certified volumes and sources.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Forest commodity
☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services
☑ Increased value chain transparency

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Wilmar recognizes the importance of being able to trace supply flows from ports and refineries back to oil palm mills and over time to plantations. This is an integral part of providing greater transparency in the supply chain, including supplier locations and knowledge of practices being used on the ground. We make our supply chain as transparent as possible to all stakeholders on our sustainability dashboard. While we previously updated this quarterly and thereafter bi-annually, we have now updated our palm oil mill traceability annually. Over 90% of volumes originate from third-party suppliers in Indonesia and Malaysia. In 2015, Wilmar committed to achieving full palm oil mill traceability for all volumes handled by our refineries. As at end Dec 2024, we achieved 98.5% traceability to palm oil mills. We also published NDPE IRF profiles for all our refineries at origin and destinations. Information on the palm oil mill traceability can also be found in our Sustainability dashboard.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

(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:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(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

Increase in overall revenue for the company in near- to long term

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Wilmar recognises this as an integrated business opportunity, with the associated cost of response incorporated into our business-as-usual operational expenses to support our suppliers.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Continue our supplier monitoring programmes to help build the capacity of our suppliers for providing sustainably-sourced commodities.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Forest commodity

☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Improved supply chain engagement

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ghana

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

☑ Nigeria

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Enhanced supplier engagement can help suppliers meet sustainable sourcing requirements (e.g. enhance removal and reducing GHG emissions), enabling access to new markets and customers that prioritize deforestation-free and responsibly produced commodities.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

(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:
☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ High

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

Support revenue growth and strengthen long-term competitiveness.

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

Select from:
☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Wilmar recognises this as an integrated business opportunity, with the associated cost of response incorporated into our business-as-usual operational expenses to support our suppliers.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Continue engaging suppliers to strengthen carbon removal efforts through conservation and sustainable land management practices, helping to increase GHG sequestration and reduce net emissions.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Reduced water usage and consumption

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Unknown

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Through water conservation methods such as recycling steam condensate, improving production processes to reduce steam use, reusing water, installing meters to assess water consumption, identifying leak points, and reducing waste, a significant volume of water can be saved.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term

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

Select from:
☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Low

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

Improved company financial health and potential growing reputation in near-term horizon

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

Select from:
☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Part of existing operational costs.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Roll out water savings and awareness campaign to encourage staff and workers to identify water leak points for fixing, implement water savings initiatives to reduce or reuse water, and improve production processes to reduce steam use and recycle steam condensate.
[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.

	Financial metric
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Revenue
Water	*Select from:* ☑ OPEX

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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

The Company is committed to building a diverse, inclusive and collaborative culture. The Company recognises and embraces the benefits of diversity on its Board and views diversity at the Board level as an essential and progressive element in supporting the achievement of the Company's strategic objectives and its sustainable development. A diverse Board will include and make good use of differences between board members in terms of skills, experience, background, gender, age, cultural and educational background, ethnicity, professional experience and other relevant factors. In determining and planning the Board's composition, these *differences will be considered in determining the optimum composition of the Board and where possible, should be balanced appropriately. All board appointments are based on merit in the context of the skills, experience, independence and knowledge which the Board as a whole requires to be effective.*

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

Wilmar Board Diversity Policy.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board 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

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Chairman and CEO, and the Board of Directors oversee the management of Wilmar's sustainability strategy. They are supported by the Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) which meets quarterly. The BSC assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling its oversight responsibility in relation to Wilmar's objectives, policies and practices pertaining to sustainability or ESG matters including climate change. These include formulating ESG strategies, identifying ESG-related risks, evaluating ESG performance and targets and monitoring the implementation of ESG related policies and practices. To achieve effective implementation of sustainability throughout the Company, the BSC receives periodic reporting and advisories from the following: 1. SUSTAINABILITY MANAGEMENT TEAM (SMT) which is headed by the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) who is assisted by the General Manager – Group Sustainability. The SMT is supported by the Sustainability Department and comprises members across all internal Wilmar departments and operational units. 2. INDEPENDENT SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY PANEL (ISAP) works with our SMT to provide on-the-ground support to execute and evaluate the implementation of our ESG policies. The ISAP comprises independent sustainability experts and eminent individuals and provides advisories and recommendations related to external stakeholder expectations and global sustainability trends.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board 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

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Chairman and CEO, and the Board of Directors oversee the management of Wilmar's sustainability strategy. They are supported by the Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) which meets quarterly. The BSC assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling its oversight responsibility in relation to Wilmar's objectives, policies and practices pertaining to sustainability or ESG matters including climate change. These include formulating ESG strategies, identifying ESG-related risks, evaluating ESG performance and targets and monitoring the implementation of ESG related policies and practices. To achieve effective implementation of sustainability throughout the Company, the BSC receives periodic reporting and advisories from the following: 1. SUSTAINABILITY MANAGEMENT TEAM (SMT) which is headed by the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) who is assisted by the General Manager – Group Sustainability. The SMT is supported by the Sustainability Department and comprises members across all internal Wilmar departments and operational units. 2. INDEPENDENT SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY PANEL (ISAP) works with our SMT to provide on-the-ground support to execute and evaluate the implementation of our ESG policies. The ISAP comprises independent sustainability experts and eminent individuals and provides advisories and recommendations related to external stakeholder expectations and global sustainability trends.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board 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

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Chairman and CEO, and the Board of Directors oversee the management of Wilmar's sustainability strategy. They are supported by the Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) which meets quarterly. The BSC assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling its oversight responsibility in relation to Wilmar's objectives, policies and practices pertaining to sustainability or ESG matters including climate change. These include formulating ESG strategies, identifying ESG-related risks, evaluating ESG performance and targets and monitoring the implementation of ESG related policies and practices. To achieve effective implementation of sustainability throughout the Company, the BSC receives periodic reporting and advisories from the following: 1. SUSTAINABILITY MANAGEMENT TEAM (SMT) which is headed by the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) who is assisted by the General Manager – Group Sustainability. The SMT is supported by the Sustainability Department and comprises members across all internal Wilmar departments and operational units. 2. INDEPENDENT SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY PANEL (ISAP) works with our SMT to provide on-the-ground support to execute and evaluate the implementation of our ESG policies. The ISAP comprises independent sustainability experts and eminent individuals and provides advisories and recommendations related to external stakeholder expectations and global sustainability trends.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board 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

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Chairman and CEO, and the Board of Directors oversee the management of Wilmar's sustainability strategy. They are supported by the Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) which meets quarterly. The BSC assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling its oversight responsibility in relation to Wilmar's objectives, policies and practices pertaining to sustainability or ESG matters including climate change. These include formulating ESG strategies, identifying ESG-related risks, evaluating ESG performance and targets and monitoring the implementation of ESG related policies and practices. To achieve effective implementation of sustainability throughout the Company, the BSC receives periodic reporting and advisories from the following: 1. SUSTAINABILITY MANAGEMENT TEAM (SMT) which is headed by the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) who is assisted by the General Manager – Group Sustainability. The SMT is supported by the Sustainability Department and comprises members across all internal Wilmar departments and operational units. 2. INDEPENDENT SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY PANEL (ISAP) works with our SMT to provide on-the-ground support to execute and evaluate the implementation of our ESG policies. The ISAP comprises independent sustainability experts and eminent individuals and provides advisories and recommendations related to external stakeholder expectations and global sustainability trends.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

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

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

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

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

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

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

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

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

(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

Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) meets every quarter.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

(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

Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) meets every quarter.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers 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

Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) meets every quarter.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities
☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement
☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets
☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Developing a business strategy which considers 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

Board Sustainability Committee (BSC) meets every quarter.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

15

(4.5.3) Please explain

The remuneration framework consists of a fixed and a variable component. From FY2025, the Company has further strengthened this commitment by linking 15% of the annual bonus of the Group's EDs and key management personnel to the achievement of ESG targets. This underscores the Board's position that sustainable business practices and responsible stewardship are integral to long term value creation. The key ESG targets which were incorporated in the performance review for FY2025 include Climate Change (including No Deforestation), Responsible Sourcing and Supply, Health and Safety, Business, Ethics and Compliance and others. These ESG targets form part of a larger set of ESG topics that have been identified as being material to the Group. The performance of each key management personnel was appraised with reference to the key targets, along with external factors such as changing business environment and industry trends, to determine the executives' remuneration package.

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

15

(4.5.3) Please explain

The remuneration framework consists of a fixed and a variable component. From FY2025, the Company has further strengthened this commitment by linking 15% of the annual bonus of the Group's EDs and key management personnel to the achievement of ESG targets. This underscores the Board's position that sustainable business practices and responsible stewardship are integral to long term value creation. The key ESG targets which were incorporated in the performance review for FY2025 include Climate Change (including No Deforestation), Responsible Sourcing and Supply, Health and Safety, Business, Ethics and Compliance and others. These ESG targets form part of a larger set of ESG topics that have been identified as being material to the Group. The performance of each key management personnel was appraised with reference to the key targets, along with external factors such as changing business environment and industry trends, to determine the executives' remuneration package.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Our current near-term focus is on our climate and forest targets.
[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

☑ Bonus – set figure

☑ Salary increase

☑ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Achievement of climate transition plan

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(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 remuneration framework consists of a fixed and a variable component. From FY2025, the Company has further strengthened this commitment by linking 15% of the annual bonus of the Group's EDs and key management personnel to the achievement of ESG targets. This underscores the Board's position that sustainable business practices and responsible stewardship are integral to long term value creation. The key ESG targets which were incorporated in the performance review for FY2025 include Climate Change (including No Deforestation), Responsible Sourcing and Supply, Health and Safety, Business, Ethics and Compliance and others. These ESG targets form part of a larger set of ESG topics that have been identified as being material to the Group. The performance of each key management personnel was appraised with reference to the key targets, along with external factors such as changing business environment and industry trends, to determine the executives' remuneration package.

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

The performance indicator is in line with our near-term science-based targets, which form part of our climate transition plan.

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

☑ Bonus – set figure
☑ Salary increase
☑ 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

(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

Our Board of Directors, CEO, and CSO oversees sustainability matters including conservation and forests-related issues. Performance against targets and market reputation are evaluated every year and the results will be related to the performance review and remuneration for the year. Forest-related targets include: - No deforestation (i.e. No development on High Carbon Stock (HCS) forests or High Conservation Value (HCV) areas; No burning in the preparation of new planting, re-planting, or any other development) - No new development on peatland regardless of depth and maintain best management practices for existing plantations on peat - Safeguard biodiversity in Wilmar's operational areas, plus progress on conservation programmes in Wilmar's land area set aside for conservation - Restore, rehabilitate and maintain 1,000 ha of riparian zones by 2050

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

Ensuring no deforestation in our supply chain will contribute significantly to our target to reduce our FLAG Scope 3 emissions and thus this is in line with our near-term science-based FLAG target, which forms part of our climate transition plan.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Procurement manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus – set figure

☑ Promotion

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ The incentives are not linked to an incentive plan, or equivalent (e.g. discretionary bonus in the reporting year)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

As part of implementation of Wilmar's NDPE policy, our procurement teams are expected to actively verify and filter out companies involved with deforestation (environmental criteria) from their sourcing volumes. If a company has been flagged out due to deforestation risks but is still included in our supply chain, the procurement teams will be negatively impacted during their annual review of performance.

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

The performance indicator is in line with our near-term science-base target (Scope 3), which forms part of our climate transition plan.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Process operation manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus – set figure

☑ Promotion

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction in total energy consumption

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ The incentives are not linked to an incentive plan, or equivalent (e.g. discretionary bonus in the reporting year)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

For palm oil mills that are equipped with methane capture and utilization plants, the efficiency of operating the plants to a targeted level is incorporated into the evaluation for appraisals of managers and engineers. This will thus impact the bonuses and pay increments of the related personnel with better performances leading *to bigger monetary rewards. Ensuring an efficient methane capture system allows us to realize actual savings in emissions by reducing the amount of methane being released to the atmosphere from the palm oil mill effluent treatment system, putting us on track to meet our emission reduction targets. Also, with the captured methane used to generate supplementary electricity for mills & housing uses, this reduces our reliance on diesel fuel which would have otherwise been used as the fuel source.*

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

The performance indicator is in line with our near-term science-based target, which forms part of our climate transition plan.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Water

(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

Over 500 manufacturing plants and an extensive distribution network in over 50 countries with activities in oil palm cultivation, oilseed crushing, edible oils refining, sugar milling and refining, manufacturing of consumer products, specialty fats, oleochemicals, biodiesel, fertilisers, flour and rice milling.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas

☑ 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

(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 another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :ISO 14001

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Pol_001_EN_Env Policy rev3 051124.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

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

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

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

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

- All Wilmar operations worldwide, including those of our subsidiaries, any refinery, mill or plantation that we own, manage, or invest in, regardless of stake. - All third-party suppliers (at group-level).

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

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

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems

☑ Commitment to engage in integrated, multi-stakeholder landscape (including river basin) initiatives to promote shared sustainability goals

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :Commitment to progressively reduce GHG emissions on existing operations

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to no development on peat regardless of depth

☑ Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat

☑ Commitment to no land clearance by burning or clearcutting

☑ Commitment to the use of the High Conservation Value (HCV) approach

☑ Commitment to facilitate the inclusion of smallholders into the value chain

☑ Commitment to conduct or support restoration and/or compensation to remedy for past deforestation or conversion

☑ Commitment to no deforestation, to no planting on peatlands, and to no exploitation (NDPE) by target date

☑ Commitment to no-deforestation by target date

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment

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

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

☑ Commitment to secure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous people and local communities

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of grievance/whistleblower mechanism to monitor non-compliance with the environmental policy and raise/address/escalate any other greenwashing concerns

(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 another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :High Conservation Value (HCV), High Carbon Stock (HCS), Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

ndpe-policy-2026.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

☑ Fire Free Alliance (FFA)

☑ International Sustainability & Carbon Certification (ISCC)

☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Soy (RTRS)
☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
☑ RSPO Jurisdictional Approach to Certification
☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
☑ Other, please specify :**Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA)**

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

FFA - Wilmar was one of the founding members of FFA which focused on fire prevention through community engagement. Since joining FFA, we have completed a fire risk map for our concessions, expanded our fire monitoring to areas outside of our boundary up to 5km, and socialised the Fire-Free Community programme to 145 villages across Sumatra and Kalimantan in Indonesia. ISCC - We are one of the ISCC Association Members and take part in the shaping of the strategic direction and further development of the ISCC certification system. To contribute to a sustainable bio-based and circular economy, we promote ISCC certification system on a global scale. Link: https://www.iscc-system.org/governance/iscc-association/membership-list/ NYDF & RTRS - We have endorsed the NYDF since 2014 and actively look to promote global action in forest protection and restoration. We are also a member of RTRS promoting the responsible sourcing of soy. RSPO - We have been a RSPO member since 2004 and is actively involved in a wide range of RSPO taskforces and working groups. Across the 29 requirements encompassing various thematic areas, Wilmar is actively contributing to the implementation of RSPO's Shared Responsibility requirements. Wilmar has also been involved in various RSPO working groups that strive to improve standards and practices and develop solutions to complex issues through a multi-stakeholder and participatory process. We have representations within the RSPO, which include the Board of Governors, the Smallholder Support Fund Panel, the Steering Committee for the Sabah Jurisdictional Approach for Sustainable Palm Oil Production, the Fresh Fruit Bunch (FFB) Legality & Traceability Taskforce, the Shared Responsibility Working Group, the Biodiversity, and High Conservation Values (BHCV) Working Group, the Compensation Task Force (CTF) as well as the Human Rights Working Group, which includes the related Taskforce on Labour and the Taskforce on Decent Living Wage. SBTi - Wilmar has signed up to the SBTi in end 2022 with the aim of cementing our emission reduction targets while demonstrating progress that reflects the significance of our commitments. TCFD - Wilmar supports the TCFD recommendations that provide a standardised framework to increase transparency on climate-related risks and opportunities within financial markets. TFA - Wilmar signed up as a partner to the TFA in 2015 and our Chief Sustainability Officer, Jeremy Goon, is a member of the TFA Steering Committee together with the Heads of Sustainability of various consumer business companies, as well as government officials from forest countries. Wilmar is also an active participant in TFA working groups, such as the Finance working group, to catalyse financial sector involvement in deforestation-free commodity supply chains.
[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

Yes

☑ 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

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :SBTi

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

20250327181244170427177 2_en.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ No, neither my organization or the intermediary organization we engage through is registered

(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

Wilmar actively participates in public policy discussions that may affect our business. We evaluate legislation and government policies carefully and advocate for change where appropriate, in line with applicable laws and regulations, as well as Wilmar's own corporate policies and procedures. We engage a consultant under a contractual arrangement to represent our views on EU sustainability policies. Through this engagement, we provided input to the European Commission on its proposed regulation on deforestation-free products and the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive. While expressing broad support for these proposals, Wilmar offered practical insights on commodity flows, highlighted potential risks and recommended solutions. We also contributed feedback, both directly and through

relevant industry associations such as Fediol, on the biofuels aspects of the European Commission's Fit for 55 package, which aims to reduce EU GHG emissions by at least 55.0% by 2030 compared to 1990 levels.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:
☑ Independent consultant

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

KDC Conseil/Europtimum

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

Wilmar takes our role as a responsible corporate citizen seriously and actively participates in public policy discussions that may affect our business. We evaluate legislation and government policies carefully and advocate for change where appropriate, in line with applicable laws and regulations, as well as Wilmar's own corporate policies and procedures. No monetary value was offered to any government officials as part of our advocacy work. All industry associations with which we collaborate maintain similarly strict codes of conduct, as well as ethical and anti-trust policies.

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

43700

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

Since 2024, we have engaged KDC Conseil through Europtimum to represent our views on EU sustainability policies. Through this engagement, we provided input to the European Commission on its proposed regulation on deforestation-free products and the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive. While expressing broad support for these proposals, Wilmar offered practical insights on commodity flows, highlighted potential risks and recommended solutions. We also contributed feedback, both directly and through relevant industry associations such as Fediol, on the biofuels aspects of the European Commission's Fit for 55 package, which aims to reduce EU GHG emissions by at least 55.0% by 2030 compared to 1990 levels. In addition, Wilmar participates in recognised sustainabilityrelated trade associations, multi-stakeholder initiatives and tax-exempt groups, reaffirming our commitment to responsible and transparent corporate engagement.

(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

(4.12.1.2) Is your publication in line with a standard or framework?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.12.1.3) Standard or framework the publication is in line with

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ IFRS

☑ TCFD
☑ TNFD

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

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

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Commodity volumes
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Water-related targets
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Water pollution indicators
☑ Greenhouse gas emissions figures
☑ Content of environmental policies
☑ Other, please specify **:Waste and Sustainable Packaging figures**
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Forest-related targets
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Climate-related targets

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

Wilmar Sustainability Report 2025 Page 13, 52: NDPE Policy, Environmental Policies Page 19-21: Governance Page 30-31: Nature-related Dependencies and Impacts Page 31: Nature-related Risks and Opportunities Page 40-44: Climate-related Risks and Opportunities Page 27-31, 39, 51-53, 191: Strategy/Our approach Page 16: Stakeholder/Value Chain Management Summary of Progress, Page 1-5: Climate, Water, ForestTargets Base Data Table, Page1-8: Commodity volumes, Water, waste, GHG figures

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

Wilmar SR 2025.pdf

(4.12.1.9) Comment

Wilmar SR 2025: http://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/sr-2025.pdf?sfvrsn=c81863fc_13 Wilmar Summary of Progress: http://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/sop-2025.pdf?sfvrsn=cf28b7e4_8 Wilmar Base Data Table: http://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/bdt-2025.pdf?sfvrsn=c7abeea3_7
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Not defined

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Not defined

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ 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:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Not an immediate strategic priority
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) 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
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Using 2022 as baseline year for Wilmar, we assumed a linear reduction based on Wilmar's SBTi near-term and long term emission reduction goals to extrapolate the emissions profile growth rate and glidepath. Although we did not conduct a detailed physical risk assessment for all sites, our sample 25 sites were used as a proxy *for the wider business noting those sites were selected based on material impact on group's revenue from as wide a coverage of countries/regions as possible (to factor in potential growth areas as well).*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our key considerations for selecting the scenario guideline were based on 6 main factors - linkage to financial impacts, geographic coverage including individual key operating countries, in line with national commitments of key countries, accounts for both transition and physical risk projections, industry-agnostic and good quality & data availability. In order to align with the climate scenarios referred to in SBTi which support the progress towards a 1.5 degree Celsius pathway, the best and worst case scenarios from the selected scenario framework were selected to allow for a more distinct representation of the potential impacts so that the full range of possible outcomes can be captured. Although NGFS projections can be used for physical scenarios as well, given we are operating within the agricultural sector, it was decided to utilise IPCC projections to obtain a broader range of physical risk impacts due to IPCC's higher temperate projections.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Forests scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available forests scenario, please specify :TNFD LEAP approach through ENCORE rating system

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2040

☑ Other, please specify :more than 10 years

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

As the qualitative analysis is mainly based on the information and feedback the company has been exposed to thus far, the outcome is still generic and not subjective with no quantitative calculation included.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We recognise the need to broaden the scope of our conservation efforts beyond HCV and HCS conservation, management and monitoring, demonstrating our continued commitment to environmental stewardship. Taking guidance from the TNFD's LEAP assessment, we have identified and conducted an assessment on our key assets to determine the material nature-related drivers, impacts and dependencies that may impact the business. Following the TNFD recommendations, we then identified Wilmar's material DIROs and assessed their potential impacts on nature and our business. Aligned with our climate scenario analysis approach, potential impacts have been assessed and classified into short- (one to two years), medium- (two to 10 years) and long-term (more than 10 years) horizons. The materiality of nature dependencies and their impact was assessed using a heatmap based on ENCORE's rating system.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Using 2022 as baseline year for Wilmar, we assumed a linear reduction based on Wilmar's SBTi near-term and long term emission reduction goals to extrapolate the emissions profile growth rate and glidepath. Although we did not conduct a detailed physical risk assessment for all sites, our sample 25 sites were used as a proxy for the wider business noting those sites were selected based on material impact on group's revenue from as wide a coverage of countries/regions as possible (to factor in potential growth areas as well).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our key considerations for selecting the scenario guideline were based on 6 main factors - linkage to financial impacts, geographic coverage including individual key operating countries, in line with national commitments of key countries, accounts for both transition and physical risk projections, industry-agnostic and good quality & data availability. In order to align with the climate scenarios referred to in SBTi which support the progress towards a 1.5 degree Celsius pathway, the best and worst case scenarios from the selected scenario framework were selected to allow for a more distinct representation of the potential impacts so that the full range of possible outcomes can be captured. Although NGFS projections can be used for physical scenarios as well, given we are operating within the agricultural sector, it was decided to utilise IPCC projections to obtain a broader range of physical risk impacts due to IPCC's higher temperate projections.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :NGFS Net Zero 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

To estimate the reduction in cost of debt, we used an average increase for cost of debt due to high temperatures and extra heavy rain as a proxy. We also assumed that there is no reduction in the cost of debt in a current policies scenario, whereas there will be a reduction of our proxy in a Net Zero scenario. Our inflation rates were assumed for localised contexts based on average of proxy figures while our sample 25 sites were used as a proxy for the wider business noting those sites were selected based on material impact on group's revenue from as wide a coverage of countries/regions as possible (to factor in potential growth areas as well).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our key considerations for selecting the scenario guideline were based on 6 main factors - linkage to financial impacts, geographic coverage including individual key operating countries, in line with national commitments of key countries, accounts for both transition and physical risk projections, industry-agnostic and good quality & data availability. NGFS was selected as we believe it has comprehensively met all of our key considerations. In order to align with the climate scenarios referred to in SBTi which support the progress towards a 1.5 degree Celsius pathway, the best and worst case scenarios from the selected scenario framework were selected to allow for a more distinct representation of the potential impacts so that the full range of possible outcomes can be captured.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :NGFS Current Policies

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply
☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 3.0ºC - 3.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

To estimate the reduction in cost of debt, we used an average increase for cost of debt due to high temperatures and extra heavy rain as a proxy. We also assumed that there is no reduction in the cost of debt in a current policies scenario, whereas there will be a reduction of our proxy in a Net Zero scenario. Our inflation rates were assumed for localised contexts based on average of proxy figures while our sample 25 sites were used as a proxy for the wider business noting those sites were selected based on material impact on group's revenue from as wide a coverage of countries/regions as possible (to factor in potential growth areas as well).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our key considerations for selecting the scenario guideline were based on 6 main factors - linkage to financial impacts, geographic coverage including individual key operating countries, in line with national commitments of key countries, accounts for both transition and physical risk projections, industry-agnostic and good quality & data availability. NGFS was selected as we believe it has comprehensively met all of our key considerations. In order to align with the climate scenarios referred to in SBTi which support the progress towards a 1.5 degree Celsius pathway, the best and worst case scenarios from the selected scenario framework were selected to allow for a more distinct representation of the potential impacts so that the full range of possible outcomes can be captured.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Capacity building

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

The qualitative and quantitative outcomes of the exercise have been summarized in our Sustainability Report 2025 on page 40-44 & 192 (link: https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/sr-2025.pdf).

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Business division

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

The qualitative and quantitative outcomes of the exercise have been summarized in our Sustainability Report 2025 on page 40-44 & 192 (link: https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/sr-2025.pdf).
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ No, but we are developing a climate transition plan within the next two years

(5.2.20) Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Currently determining the individual country-level climate roadmaps to align across all levels of management

(5.2.21) Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

As part of our commitment to meet our SBTi targets, we are currently developing individual country-level roadmaps to be aligned across all levels of management and is still in progress.
[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, strategy only

(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

(5.3.3) Primary reason why environmental risks and/or opportunities have not affected your strategy and/or financial planning across all business areas

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(5.3.4) Explain why environmental risks and/or opportunities have not affected your strategy and/or financial planning across all business areas

NA
[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

☑ Transition risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

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

With the identified potential risk of changing customer behaviour resulting in loss of existing and potential sales, we have continually engaged with our value chain partners to implement our sustainability commitments and expand the range of sustainable products for customers. On the flip side, we also see the potential for the climate opportunity of opening doors to new markets and expanded market share by developing new and innovative products that meet our customer's requirements in product specifications as well as sustainability criteria. We continue to invest in R&D and collaborate widely to push for these new opportunities.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Physical risks

☑ Transition risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

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

Through the identified risks and opportunities from the scenario analysis, it further reinforces the approach that we have taken thus far and refocus our effort on our supplier engagements to move the industry in this journey. Our forest-related commitments have been integrated into our long-term business plan in 2013, through the NDPE Policy, which covers our global operations worldwide, subsidiaries, joint ventures and 3rd-party suppliers. For NDPE Policy to be effective, engagement with 3rd-party suppliers and smallholders is key. We implemented the Supplier Reporting Tool (SRT) and Supplier Group Compliance Programme (SGCP) to assess our suppliers' level of compliance with our NDPE Policy. We assess all mills in our supply chain annually. The SRT is used to screen socio-environmental risks, which include HCV, HCS and peat protection, grievance mechanisms, environmental impact management, FPIC, legal and customary land rights and traceability. Suppliers also receive a report with an individualised action plan. This ensures greater consistency in providing recommendations and secures clarity on the required follow-up procedures. This allows for improved sustainability performance and risk management of our direct third-party suppliers.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Physical risks

☑ Transition risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

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

With the identified potential risk of changing customer behaviour resulting in loss of existing and potential sales, we have continually engaged with our value chain partners to implement our sustainability commitments and expand the range of sustainable products for customers. On the flip side, we also see the potential for the climate opportunity of opening doors to new markets and expanded market share by developing new and innovative products that meet our customer's requirements in product specifications as well as sustainability criteria. We continue to invest in R&D and collaborate widely to push for these new opportunities. To mitigate potential impact from climate physical risks, we have also invested in developing resilient crop types for palm and sugar to ensure our future crop cycles are sustainable and can withstand the growing impact from climate hazards.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Physical risks

☑ Transition risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

The identified risks and opportunities that could impact our operations affirms the need for us to move towards a low-carbon, deforestation-free and water-efficient production and forms the basis for us to commit to our SBTi targets. It drives the development of our climate transition plan which would affect our operations in terms of production processes, procurement strategy and low-carbon opportunities to tap on.

[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization’s climate transition
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Internal assessment of activities based on sales derived from low-carbon products or services including renewable electricity and renewable energy certificates as well as biofuels based on national biofuel mandates

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue/Turnover

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

7

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

9

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2035 (%)

12

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

The alignment assessment is based on our low-carbon portfolio which includes sales of renewable electricity and renewable energy certificates, and biofuels and relevant feedstocks sales based on national biofuel mandates and renewable energy certification standards like International Sustainability and Carbon Certification or Italian National Sustainability Certification Scheme for Biofuels and Bioliquids.
[Add row]

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

Carbon

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

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

(5.10.2) Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.10.3) Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality

Our current focus is on emissions reduction and no-deforestation commitment as well as to scale this across our supply chain in order to address environmental impacts in a material way. We will continue to assess if/when an internal price would be beneficial and will develop the approach accordingly then.

Water

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:

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

(5.10.2) Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.10.3) Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality

Our current focus is on water efficiency projects for our operations and we will continue to assess if/when an internal price would be beneficial and will develop the approach accordingly then.

Other

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change

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

[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

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Refer to pg 12-14 of our Palm NDPE Implementation Annual Report 2025 for the details on how we classify our suppliers into low- or high-priority suppliers based on their dependencies and/or impacts on environment and social issues. The percentage of Tier 1 suppliers assessed reported is limited to palm suppliers only.

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

10

Forests

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

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Refer to pg 12-14 of our Palm NDPE Implementation Annual Report 2025 for the details on how we classify our suppliers into low- or high-priority suppliers based on their dependencies and/or impacts on environment and social issues. The percentage of Tier 1 suppliers assessed reported is limited to palm suppliers only.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

10

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape/marine ecosystem condition

☑ Impact on water availability

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Similar approach with our own operations has been adopted for water stress risk assessment of suppliers (Tier 1 palm oil and sugar mills) in which the World Resources Institute's Aqueduct tool was utilised to determine if a site is located in a high or extremely high water stress area (i.e. potential high dependency/impact on water sources).

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

24
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Leverage over suppliers

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Regulatory compliance

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

To focus on the material suppliers to engage to improve our Scope 3 emissions in the near-term.

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

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

☑ Product safety and compliance

☑ Supplier performance improvement

☑ Suppliers' exposure or vulnerability to physical risks

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our NDPE Policy applies to all third-party suppliers at the group level, with no exceptions. In an industry first, we have also made the complete list of supplying mills available on our Sustainability Dashboard since 2015. To date, we have completed formal engagements with 100% our group-level palm oil suppliers. We assess our *suppliers' progress and implementation of the NDPE Policy through our SRT. Hosted on the Diginex system, the SRT is an online self-reporting tool which is implemented annually to assess 100% of Wilmar's direct supplying mills, including our own mills and their associated estates. Results from the SRT are then used to identify potential environmental and social risks in our supply chain which form a key part of our Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) approach. SRT covers the following core NDPE elements: • Access to grievance mechanisms • Women's rights • Child protection • Environmental and biodiversity impact management including HCV, HCS, fire and peat management and no burning • Labour rights and standards including but not limited to forced labour and human trafficking, freedom of association and collective bargaining, non-discrimination, equal opportunities and fair living wages • Recruitment fees • Legality • Legal and customary (or traditional) land rights • Commitment to protect and respect Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) • Occupational health and safety • Traceability*

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ No, we do not prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.3) Primary reason for no supplier prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ We engage with all suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Although we conduct a risk-based assessment for all of our direct suppliers and establish a mill risk prioritization, all suppliers would still be engaged under the NDPE Sugar programme via different approaches varying between clarification requests, webinars, workshops or in certain cases an on-site assessment. We also provide tailored action plans and offer support in capacity-building to help suppliers improve their sustainability practices.
[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:

☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Refer NDPE policy https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/policies/wilmar-ndpe-policy---2019.pdf?sfvrsn=7870af13_2

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Refer NDPE policy https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/policies/wilmar-ndpe-policy---2019.pdf?sfvrsn=7870af13_2

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:

☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Refer NDPE policy (https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/policies/wilmar-ndpe-policy---2019.pdf?sfvrsn=7870af13_2) and NDPE Sugar policy (https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/policies/ndpe-sugar-policy.pdf?sfvrsn=9367bb03_7)
[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.

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
☑ Second-party verification
☑ Supplier self-assessment
☑ Geospatial monitoring tool
☑ Supplier scorecard or rating
☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Suspend 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

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

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

☑ Re-integrating suppliers back into upstream value chain based on the successful and verifiable completion of activities

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Our suppliers' compliance are assessed using our Supplier Reporting Tool (SRT), and our Supplier Group Compliance Programme (SGCP). We also have a comprehensive Grievance Mechanism for all stakeholders to report any suspected non-compliances. Please refer to our website for more information on our

compliance tools. SRT & SGCP: https://www.wilmar-international.com/sustainability/supply-chain-transformation Grievance Procedure: https://www.wilmar-international.com/sustainability/grievance-procedure Supplier guideline: https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/policies/supplier-guidelines-2026.pdf This requirement applies to our oil palm supply chain and is implemented through Wilmar's No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation (NDPE) Policy.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

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

Information collection
☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers
☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

As the scope of NDPE policy covers third-party suppliers, Wilmar's engagement approach is to apply across all of our suppliers at initial assessment but adopt a risk-based approach to deeper engagements focusing on areas with commercial importance, as well as areas with higher risks in terms of environmental and social impact. For palm and sugar suppliers, we assess them annually through the Supplier Reporting Tool (SRT) to screen for environmental and social risks, including climate-related indicators such as environmental impact management (i.e. HCV, HCS, fire and peat management, no burning) and GHG emissions data. The GHG data collection allows us to identify the varying stages of implementation for suppliers so that we can tailor our support to their specific need. Through the SRT, we can better understand suppliers' decarbonisation approach or potential levers, and provide tools and practical guidance to support their low-carbon transition where relevant. This supports the wider shift towards lower-carbon supply chains and moves the industry along the path.

(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

Capacity building

☑ Develop or distribute resources on how to map upstream value chain

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

☑ Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones

Financial incentives

☑ Provide financial incentives for certified products

Information collection

☑ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Wilmar uses the Supplier Reporting Tool (SRT) to assess our suppliers' progress and implementation of our NDPE Policy. The SRT is an annual, online self-reporting tool used to assess 100% of Wilmar's direct supplying mills, including our own mills and their associated estates. The data collected through the SRT enables us to identify potential environmental and social risks, including potential negative impacts across the supply chain and any associated country-specific risks. Outcomes from the SRT form the foundation of our Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) process. The SRT covers the following core NDPE elements: • Access to grievance mechanisms • Women's rights • Child protection • Environmental and biodiversity impact management, including HCV, High Carbon Stock (HCS), fire and peat management and no-burning • Labour rights and standards, including but not limited to forced labour and human trafficking, freedom of association and collective bargaining, non-discrimination, equal opportunities and fair living wages • Recruitment fees • Legality • Legal and customary (or traditional) land rights • Commitment to protecting and respecting Human Rights Defenders • Occupational health and safety • Traceability • Sourcing practices To identify potential risks and negative impacts, our risk assessments are informed by SRT responses, mill certification status, NDPE commitments, TtP, SGCP data, grievance records and GFW commodity risk geospatial analysis. Mills identified as high priority mills undergo site assessments and/or direct engagement as part of our NDPE Policy implementation programme. Upon completion of each site assessment, suppliers are expected to review the findings and provide clarifications prior to acknowledging the proposed improvement plans, with their progress monitored annually through SRT. Issues that cannot be resolved satisfactorily are escalated to Wilmar's Grievance team for further action.

(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 :Wilmar's NDPE Policy

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Our sugar suppliers' water stress assessment indicates that approximately 24.1% of our supply base operates in water-stressed areas. In response, we actively communicate water conservation best practices to suppliers in these regions, supporting their efforts to manage water use responsibly and in line with our broader environmental commitments. On top of that, our sugar operations in India (Shree Renuka Sugars Limited) have been providing ongoing farmer trainings that cover the latest technologies, agronomic practices, safety, health and yield improvement. In Savasuddi village (Raibag unit), farmers were trained in water management, micro-irrigation, mulching, and accessing government schemes in collaboration with the Agricultural Department of Karnataka to optimise water use during the peak summer season.

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

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Palm oil

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building
☑ Organize capacity building events
☑ Develop or distribute upstream value chain mapping tool
☑ Support smallholders to adhere to standards in upstream value chain
☑ Support smallholders to adhere to regenerative agriculture principles
☑ Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity
☑ Provide training, support and best practices on sustainable agriculture practices and nutrient management
☑ Prioritize support for smallholders in regions at high-risk of deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Collaborate with smallholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
☑ Encourage smallholders to take part in landscape or jurisdictional initiatives

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

5675

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Scheme Smallholders - Ghana: BOPP launched the Adum Smallholder Oil Palm Project(ASHOPP). The project covered 633 ha and supported 343 smallholders in the Adum area. Indonesia: As of 2025, we supported 34,947 ha of planted area under government-originated plasma schemes. Independent Smallholders - Ghana: As of December 2025, a total of 610 ha have been planted to date, of which 143 ha were planted during 2025. The initiative has supported 153 farmers. Malaysia: As

of 2025, 57 smallholders had participated in our programmes that focus on capacity-building and improving access to fertilisers to help farmers increase yields. Indonesia: To maximise impact and avoid duplication, we collaborate with NGOs and industry partners on supplier engagement initiatives. In 2025, 4,666 smallholders participated in these programmes. To improve supply chain traceability, we developed a tracking tool that enables mills and co-operatives to monitor whether their FFB supply remains deforestation-free. This tool has been instrumental in helping 4,156 smallholders attain ISPO certification.
[Add row]

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing
☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:
☑ None

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

Share the progress of sustainability with our investors and shareholders to improve transparency.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Continued investments from relevant stakeholders.

Forests

(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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Share the progress of sustainability effort and encouraging engagement with customers

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Collaborative projects are being undertaken and under consideration for implementation
[Add row]

C6. Environmental performance - Consolidation approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

This approach means that a company has the authority to directly reduce and influence emissions from its operations and thus is more linked to a company's true carbon footprint as well as efforts in climate action. It also helps that this is consistent with the current accounting and reporting practices of many peer companies in the industry that report on emissions from facilities so that any sharing or collaboration with industry peers can be done on the same basis.

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

This approach means that a company has the authority to directly influence decisions from its operations to reduce negative impact on nature so this is more linked to a company's true efforts in forests/nature action. It also helps that this is consistent with the current accounting and reporting practices of many peer companies in the industry that report on nature so that any sharing or collaboration with industry peers can be done on the same basis.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

This approach means that a company has the authority to directly influence decisions from its operations for water management so this is more linked to a company's true water footprint as well as efforts in water action. It also helps that this is consistent with the current accounting and reporting practices of many peer companies in the industry that report on water use from facilities so that any sharing or collaboration with industry peers can be done on the same basis.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

This approach means that a company has the authority to directly influence decisions from its operations for plastics use so this is more linked to a company's true plastics footprint as well as efforts in plastics management. It also helps that this is consistent with the current accounting and reporting practices of many peer companies in the industry that report on plastics use from facilities so that any sharing or collaboration with industry peers can be done on the same basis.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

This approach means that a company has the authority to directly influence decisions from its operations to reduce negative impact on biodiversity so this is more linked to a company's true efforts in biodiversity action. It also helps that this is consistent with the current accounting and reporting practices of many peer companies in the industry that report on biodiversity so that any sharing or collaboration with industry peers can be done on the same basis.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Land Sector and Removals Standard and Guidance

☑ 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories

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

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

☑ Other, please specify :RSPO PalmGHG Calculator and BioGrace

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*We report both location-based and market-based Scope 2 emissions.*

[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 excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Emissions from non-manufacturing sites such as fuel consumption of vehicles owned and operated by regional headquarters, standalone offices and research & development (R&D) facilities as well as electricity consumption by the same facilities.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

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

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

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

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

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

0.8

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

The emissions from these sources are excluded as they are insignificant (0.8%) in comparison to the total emissions from the production/manufacturing components within our operations (i.e. plantations, mills and factories). The emissions which do not significantly impact the overall emissions are considered not relevant.

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

The percentage of excluded emissions was estimated based on the emissions from these sources in our China operations which constitutes more than 50% of our total factory emissions so it is a good representation of our overall group's percentage for these sources (estimated to be around 0.8%).
[Add row]

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9000000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are calculated using an operational control approach in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. Emissions covered include stationary combustion, mobile combustion, fugitive emissions (e.g. palm oil mill effluent emissions), fertilizer-related N_2O emissions, peat emissions, and land use change emissions from operations under Wilmar's operational control. Activity data is collected monthly through Enablon and other operational reporting systems. Greenhouse gas emissions are calculated by multiplying activity data by relevant emission factors sourced from recognized standards including IPCC, NGERS and RSPO PalmGHG methodologies. Emissions are reported in tonnes of CO_2 equivalent (tCO_2e) using IPCC AR6 Global Warming Potentials.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3800000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The location-based Scope 2 emisison was calculated based on amount of energy purchased and local average emission factor by country or region.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3600000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For the countries where we have access to contractual instruments such as green tariff, energy attribute certificate (EAC) and supplier-specific emission factors, we monitor and report the Scope 2 emission based on the amount of energy purchased and their specific GHG attributes. For rest of the countries, we assume their emissions are similar to that from location-based approach.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

143700000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on volumes of various commodities (including palm, soy, sugar, wheat, rice, etc), chemicals and packaging materials sourced in 2022.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1500000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on spend-based approach and the activity data from Wilmar's 2022 Annual Report.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2100000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The fuel- and energy-related emissions, other than those reported under Scope 1 and 2 were quantified based on fuels and energy purchased in 2022.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6400000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on volume of materials and products if the cost of transport was borne by us, and their distance between origin and destination in 2022. For those without such details, assumptions had been made with the guidance from consultant to close the gaps and to improve data quality in future.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

500000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission, other than reported under Scope 1 and 2 was quantified based on quantity sent to off-site treatment sites and method of treatment.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on spend-based approach and the activity data (including accommodations and flights) from Group Accounts.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on number of employees by country and external secondary data such as average distance travelled by country and mode of key transportation.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on spend-based approach and the activity data from Wilmar's 2022 Annual Report.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1900000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on volume of products if the cost of transport was borne by the customers, and their distance between origin and destination countries. For those without such details, assumptions had been made with the guidance from consultant to close the gaps and to improve data quality in future.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3100000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on volume of sold products which could potentially be processed by third-party companies. For those products that have vast range of applications, they were excluded from the scope according to GHG Protocol.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

500000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on volume of sold products which could be directly used by end consumers only.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1800000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on volume of packaging materials and method of end-of-life treatment by country as well as food waste emissions from consumer food sold.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission from the downstream leased assets such as tankers and dry bulk vessels had been accounted for under our Scope 1 due to operational control criteria.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not operate any franchising business.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

500000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emission was quantified based on spend-based approach and the activity data from Wilmar's 2022 Annual Report.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

As an agribusiness company, more than 90% of the total Scope 3 emissions is expected to be from purchased goods. As we also take into account other 14 categories as listed under GHG Protocol in our mapping, we do not consider other source(s) of Scope 3 emissions relevant.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

As an agribusiness company, more than 90% of the total Scope 3 emissions is expected to be from purchased goods. As we also take into account other 14 categories as listed under GHG Protocol in our mapping, we do not consider other source(s) of Scope 3 emissions relevant.
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

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

9100000

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are calculated based on the GHG Protocol, the world's most widely used GHG accounting standards for companies and include the following gases: CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O. The GWP rates used are from the IPCC AR6. The operational control approach is used to consolidate GHG emissions. Non-manufacturing sites such as headquarters/stand-alone offices are excluded.
[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)

4500000

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

4500000

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions are calculated based on the GHG Protocol, the world's most widely used GHG accounting standards for companies and include the following gases: CO2, CH4 and N2O. The GWP rates used are from the IPCC AR6. The operational control approach is used to consolidate GHG emissions. Non-manufacturing sites such as headquarters/stand-alone offices are excluded.
[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)

154000000

(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

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future. The figure estimated for this year is based on the 7% increase of production volume from 2022.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

Based on the mapping of Scope 3 emissions for updated baseline year 2022, this category is expected to be negligible and thus immaterial to the Group's total Scope 3 emissions. As a result, this category is considered not relevant.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

Based on the mapping of Scope 3 emissions for updated baseline year 2022, this category is expected to be negligible and thus immaterial to the Group's total Scope 3 emissions. As a result, this category is considered not relevant.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

(7.8.6) Please explain

Based on the mapping of Scope 3 emissions for updated baseline year 2022, this category is expected to be negligible and thus immaterial to the Group's total Scope 3 emissions. As a result, this category is considered not relevant.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Emissions covered under scope 1 or 2

(7.8.6) Please explain

Any emissions from downstream leased assets that Wilmar owns have already been accounted for in our Scope 1 & 2 emissions

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

Wilmar does not own any franchise business.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.8.6) Please explain

We had completed the mapping and calculation of our Scope 3 emissions with a third-party consultant for the updated baseline year 2022 in the reporting year. This forms the basis of our Scope 3 calculation moving forward by aligning our understanding of the requirements for each category and developing the framework for data collection and calculation. With this, we expect to calculate and report Scope 3 emissions on a more frequent basis in the future.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

As an agricultural company, more than 90% of total Scope 3 emissions is expected to be from purchased goods. As we also take into account other 14 categories as listed under GHG Protocol in our mapping, we do not consider other source(s) of Scope 3 emissions relevant.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

As an agricultural company, more than 90% of total Scope 3 emissions is expected to be from purchased goods. As we also take into account other 14 categories as listed under GHG Protocol in our mapping, we do not consider other source(s) of Scope 3 emissions relevant.
[Fixed row]

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

[Fixed 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)

840000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

7

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Drops in the renewable fuel consumption by 2.9% compared to last year

Other emissions reduction activities

(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

Although Wilmar continued to implement emissions reduction initiatives including methane capture, energy efficiency and recovery of waste energy across its operations, these initiatives did not result in a significant reduction in emissions compared with the previous year.

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

Not applicable

Acquisitions

(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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

540000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2025, the overall volume of production increased by 4% as compared to previous year. This corresponded to a nearly 4% increase in emissions from FY2024

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not applicable
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.12) Does your organization have significant land sector activities in its operations or value chain?

	Agriculture, forestry or other land sector activities	Indicate if these activities are only related to forest lands and/or non-productive, non-forest lands
	Select from: ☑ Yes, in both our direct operations and our upstream/downstream value chain	*Select from:* ☑ No, these activities include those related to agricultural lands

[Fixed row]

(7.12.1) Which of the following land sector accounting subcategories are relevant to your organization in the reporting year?

Land use change emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

The CO2 emissions due to land use change were calculated using RSPO PalmGHG Calculator. The LUC were amortized out based on linear discounting method across 20-years planting cycle.

Land management net biogenic CO2 emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

The emissions arise from the management of cultivated peatlands within organization's managed oil palm plantations and were calculated using the RSPO PalmGHG Calculator.

Land management production emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Emissions primarily from managed agricultural soils including peat N2O and fertilizer application. These emissions are quantified using RSPO PalmGHG Calculator and IPCC emission factors

Biogenic product emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.2) Scope 2

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Emissions were associated with the combustion and processing of biomass-derived products and residues generated such as biomass and bagasse.

Land management CO2 removals

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

The organization has not calculated the overall land management CO2 removals during the reporting year but we are developing potential removal projects and calculate their impacts for future removal claims.

Land occupation

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

The organization has calculated and mapped out our total land occupation during the reporting year.

Land carbon leakage

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

The organization has not assessed potential land carbon leakage associated with land management activities during the reporting year.

Biogenic product CO2 emissions (as gross CO2 fluxes)

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Biogenic product CO_2 emissions have been reported under existing biogenic emissions separately per GHG Protocol guidance.

Reversals of land management CO2 removals

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

As no land management CO2 removals are currently accounted for, there were no reversal events to assess or report during the reporting year.
[Fixed row]

(7.12.3) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

CO2 emissions from land use management

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

CO2 emissions from peat oxidation have been accounted in our Scope 1 emissions and not excluded.

CO2 removals from land use management

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

With the requirements from GHG Protocol's Land Sector and Removal Standard and Guidance, we are developing potential removal projects and will calculate their impacts for future removal claims.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

With the requirements from GHG Protocol's Land Sector and Removal Standard and Guidance, we will align with the standard to account for sequestration during land use change in future.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

14000

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

The emissions due to combustion of bio-diesel at farm level were included and estimated based on GHG Protocol.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

10300000

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

The emissions due to combustion of biomass-derived fuels, biogas, bio-diesel and bio-ethanol were included and estimated based on GHG Protocol.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

The fuels used for shipping business were mineral-based.
[Fixed row]

(7.13) Does your organization choose to account for and report technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage, or have you done so in previous years?

	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage in the reporting year	Specify the reason for no technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geological storage in the reporting year	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage were accounted for and reported in previous years
	Select from: ☑ No, explanation provided	*Select from:* ☑ No relevant activities identified	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

Palm oil

(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)

6470000

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

The emissions are calculated using the GHG Protocol tools and include all activities ranging from plantations, mills, refineries to downstream processing operations within the reporting scope. However, due to the nature of downstream operations being able to process various feedstock ranging from palm oil to other oilseeds throughout the year, the split of emissions between palm and oilseeds & grains is less straight-forward and thus the current calculation is based on each commodity group taking a 50% split of the factories' emissions

Soy

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not intend to calculate this data within the next two years

(7.14.7) Explain why you do not calculate GHG emissions for this commodity

We do not operate soy plantations, nor is it produced in any of our plantation areas. We just trade and retail soy.

Sugar

(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)

1000000

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

The emissions are calculated using the GHG Protocol tools and include all activities ranging from plantations, mills & refineries within the reporting scope. Wherever the relevant emission factors are available for the region we operate in Australia, we have used those to calculate the emissions.
[Fixed row]

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 and/or Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

(7.15.1) Emissions breakdown by greenhouse gas type

Select from:

☑ Yes, Scope 1 emissions only
[Fixed row]

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and Scope 2 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 selected gas)

7710000

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

7710000

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

40000

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

1080000

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

1099

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

300000

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)
[Add row]

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

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

160000

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

70000

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

70000

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3590000

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

2980000

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

2950000

Ethiopia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1000

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

0

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

0

Fiji

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6000

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

11000

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

11000

Ghana

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31000

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

11000

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

11000

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

340000

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

12000

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

12000

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3300000

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

850000

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

850000

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

460000

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

220000

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

220000

Morocco

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3000

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

6000

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

6000

Mozambique

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

200

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

6

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

6

Myanmar

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3000

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

600

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

600

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4

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

33000

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

33000

New Caledonia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8

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

500

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

500

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

41000

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

6000

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

71

Nigeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

107000

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

0

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

0

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24000

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

40000

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

40000

Papua New Guinea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14000

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

4000

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

4000

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

924000

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

4000

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

4000

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38000

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

45000

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

45000

Sri Lanka

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2000

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

72000

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

72000

Tanzania (The United Republic of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22000

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

12000

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

12000

Ukraine

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3000

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

25000

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

25000

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4000

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

1000

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

1000

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35000

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

100000

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

100000

Zambia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7000

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

2000

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

2000

Zimbabwe

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

500

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

8000

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

8000
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Oil Palm Plantations*	*630000*
Row 2	*Palm Oil Mills*	*1100000*
Row 3	*Sugarcane Plantations*	*10600*
Row 4	*Sugar Mills*	*140000*
Row 5	*Factories (Food, Feed & Others)*	*6300000*
Row 6	*Shipping/aviation*	*920000*

[Add row]

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.18.1) Select the form(s) in which you are reporting your agricultural/forestry emissions.

Select from:
☑ Total emissions

(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.

Row 1

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:
☑ Agriculture/Forestry

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

640000

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

The Agriculture/Forestry emissions were derived from our oil palm and sugarcane plantations. The emissions due to stationary and mobile fuels, purchased energy, fertilizers and herbicides were calculated based on GHG Protocol, IPCC and BioGrace. The emissions derived from land use change and peat oxidation were estimated based on RSPO PalmGHG Calculator.

Row 2

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:
☑ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7500000

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

The Processing/Manufacturing emissions were derived from our mills, refineries and downstream processors. The emissions due to stationary and mobile fuels, purchased energy and chemicals were calculated based on GHG Protocol and IPCC.

Row 3

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:
☑ Distribution

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

920000

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

The emissions from combustion of fuel oils from our Shipping/aviation business were calculated based on ISO8217.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Oil Palm Plantations*	*6800*	*6800*
Row 2	*Palm Oil Mills*	*4800*	*4800*
Row 3	*Sugarcane Plantations*	*300*	*300*
Row 4	*Sugar Mills*	*33500*	*33500*
Row 5	*Factories (Food, Feed & Others)*	*4500000*	*4500000*
Row 6	*Shipping/aviation*	*0*	*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)

9080000

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

4360000

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

4360000

(7.22.4) Please explain

These emissions cover operations from our subsidiaries which are under our operational control.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14000

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

160000

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

160000

(7.22.4) Please explain

These emissions cover operations from our joint ventures which are under our operational control.
[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

Yihai Kerry Arawana Holdings Co., Ltd

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ ISIN code - equity

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify :Ticker symbol due to character limit

(7.23.1.5) ISIN code – equity

CNE1000048D3

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

Ticker symbol - 300999

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3600000

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

3000000

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

3000000

(7.23.1.15) Comment

The subsidiary is included as part of Wilmar's emission reporting boundary based on operational control.

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Shree Renuka Sugars Limited

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Sugar

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ ISIN code - equity

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify :Ticker symbol due to character limit

(7.23.1.5) ISIN code – equity

INE087H01022

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

Ticker symbol - RENUKA

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

340000

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

12000

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

12000

(7.23.1.15) Comment

The subsidiary is included as part of Wilmar's emission reporting boundary based on operational control.

Row 3

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Wilmar Cahaya Indonesia Tbk, PT

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Palm oil processing

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ ISIN code - equity
☑ Ticker symbol

(7.23.1.5) ISIN code – equity

ID1000135007

(7.23.1.7) Ticker symbol

CEKA

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1000

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

48000

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

48000

(7.23.1.15) Comment

The subsidiary is included as part of Wilmar's emission reporting boundary based on operational control.
[Add row]

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

There is a wide spectrum of products that are derived from palm oil (from basic cooking oil to specialized fats / oleochemical products) and sugar; and the effort to accurately track the individual product line would be a huge undertaking considering there are many upgrades/downgrade/mixing of several products at different points along the supply chain before the final product. Unless market regulations mandate the need for emissions allocation to individual product lines (e.g. biodiesel for Europe's biofuel market), it is cost ineffective to develop the capabilities to account for the emissions of every product.
[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

Given the diverse nature of our business segments and products that span the whole value chain for agricultural commodities, allocating emissions for all of our product lines to customers would not be an efficient approach for us so focus will be given to certain main product lines that require emissions data for market access or customer requirements.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

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

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

29203374

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

23809030

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

53012404.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

792254

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

5704672

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

36780

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

6496926.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

230674

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2205940

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

2436614.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

11923

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

11923.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

30238225

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

31719642

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

36780

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

61957867.00
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

10547999

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

10684094

(7.30.7.7) Comment

The sustainable biomass includes empty fruit bunches, shells, fibre, bagasse and bio-based fuels (blends like biodiesel or bioethanol) from the mills that are certified to RSPO, ISCC and Bonsucro. For bio-based fuels consumed, only the energy derived from the biofuel content of the blended fuel is included.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

18321331

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

18346895

(7.30.7.7) Comment

The other biomass includes wood/timber, empty fruit bunches, rice husks, shells, fibre, bagasse and bio-based fuels (blends like biodiesel or bioethanol) from the sites, except for the certified mills.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

334044.23

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

172385.6

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Biogas generated from anaerobic treatment of effluents, captured and consumed in the operations are included under this category

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

15338769

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

0

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

0

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

15338769

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Coal used includes lignite, sub-bituminous, anthracite and other bituminous coal

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

3931934

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

3931934

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Oils used include motor gasoline, diesel and heavy fuel oils

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4538327

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

0

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

0

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

4538327

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Gases used include natural gas, acetylene, Liquified Petroleum Gas (LPG)

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

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

All fuels consumed have been covered in the categories above.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

53012405

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

0

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

0

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

19877096

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

33135309

(7.30.7.7) Comment

The aggregation of the fuels consumed above is calculated for this row and aligns with the data in 7.30.1
[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)

2344724

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

1873882

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

1177490

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

753019

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)

9059359

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

8246105

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

6435314

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

6089061

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 a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Australia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

114186

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

252662

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

97486

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

2303030

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

2767364.00

China

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4528304

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

888331

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

2161038

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

11137660

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

18715333.00

Ethiopia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2174

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

145

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

0

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

0

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

2319.00

Fiji

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

27039

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

1083

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

0

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

23

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

28145.00

Ghana

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29797

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

2868

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

0

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

86775

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

119440.00

India

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12111

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

319060

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

0

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

2641258

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

2972429.00

Indonesia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1101094

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

275891

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

0

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

226874

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

1603859.00

Malaysia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

360839

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

42154

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

59357

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

164031

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

626381.00

Morocco

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3972

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

3972.00

Mozambique

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

49

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

49.00

Myanmar

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1264

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

64970

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

0

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

54777

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

121011.00

Netherlands

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16371

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

0

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

118733

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

0

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

135104.00

New Caledonia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

798

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

798.00

New Zealand

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

58638

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

178

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

0

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

57044

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

115860.00

Nigeria

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

5739

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

0

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

0

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

5739.00

Papua New Guinea

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6642

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

18053

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

0

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

0

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

24695.00

Philippines

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

23942

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

41

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

0

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

0

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

23983.00

Singapore

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9925

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

2434

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

0

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

0

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

12359.00

South Africa

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24279

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

0

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

0

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

43019

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

67298.00

Sri Lanka

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6956

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

134

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

0

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

28499

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

35589.00

Tanzania (The United Republic of)

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

22580

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

104

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

0

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

0

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

22684.00

Ukraine

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

43803

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

0

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

0

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

42480

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

86283.00

United States of America

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6222

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

6222.00

Viet Nam

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

86620

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

34

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

0

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

239195

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

325849.00

Zambia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4444

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

0

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

0

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

27958

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

32402.00

Zimbabwe

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4878

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

0

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

0

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

23407

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

28285.00
[Fixed row]

(7.30.15) Provide details on the electricity purchases that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Australia

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Direct line to an off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line PPA)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Other biomass

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

11408

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ LGC [Australia]

(7.30.15.14) Comment

The electricity was supplied from the adjacent sugar mill which has installed a co-generation plant using bagasse as the main fuel source.

Row 2

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ New Zealand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :Hydro, wind, geothermal, solar and biomass

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

13938

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ NZECS [New Zealand]

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

Select from:
☑ New Zealand

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

As the electricity was sourced directly from grid with EACs, the low-carbon technology type is a mix of various renewable sources including hydro, wind, solar and biofuels & waste

Row 3

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

98796

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GEC [China]

(7.30.15.14) Comment

The electricity was generated from the third-party solar panels installed on the rooftop of our plants and warehouses, as well as certain portions from GECs in the electricity supply

Row 4

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Nuclear

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

624112

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GEC [China]

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

Select from:
☑ China

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

The electricity was purchased from electricity supplier via GECs which include sources ranging from nuclear, wind, hydro, geothermal etc.
[Add row]

(7.30.17) Provide details of your organization's low-carbon heat, steam, and cooling purchases in the reporting year by country/area.

Row 1

(7.30.17.1) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

(7.30.17.2) Country/area of consumption of low-carbon heat, steam or cooling

Select from:

☑ Australia

(7.30.17.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Steam

(7.30.17.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Other biomass

(7.30.17.5) Low-carbon heat, steam, or cooling consumed (MWh)

97485.83

(7.30.17.6) Comment

The steam was supplied from the adjacent sugar mill which has installed a co-generation plant using bagasse as the main fuel source. Despite there was no tracking instrument for such steam purchase, the emission profile of steam supply has to declared and monitor every quater.

Row 2

(7.30.17.1) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

(7.30.17.2) Country/area of consumption of low-carbon heat, steam or cooling

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(7.30.17.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Steam

(7.30.17.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Other biomass

(7.30.17.5) Low-carbon heat, steam, or cooling consumed (MWh)

59357.22

(7.30.17.6) Comment

The figure is based on the bill generated by our steam supplier
[Add 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

0.000193167

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

13600000

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

70416000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

6

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

The percentage increase is attributed to higher emissions alongside higher revenue this year. The increase in emissions primarily driven by higher production output and reduced renewable energy consumption by 2.9%.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

0.62

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Energy consumption in MWh

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Production volume in MT

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0.5

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Energy intensity decreased by 0.5% compared with the previous reporting year which driven by ongoing operational efficiency improvements.
[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

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

☑ Methane (CH_4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(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

12/31/2022

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

8000000

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

3500000

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

0.000

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

11500000.000

(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

12/31/2032

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50.4

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

5704000.000

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

8500000

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

4500000

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

13000000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-25.88

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target boundary includes all Wilmar-owned and operated global operations covering plantations, mills, refineries, manufacturing and logistics facilities. It accounts for 100% of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions within the organizational boundary.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 50.4% by 2032 from a 2022 base year

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

Wilmar continues to advance its decarbonization strategy through renewable energy deployment including solar PV, PPAs and RECs, energy efficiency upgrades and fuel switching to natural gas, biomass and biogas. In 2025, the Group continues to implement emissions reduction initiatives and remains committed to achieving its 2032 emissions reduction target.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)
☑ Methane (CH_4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(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 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)
☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3, Category 10 – Processing of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

29700000

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

2100000

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

5100000

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3100000

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

40000000.000

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

40000000.000

(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)

72.1

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

80

(7.53.1.44) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

54.8

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

54.8

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2032

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

30

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

28000000.000

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

29700000

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2100000

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

5100000

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3100000

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

40000000.000

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

40000000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:
☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.00

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The 2025 reporting year emissions have not been calculated so the data is maintained from base year.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions, covering purchased goods and services, fuel- and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, and the processing of sold products, by 30% by 2032 from a 2022 baseline year.

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

Wilmar is working closely with suppliers to improve NDPE compliance, increase supply chain traceability and make logistics and energy use more efficient. While 2025 emissions data are under third-party assurance, progress already visible through stronger supplier engagement keeping the target on track. We are also advancing nature-based solutions to enhance carbon sequestration within our operations to mitigate FLAG emission and scaling primary data collection and support more targeted supplier engagement.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 3

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 3

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)
☑ Methane (CH_4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2022

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

1000000

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

73700000

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

73700000.000

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

74700000.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.35) 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)

72

(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)

72

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

72.2

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2032

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

36.4

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

47509200.000

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

600000

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

73700000

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

73700000.000

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

74300000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:
☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions only (e.g. FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

1.47

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target boundary include the land-related emissions associated with agricultural production and relevant upstream value-chain activities. The 2025 reporting year FLAG emissions have not been calculated so the data is maintained from base year.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 1 and 3 FLAG GHG emissions by 36.4% by 2032 from 2022 base year.

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

Wilmar is implementing nature-based solutions to strengthen carbon sequestration within its operations to drive down the FLAG-related emissions. The Group also progressed efforts to improve the collection of primary data across its supply chains, providing a stronger basis for more accurate Scope 3 emissions accounting which enabling us to design targeted action plans to lower greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from our supplier.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 4

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 4

(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

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2022

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

8000000

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

3500000

(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)

11500000.000

(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

12/31/2050

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

90

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

1150000.000

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

8500000

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

4500000

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

13000000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-14.49

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target boundary includes all Wilmar-owned and operated global operations covering plantations, mills, refineries, manufacturing and logistics facilities. It accounts for 100% of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions within the organizational boundary.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions by 90% by 2050 from a 2022 base year.

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

Wilmar plans to achieve its long-term Scope 1 and 2 target through region-specific, time-bound decarbonisation strategies focused primarily on structural abatement. Key measures include improving energy efficiency, expanding renewable energy deployment, transitioning to lower-carbon fuels and pursuing electrification where feasible. During 2025, the Group continued to implement and expand energy-efficiency programmes, renewable energy and lower-carbon energy solutions across its operations. Progress is monitored through metrics including absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions, energy consumption, energy efficiency and renewable energy deployment. Performance against climate targets is assessed annually and incorporated into the performance evaluation and remuneration of Executive Directors and key management personnel. The target supports Wilmar's 1.5°C-aligned, SBTi-validated decarbonisation pathway.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 5

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 5

(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

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

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

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 10 – Processing of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2022

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

41200000

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2100000

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

6400000

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

1900000

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3100000

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

54700000.000

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

54700000.000

(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

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.43) 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

(7.53.1.44) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

91.6

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

91.6

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2050

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

90

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

5470000.000

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

41200000

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2100000

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

6400000

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

1900000

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3100000

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

54700000.000

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

54700000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.00

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The 2025 reporting year emissions have not been calculated so the data is maintained from base year.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions, covering purchased goods and services, fuel- and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, downstream transport and distribution and the processing of sold products, by 90% by 2050 from a 2022 baseline year.

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

Wilmar plans to achieve its long-term Scope 3 target by strengthening supply-chain decarbonisation across the target boundary, which covers purchased goods and services, fuel- and energy-related activities, upstream and downstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products. Key measures include scaling the collection and use of primary Scope 3 data, developing targeted action plans and strengthening engagement with suppliers and other value-chain partners to identify and implement emissions reduction opportunities. During 2025, Wilmar continued to strengthen its approach to value-chain emissions management and supplier engagement. Progress is monitored through Scope 3 emissions and improvements in the availability and quality of primary supply-chain data, with performance against climate targets assessed annually.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 6

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 6

(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

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

☑ Methane (CH_4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

1000000

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

93100000

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

93100000.000

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

94100000.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.35) 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)

91

(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)

91

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

90.9

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2050

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

72

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

26348000.000

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

600000

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

93100000

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

93100000.000

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

93700000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions only (e.g. FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.59

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target boundary include the land-related emissions associated with agricultural production and relevant upstream value-chain activities. The 2025 reporting year FLAG emissions have not been calculated so the data is maintained from base year.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 1 and 3 FLAG GHG emissions by 72% by 2050 from 2022 base year.

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

Wilmar plans to achieve its long-term FLAG target through nature-based and operational mitigation measures across its agricultural operations and supply chain. Key measures include addressing land-use change and deforestation, protecting peatlands, improving the management of agricultural and processing emissions, and implementing nature-based solutions across relevant FLAG activities. During 2025, Wilmar continued implementing its NDPE commitments and emissions reduction measures across its upstream operations. Progress is monitored through FLAG-related GHG emissions and relevant land-use and supply-chain indicators, with performance against climate targets assessed annually.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:
☑ Yes
[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

(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

05/31/2021

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business activity

(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

12/30/2018

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

129762

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

40

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2025

(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

48.6

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

14.33

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Achieved and maintained

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply
☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Due to the wide-ranging types of businesses under the Group and varying levels of maturity in terms of climate change management, the approach to target setting would have to factor in the different needs and expectations from the different subsidiaries within the Group. One of our subsidiaries, Goodman Fielder, has been managing its climate change strategy and thus is at a good position to set out its own target for their operations. Thus, with the launch of their sustainability strategy in June 2021, it included the goal of achieving 100% renewable electricity use by 2025.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Achieving 100% renewable electricity allows us to reduce our Scope 2 emissions which is part of our climate roadmap to achieve SBTi targets aligned to 1.5 degrees celsius.

(7.54.1.22) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

We continue to invest in on-site renewable energy generation such as solar and to procure renewable electricity certificates (RECs) for electricity imported from grid. In 2025, Goodman Fielder in New Zealand achieved 100% renewable electricity through RECs.
[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

03/26/2025

(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

☑ Abs4

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/30/2032

(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

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

☑ Methane (CH_4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target boundary includes all Wilmar-owned and operated global operations covering plantations, mills, refineries, manufacturing and logistics facilities. It accounts for 100% of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions within the organizational boundary.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 90.0% by 2050 from a 2022 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:

☑ Unsure

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

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

We will monitor the initiatives that are planned and implemented to determine the pace of progress to meeting the target. As and when necessary, we will make amendments to update the roadmap and plans to achieve our target for net zero.

Row 2

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ2

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(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

☑ Abs5

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/30/2032

(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

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

☑ Methane (CH_4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our Scope 3 net zero target covers purchased goods and services, energy-related activities, upstream logistics and processing of sold products. Minor categories such as capital goods, waste, business travel, commuting, downstream use and end-of-life are excluded due to these not being significant for overall Scope 3 emissions.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions, covering purchased goods and services, fuel- and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, downstream transport and distribution and the processing of sold products, by 90% by 2050 from a 2022 baseline 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:

☑ Unsure

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

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

We will monitor the initiatives that are planned and implemented to determine the pace of progress to meeting the target. As and when necessary, we will make amendments to update the roadmap and plans to achieve our target for net zero.

Row 3

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ3

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

03/26/2025

(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

☑ Abs6

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/30/2032

(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

Wilmar SBTi Validation letter.pdf

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

☑ Methane (CH_4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target boundary include the land-related emissions associated with agricultural production and relevant upstream value-chain activities. The 2025 reporting year FLAG emissions have not been calculated so the data is maintained from base year.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Reduce absolute Scope 1 and 3 FLAG GHG emissions by 72% by 2050 from 2022 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:

☑ Unsure

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

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

We will monitor the initiatives that are planned and implemented to determine the pace of progress to meeting the target. As and when necessary, we will make amendments to update the roadmap and plans to achieve our target for net zero.
[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.

	Emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*0*	
To be implemented	*0*	*0*
Implementation commenced	*0*	*0*

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Implemented	*3*	*630000*
Not to be implemented	*0*	

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solid biofuels

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

90000

(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 1.2)

500000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1800000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Biomass like rice husks is used to replace or supplement existing coal boilers that have reached their end-of-life to generate green thermal energy

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption
☑ Solar PV

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

40700

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

14000000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

116800000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

We have rolled out solar photovoltaic (PV) installations across our facilities. In 2025, total installed solar PV capacity across the Group reached 138.8 MWp. This has resulted in approximately 40,700 tCO2e of reductions annually. We aim to increase solar PV capacity by more than 10 MWp through installations at potential sites currently under review for implementation or construction.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Fugitive emissions reductions

☑ Agricultural methane capture

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

500000

(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 1.2)

5000000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

50000000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, our 25 methane capture facilities in Indonesia and Malaysia have enabled us to avoid approximately 0.5 million tCO2e of GHG emissions being released into the atmosphere.
[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

To comply with the European Union Renewable Energy Directive's standard of greenhouse gas emission reduction requirements (market access to EU biofuels market) as well as Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (market access to EU for selected product groups).

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Lower return on investment (ROI) specification

(7.55.3.2) Comment

As a means to reducing the operational cost from fuel use, it is possible to generate cost savings from methane capture plant by replacing the diesel fuel for electricity generation with methane-rich biogas (at minimal operational cost as the gas is naturally generated from POME treatment ponds). Also, by replacing a portion of electricity generation from boiler-powered turbine engines, boiler fuels (biomass in the case of palm oil mills) could be saved and sold for a profit.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

With the growing demand for low-carbon product, putting in place a budget focusing on research and development into such new opportunities will give added incentives and makes good business sense.
[Add row]

(7.67) Do you implement agriculture or forest management practices on your own land with a climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefit?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.67.1) Specify the agricultural or forest management practice(s) implemented on your own land with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits and provide a corresponding emissions figure, if known.

Row 1

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Fire control

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Wilmar has a zero-burning policy throughout our oil palm plantations to ensure that emissions from open burning are avoided. Also, we adopt a zero-burning replanting method through mechanical means in our own operations and assists our smallholders (e.g. lend mechanical excavators for replanting use) whenever help is requested. Wilmar is a founding member of the Free Free Alliance (FFA)that pursues a broad approach in preventing land and forest fires in Indonesia. Members of the alliance share experiences, tools and approaches with regards to addressing the incidence of fires in the areas where they operate.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Emission reductions (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

93600

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

The impact was estimated based on the reduction in affected Wilmar's concessions due to fire from 2018 to 2025 (total 380 ha) and average emissions from fire per ha (246 tCO2e/ha).

Row 2

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Biodiversity considerations

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

A key component of Wilmar's No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation (NDPE) Policy adopted in December 2013 and updated in 2019 is a 'No Deforestation' commitment to ensure that Wilmar do not develop in High Carbon Stock (HCS) Forests or High Conservation Value (HCV) Areas, or knowingly source from suppliers engaged in the development of HCS or HCV. The policy scope covers 100% of Wilmar operations worldwide, extending beyond our own mills, plantations and refineries, and including 100% of our subsidiaries, and 100% of our third-party suppliers. Components of the 'No Deforestation' commitment are as follows:• No development on High Carbon Stock (HCS) Forests or High Conservation Value (HCV) Areas • No burning • Progressively reduce GHG emissions on existing operations: Wilmar requires the protection of HCS forests and HCV areas in all estates within our global supply chain under the full scope of this policy. HCV areas and HCS forests for protection must first be identified prior to any new planting/development, utilising international best practice guidance from the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) Principles and Criteria, High Conservation Value Resource Network (HCVRN) and the High Carbon Stock (HCS) Approach. In areas where there has been historical degradation on HCV-HCS or any non-compliant land clearing within our concession as per our NDPE cutoff date (31 December 2015), restoration and reforestation activities are undertaken to enhance the conservation values identified and to improve landscape connectivity. If HCV-HCS are present in our sites, we formulate management plans inc. monitoring to ensure that no illegal activities (i.e. logging, mining and poaching) occur. We have recorded no illegal and/or deforestation cases in our own operations as at end 2025.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Emission reductions (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

24600000

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

Based on the land clearing emission factors used in RSPO PalmGHG calculators, the difference between an oil palm and undisturbed forest's standing crop emission intensity is 772 tCO2e/ha. Assuming all conserved areas managed by Wilmar in palm areas are undisturbed forests (total 31,876ha), emission of approximately 24.6 million CO2e can be avoided.

Row 3

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Composting

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

In our palm and sugar upstream operations, Wilmar practices a circular economy approach of reusing waste biomass wherever possible, such as for mulching. Empty Fruit Bunch (EFB) is produced as waste at our palm oil mills. The EFB containing nutrients required by our oil palms is composted and mulched on our estates, allowing for partial mitigation of embedded emissions of new/purchased nitrogen fertilisers used. This practice is implemented company-wide for Wilmar's global palm and sugar plantations and mills where we have operational control, and is carried out with benefits reaped on an ongoing basis.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

18500

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

The emission savings are estimated based on the total EFB mulched (about 1,030,000 MT in 2025) and production emission factor of Nitrogen nutrient (5.62 tCO2e/MT Nitrogen). The Nitrogen content of EFB is estimated to be 0.32%.

Row 4

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Integrated pest management

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Management of pest, disease and weed on our plantations is achieved through the combination of cultural, mechanical, biological and chemical strategies within an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program. Recycled palm fronds and other organic products are also used to increase the fixing capacity of soils. An example of an initiative within the IPM is the mass rearing of barn owls for biological rat control and the use of target-specific rat baits.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

414.0

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

Based on the data collected from the barn owls programme in Central Kalimantan, there is a potential to reduce a maximum of 7,500kg of rat baits use in a year. Calculating with the emission factor for pesticides and assuming the same is applied across other Malaysia and Indonesia estates, a potential of 414 tCO2e of emissions can be saved annually.

Row 5

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

As part of Wilmar's "No Deforestation" commitment in the NDPE policy which covers 100% of Wilmar's global operations, we undertake enrichment planting of HCV areas, riparian areas, areas along major roads within plantation complexes, and available vacant space not suitable for crops based on a landscape approach. Initiated by our Plantation Head of Malaysia, the Conservation Recreational Landscape Project seeks to plant trees in spaces outside our designated riparian and conservation areas in Malaysia. This is one of the commitments we have made in our NDPE Policy to promote the "Go Green" approach. Teams from all our operating units, both plantations and mills, are involved in reforestation and greening projects around the housing complexes, vacant spaces and palm oil mills. We are also working closely with government agencies such as Sabah Forest Department and Sarawak Forest Department to support the Greening Malaysia Programme and 100 Million Tree-Planting Campaign.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

264000

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

The carbon sequestrated was estimated based on the number of trees planted since 2020 (264,000) in Indonesia, Malaysia and West Africa; and carbon sequestrated per year (25kg) over 40 years of life span (i.e. 1 tonne carbon sequestered per tree).
[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:

☑ Biodiversity considerations

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

To share our experience from managing and monitoring our conservation area, Wilmar developed two documents in 2021. The first is aimed at plantation managers and titled "Best Management Practices Manual for Growers on Forest Conservation and Community Collaboration". This document was developed together with Proforest and contains four chapters: (1) biodiversity protection and forest monitoring; (2) balancing community needs and forest protection; (3) management and restoration of riparian areas; and (4) fire and peat management.The second document provides guidance to support our suppliers who need to establish monitoring systems to manage identified conservation areas. It is titled "A Practical Guide to Conservation Area Monitoring" and is available in both Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia. This guidance aims to equip suppliers with an understanding of how to monitor and patrol conservation areas. It also provides easy to follow step-by-step actions for practitioners and plantation operation teams on how to respond to any encroachment.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

These guidelines are a first for the industry and have been designed to be practical and easy to understand, recognizing that estate management teams may not have experts on the ground. In November and December 2021, both documents were presented to 131 of our suppliers in Indonesia and Malaysia, via online training sessions.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

NA
[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.69) Do you know if any of the management practices implemented on your own land disclosed in 7.67.1 have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.69.1) Provide details on those management practices that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation and on your management response.

Row 1

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Conservation of forests increases the carbon sink capability while allowing the biodiversity of flora and fauna to thrive in the conserved forests.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

We have not implemented any responses as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.

Row 2

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Reforestation of certain mix of plantings can help to reverse the biodiversity loss by re-establishing and regrowing the forest canopy as habitat for the terrestrial biodiversity. The planted trees also prevent from soil erosion through the deep roots.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

We have not implemented any responses as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.

Row 3

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Prevention of land clearing using fires has beneficial impact for biodiversity as it prevents the potential uncontrolled loss of vegetation, refuge habitat, and food sources.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

We have not implemented any responses as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.

Row 4

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

☑ Yield

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

The soil quality of crops has benefited from better pest, disease and weed management through good pesticides control which prevents excessive toxicity leaking into the soil. The targeted application of the right dosage/method of pesticides can also ensure beneficial plants are not killed off and as an overall impact, this can help with our crop yield in the long-term.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

We have not implemented any responses as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.

Row 5

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

☑ Yield

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

The Empty Fruit Bunch (EFB), containing nutrients required by the oil palm, is returned to the soil to conserve the moisture underneath the soil in order to maintain the yield.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

We have not implemented any responses as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.

[Add row]

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Through engagement and training, it will create awareness and provide necessary tools for the suppliers on technical know-how to better conserve the biodiversity.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

We have not implemented any responses as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.
[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:
☑ Low-Carbon Investment (LCI) Registry Taxonomy

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☑ Other power, please specify :Biomass

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

All of Wilmar's sugar mills in Australia and India are equipped with cogeneration plants to generate both electricity and heat simultaneously. While we primarily use this energy for our own mills, some mills have been designed to generate renewable electricity for export. To ensure a readily available source of renewable energy outside of the traditional crushing season, we stockpile surplus bagasse in specially designed pads at one of our mills. In 2025, we exported a total of 419,904 MWh to the national grid from our mills in Australia and India.

(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:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

1 kWh electricity usage from grid versus biomass (i.e. bagasse)

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Local grid electricity

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

30952

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

We followed an attributional approach to our calculation and measured the difference in emissions during usage stage between the renewable electricity generated from bagasse and local grid electricity. Rationale of allocating for usage stage only is because it could simplify the calculation by excluding the uncertainties such as the potential emissions due to land use change and wide fuel mix used in the grid. We used the following Global Warming Potential 100 (GWP100) factors from the IPCC 6th assessment report: Carbon Dioxide (CO2): 1 Non-Fossil Methane (CH4): 27 Nitrous Oxide (N2O): 273 We estimated and compared the GHG emission per kWh electricity from bagasse and grid. To estimate emissions from combustion of bagasse, we applied the total electricity generated into the GHG Protocol's calculator under "Other primary solid biomass fuels". At the same time, we used the grid emission factors from local governmental data and Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) to estimate the GHG emission from grid at the same amount of electricity sourced. The calculation does not account for the biogenic emissions from combustion of bagasse.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.04

Row 2

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ Low-Carbon Investment (LCI) Registry Taxonomy

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Biofuels

☑ Bioethanol

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

In Australia, we are the largest manufacturer of sugar-based ethanol with a capacity of 60 million litres of bioethanol a year at our Sarina Distillery. About two-thirds of this ethanol is sold into the Australian market for use in E10 and E85 blends of petrol. Bioethanol is the most widely used alternative fuel in the world. It is a renewable derived from natural ingredients, making it a sustainable fuel option for motorists. Our bioethanol is produced from molasses – a by-product of the sugar manufacturing process. In India, we are the leading supplier of ethanol to oil marketing companies. Its distilleries produce both potable alcohol and ethanol that can be blended with petroleum. Having achieved the target of 10% ethanol blending in June 2022, the Indian government has pushed forward its target of 20% by five years to 2025. Our ethanol distillery plants are located in states of Karnataka and have the capacity of 1,250 kilolitres per day.

(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:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

1 litre motor fuel usage derived from petroleum vs biomass (i.e. sugar production)

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Motor gasoline

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

370337

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

We followed an attributional approach to our calculation and measured the difference in emissions during usage stage between the bioethanol and motor gasoline. Rationale of allocating for usage stage only is because it could simplify the calculation by excluding the upstream production emissions which require further evaluation and assessment. We used the following Global Warming Potential 100 (GWP100) factors from the IPCC 6th assessment report: Carbon Dioxide (CO2): 1 Non-Fossil Methane (CH4): 27 Nitrous Oxide (N2O): 273 We estimated and compared the GHG emission profile between bioethanol and petroleum-based gasoline on the same unit basis. To estimate the emissions from bioethanol, we applied the total quantity of bioethanol sold into the GHG Protocol's Transport Tool under "Ethanol". At the same time, we applied the emission factor of petroleum-based gasoline using the same quantity sold to calculate the resultant emission for comparison. The calculation does not account for the biogenic emissions from combustion of bioethanol.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.171

Row 3

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ Low-Carbon Investment (LCI) Registry Taxonomy

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Organic fertilisers

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

In India, the press mud and filter cake obtained as waste is mixed with effluents from our distillery operations to manufacture organic fertilisers, which is eco-friendly as well as cost-effective than chemical fertilisers. It is a 100% natural product that enriches the soil fertility and is useful for all soil types and crops. It helps to avoid the emissions from the upstream production as compared to the chemical fertilisers. In Australia, we process the dunder (substance remaining after fermenting molasses into bioethanol) into BioDunder, a comprehensive plant-based fertiliser containing nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, sulphur and organic carbon. This renewable cycle returns nutrients and organic matter to the soil, supporting crops like sugarcane and offering a sustainable alternative to imported synthetic fertilisers.

(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-cradle/closed loop production

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

1 tonne fertiliser that is chemically-produced vs 100% biomass

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Chemical fertilisers

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

44839

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

We followed an attributional approach to our calculation and measured the difference in emissions during upstream production stage between the organic and chemical fertilisers. Most of the avoided emissions occur where the organic fertilisers are produced as waste from our distillery operations and require no further upstream production processes where inputs such as materials, energy and logistics are required. We used the following Global Warming Potential 100 (GWP100) factors from the IPCC 6th assessment report: Carbon Dioxide (CO_2): 1 Non-Fossil Methane (CH_4): 27 Nitrous Oxide (N_2O): 273 The Nitrogen (N), Phosphorus (P) and Potassium (K) content of the organic fertilisers are estimated in mass unit. Each nutrient type (N, P and K) would be multiplied with the respective production emission factor from BioGrace standard values.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.038

Row 4

(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:

☑ Low-Carbon Investment (LCI) Registry Taxonomy

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Biofuels

☑ Fatty acid methyl ester (FAME)

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

We are the world's largest producer of palm biodiesel. We produce palm oil methyl ester and palm olein methyl ester. Our biodiesel plants are located in Malaysia and Indonesia. The palm oil supplied by Wilmar meets the minimum GHG emission savings of 35% as stipulated in the Renewable Energy Directive (RED) and usually ranges from 40-60%. Therefore, the use of our palm oil enables avoided GHG emissions as compared to diesel from crude oil. Wilmar is a member of the International Sustainability and Carbon Certification (ISCC) association and has been an active user of the system since 2011 to facilitate trade to the renewable energy market in the European Union. The ISCC is an international certification system covering all kinds of bio-based feedstocks and renewables catering to energy, food, feed and chemicals sectors. It incorporates sustainability criteria such as reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, sustainable use of land, protection of natural biospheres and social sustainability. Achieving ISCC certification enables delivery of products compliant with the sustainability criteria laid out by the EU's RED.

(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-grave

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

1 litre diesel usage from petroleum vs palm biodiesel

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Petroleum-based diesel

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

5044574

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

We followed an attributional approach to our calculation and measured the difference in cradle-to-grave emissions between the biodiesel and diesel. Based on the EU RED's requirement, the biodiesel is required to be able to reduce the GHG emissions by minimum 35%. Wilmar's biodiesel is able to reduce the emissions by 40-60% as compared to the fossil fuel comparators. We used the following Global Warming Potential 100 (GWP100) factors from the IPCC 6th assessment report: Carbon Dioxide (CO2): 1 Non-Fossil Methane (CH4): 27 Nitrous Oxide (N2O): 273 Based on the baseline fossil fuel's life cycle emission which is 83.8 gCO2e / MJ, we assume 50% (middle of 40-60%) lower GHG emission using our biodiesel to calculate the avoided emissions. Based on the lower heating value of 0.037 MJ/MT, the biodiesel quantity would be converted to total energy content in order to calculate the avoided emissions.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

6.59
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

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

	Exclusion from disclosure
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(8.2.1) Disclosure volume (metric tons)

7851494.79

(8.2.2) Volume type

Select all that apply

☑ Produced

☑ Sourced

(8.2.3) Produced volume (metric tons)

4197196.26

(8.2.4) Sourced volume (metric tons)

3654298.53
[Fixed row]

(8.3) Provide details on the land you own, manage and/or control that is used to produce your disclosed commodities.

Palm oil

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sabah, Sarawak

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

77751.53

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

1077447.4

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

100

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply
☑ RSPO producer/grower certification
☑ Other forest management/producer certification, please specify :MSPO

Palm oil

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sumatera Utara, Sumatera Selatan, Sumatera Barat, Riau, Jambi, Kalimantan Tengah, Kalimantan Barat

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

240195.31

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

2736486.27

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

68

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply

☑ RSPO producer/grower certification

☑ Other forest management/producer certification, please specify :ISPO

Palm oil

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Ghana

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Tema

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

6799

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

73326.83

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

100

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply
☑ RSPO producer/grower certification

Palm oil

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Nigeria

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Cross River

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

26319.17

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

152503.51

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

42

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply

☑ No certified area in this country/area, state or equivalent jurisdiction

[Add row]

(8.4) Indicate if any of the land you own, manage and/or control was not used to produce your disclosed commodities in the reporting year.

Select from:

☑ Some of the land we own, manage and/or control is not used for production

(8.4.1) Provide details on the land you own, manage and/or control that was not used to produce your disclosed commodities in the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:

☑ Unplanted land (designated for future planting)

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

984

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

0

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land controlled or managed for oil palm cultivation - unplanted

Row 2

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Set-aside land for conservation

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

11175.12

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

100

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land designated and managed as HCV areas & other conservation land set aside

Row 3

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:

☑ Unplanted land (designated for future planting)

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

12814.2

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

0

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land controlled or managed for oil palm cultivation - unplanted

Row 4

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Set-aside land for conservation

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

25635.89

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

100

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land designated and managed as HCV areas & other conservation land set aside

Row 5

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Other land type, please specify :land managed for company affiliated smallholders

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

42079.21

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

0

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land under scheme smallholder

Row 6

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Ghana

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:

☑ Unplanted land (designated for future planting)

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

131

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

0

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land controlled or managed for oil palm cultivation - unplanted

Row 7

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Ghana

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Set-aside land for conservation

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

135

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

100

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land designated and managed as HCV areas & other conservation land set aside

Row 8

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Ghana

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Other type of control, please specify :land managed by smallholder with plantation assistance by company

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Land managed by company-affiliated smallholders

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

1650

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

0

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land under scheme smallholder

Row 9

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Nigeria

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Unplanted land (designated for future planting)

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

5806.6

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

0

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land controlled or managed for oil palm cultivation - unplanted

Row 10

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Nigeria

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:
☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:
☑ Set-aside land for conservation

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

4041.18

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

100

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

Total land designated and managed as HCV areas & other conservation land set aside
[Add row]

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

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sabah & Sarawak

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

58004.7

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Independent smallholders

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sabah & Sarawak

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

275031.07

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Nigeria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Cross River

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

36824.32

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Nigeria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Cross River

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

651.59

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Ghana

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Takoradi

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

5382.62

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Independent smallholders

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Ghana

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Takoradi

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

21044.84

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sumatera & Kalimantan

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

169210.11

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sumatera & Kalimantan

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

3088149.28

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

(8.5.7) Please explain

Per supply base of the respective mills operating in the region
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.6.1) Provide details of how your organization produces or sources palm oil derived biofuel.

Row 1

(8.6.1.1) Volume type

Select from:
☑ Produced

(8.6.1.2) Palm oil derived biofuel volume

73854.24

(8.6.1.3) Metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(8.6.1.4) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.6.1.5) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.6.1.6) % of disclosure volume

Select from:
☑ 1-5%

(8.6.1.8) Comment (optional)

NA

Row 2

(8.6.1.1) Volume type

Select from:
☑ Produced

(8.6.1.2) Palm oil derived biofuel volume

1085111.11

(8.6.1.3) Metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(8.6.1.4) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.6.1.5) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.6.1.6) % of disclosure volume

Select from:
☑ 31-40%

(8.6.1.8) Comment (optional)

NA

Row 3

(8.6.1.1) Volume type

Select from:
☑ Produced

(8.6.1.2) Palm oil derived biofuel volume

2382578.52

(8.6.1.3) Metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(8.6.1.4) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.6.1.5) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.6.1.6) % of disclosure volume

Select from:
☑ 61-70%

(8.6.1.8) Comment (optional)

NA

Row 4

(8.6.1.1) Volume type

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(8.6.1.2) Palm oil derived biofuel volume

95622.65

(8.6.1.3) Metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(8.6.1.4) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.6.1.5) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.6.1.6) % of disclosure volume

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

(8.6.1.7) Biofuel material is sourced from smallholders

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.6.1.8) Comment (optional)

Per supply base of mills that supplied the raw material that is converted into biodiesel

Row 5

(8.6.1.1) Volume type

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(8.6.1.2) Palm oil derived biofuel volume

432711.81

(8.6.1.3) Metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(8.6.1.4) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.6.1.5) First-level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.6.1.6) % of disclosure volume

Select from:
☑ 81-90%

(8.6.1.7) Biofuel material is sourced from smallholders

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.6.1.8) Comment (optional)

Per supply base of mills that supplied the raw material that is converted into biodiesel
[Add row]

(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?

	Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target	Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target
Palm oil	Yes ☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

No development on High Carbon Stock (HCS) Forests or High Conservation Value (HCV) Areas

(8.7.1.3) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(8.7.1.4) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2015

(8.7.1.6) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ In line with organizational commitments, because no sector- or region-wide cutoff date is available

(8.7.1.7) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2020

[Add row]

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

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Forests target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7.1

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

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

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ RSPO producer/grower certification

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

09/28/2004

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2008

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2026

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

82.2

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

82.20

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

None, no alignment after assessment
☑ None, no alignment after assessment

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

As part of RSPO member's requirements, 100% of our palm oil mills have to be certified against the RSPO Principles & Criteria. No mills have been excluded from this according to RSPO boundary setting.

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

Continue to push for certification and work with the relevant stakeholders to close gaps for the complete certification of all mills. As of year-end 2025, we have achieved RSPO certification for 29 mills and about 82.2% of our oil palm plantations, representing a production capability of more than 770,000 tonnes of certified sustainable crude palm oil and 167,000 tonnes of certified sustainable palm kernel. Supplies from our certified plasma smallholders is included into the portfolio.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

All details have been disclosed accordingly.
[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.

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

☑ Value chain mapping

☑ Supplier engagement/communication

☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

Since 2015, Wilmar-owned palm oil mills are 100% traceable to plantation. And we are targeting to ACHIEVE 100% TRACEABILITY TO PLANTATION across our global operations by 2026. As of December 2025, we have achieved 90.0% Traceable to Plantation across our global operations
[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

98.5

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

90

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

98.5

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

98.5

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

1.5

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

387.00
[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.

Palm oil

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation-free (DF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

79.7

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

79.7

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

79.7

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

79.7

(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.

Palm oil

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

Chain-of-custody certification
☑ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :NDPE Implementation Reporting Framework

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

79.7

(8.9.1.3) Comment

Verification statement provided by independent third-party (Control Union) as supporting evidence on the % of disclosed volume that are determined to be delivering NDPE IRF volumes.
[Add row]

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

Palm oil

(8.9.3.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

79.70

(8.9.3.2) Production unit monitoring approach

Select all that apply

☑ Geospatial monitoring or remote sensing tool

☑ Ground-based monitoring system

☑ Other, please specify :Supplier Compliance & Due Diligence (Supplier Reporting Tool), traceability, international certification schemes and grievance mechanism

(8.9.3.3) Description of production unit monitoring approach

The NDPE IRF is a tool that provides palm oil companies with an industry-wide approach to measure progress on NDPE commitments across the entire production base connected to their supply chain. A key tenet of the NDPE IRF is that it focuses on implementation actions and breaks them down into concrete steps. By including information on initial engagement actions such as workshops and policy developments as well as long-term, on-the-ground interventions and initiatives, the tool can summarise any progress or gaps in the implementation of a company's NDPE commitments.

(8.9.3.4) DF/DCF status verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.3.5) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ Third party

(8.9.3.6) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit and is verified as DF/DCF

79.7

(8.9.3.7) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

Refer to the NDPE IRF verification protocol (https://www.ndpe-irf.net/technical) for the verification process taken to confirm the DF status.
[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area

79.70

(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
☑ Ground-based monitoring
☑ Third-party assessment tool
☑ Landscape or jurisdictional approaches
☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial data
☑ Information gathered through grievance mechanisms
☑ Collaborating with other organizations to develop and share risk profiles
☑ Other, please specify **:Supplier Compliance & Due Diligence (Supplier Reporting Tool) and traceability**

(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment

The NDPE IRF is a comprehensive tool used by palm oil companies to assess and track their progress on NDPE commitments across their supply chains. The NDPE IRF outlines clear steps for implementation, enabling companies to monitor progress from policy development and initial engagement to on-the-ground actions. By tracking these activities, the framework highlights both achievements and areas requiring improvement. In 2024, Wilmar focused on enhancing data collection for TtP and improving satellite monitoring procedures. Furthermore, training sessions and meetings were organised to promote the adoption and understanding of the NDPE IRF among suppliers, especially third-party refiners and traders. These efforts not only enhanced suppliers' NDPE progress and reporting capabilities

(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin

Select all that apply

☑ Peru
☑ Togo
☑ Gabon
☑ Ghana
☑ India
☑ Liberia
☑ Myanmar
☑ Nigeria
☑ Cameroon
☑ Colombia
☑ Nicaragua
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Madagascar
☑ Philippines
☑ Sao Tome and Principe
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
☑ Brazil
☑ Mexico
☑ Panama
☑ Uganda
☑ Ecuador
☑ Honduras
☑ Malaysia
☑ Thailand
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Sierra Leone
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Solomon Islands
☑ Papua New Guinea
☑ Dominican Republic

(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas

North Sumatra, West Kalimantan, Riau, Jambi, Bengkulu, Central Kalimantan, Gorontalo, West Sumatra, Lampung, Aceh, South Sumatra, Central Sulawesi, South Kalimantan, East Kalimantan, West Sulawesi, West Papua, Bangka Belitung, South East Sulawesi, North Kalimantan, South Jakarta, East Java, Southeast Sulawesi, East Jakarta, East Java, South Sulawesi, East Sulawesi, South Papua, North Sulawesi, West Java, Johor, Kelantan, Sarawak, Sabah, Kedah, Pahang, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan, Perak, Kuala Lumpur, Selangor, Terengganu, Pulau Pinang, Puntarenas, aldea Champona, Izabal, Verapaz, Peten, Santa Barbara, Bartolomé de

Las Casas, Tiquisate, Tecún Umán, Coatepeque, San Francisco Atlantida, Tela Atlantidad, Tocoa Colon, Toro, Esquina, Girón ecoparque empresarial Natura torre 2 Ofc 636, Cúcuta, Bahia Centro, West New Britain Province, Direito - Tailândia, Lado direito, Ehania, Tabou, Divo, Grabo, Iboké, Grand-Lahou, Aboisso, Pleebo-Sodoken District, Takoradi, Kwaebibirem District, Akim- Mansa District, Twifo-Ntafrewaso The Assembly Kadjebi Volta Region, Suratthani, Nakiadeniya, Cross River Estate, Edo State, Rivers State, Badureliya, West Godavari, East Godavari, Kollam District, Krishna District

(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.9.4.7) Type of verification

Select all that apply
☑ Third party

(8.9.4.8) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through sourcing area monitoring and is verified as DF/DCF

79.7

(8.9.4.9) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

Refer to the NDPE IRF verification protocol (https://www.ndpe-irf.net/technical) for the verification process taken to confirm the DF status.

(8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

Wilmar's Mill Prioritization Process is the risk assessment undertaken based on responses received from the supplier assessment process (Supplier Reporting Tool), mills' certification status, NDPE commitment, Traceability, satellite monitoring efforts, grievances raised against them and GFW commodity risk geospatial analysis. Mills categorised as high priority are subjected to site assessments and/or direct engagement as part of our NDPE Policy implementation programme.
[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
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint on the land we own, manage or control

(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

2015

(8.10.1.6) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since the specified cutoff date (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

Our monitoring programme has been put in place since 2004 and we have recorded no illegal and/or deforestation cases in our own operations as at end of 2025.
[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
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:
☑ Increasing traceability

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

79.7

(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

☑ Greater transparency

☑ Greater enforcement of regulations

☑ Greater supplier awareness/engagement

☑ Improvement in data collection and quality

☑ Involvement in multi-stakeholder initiatives

☑ Greater stakeholder engagement and collaboration

☑ Investment in monitoring tools and traceability systems

☑ Involvement in landscape and/or jurisdictional initiatives

☑ Greater alignment between company goals and goals at landscape/jurisdictional level

☑ Increased knowledge on commodity driven deforestation, forest degradation and/or conversion

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

Score has decreased aa we migrated from version 5.8 to version 6.0. We can add the input below if needed: Wilmar has been an active participant of the NDPE IRF initiative since 2019, contributing to industry-wide dialoque and joint efforts to address key sustainability issues. We also use this framework to track progress towards our deforestation- and conversion-free commitments. In 2025, the NDPE IRF framework was updated as part of efforts to continualy strengthen transparency, comparability and accountability in palm of supply chain reporting. The updated framework incorporates new allocation criteria, enhanced data verification protocols, expanded exploitation indicators and clearer quidance for supplier cassification and reporting. For more information, please see Wilmar's NDPE IRF Action Plan 2024-2025: https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/resource/ndpe-irf-2024.pdf?sfvrsn=4bd679f8_4

[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
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, and willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members

[Fixed row]

(8.13.1) Provide details on the actions your organization has taken in its direct operations and/or upstream value chain that have resulted in reduced GHG emissions and/or enhanced removals.

Row 1

(8.13.1.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Palm oil

(8.13.1.2) Description of actions

Implementation of No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation (NDPE) policy across our own operations and upstream suppliers.

(8.13.1.3) CO2e reductions and removals achieved from base year (metric tons CO2e)

230000

(8.13.1.4) Base year

2025

(8.13.1.5) Emissions accounting boundary

Select from:
☑ Included in the corporate GHG inventory boundary

(8.13.1.6) Scope

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(8.13.1.7) Emissions accounting methodology and standards

Select all that apply
☑ GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard
☑ The GHG Protocol Agricultural Guidance

(8.13.1.8) Explain calculation

This is calculated based on the difference between the land use change emissions of our own operations between 2023 and 2025. The data uses primary planting data across our operations with their different planting years and amortised using linear discounting approach with emission factors from RSPO PalmGHG calculator.
[Add 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 both suppliers and owned/managed/controlled land

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply
☑ Labor rights
☑ Land use rights

☑ Third parties' rights
☑ Environmental protection
☑ Human rights protected under international law
☑ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting
☑ The principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), including as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply
☑ Certification

(8.14.5) Please explain

The Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSPO) Certification Scheme is the national scheme in Malaysia for oil palm plantations, independent and organised smallholdings, and palm oil processing facilities are to be certified against the requirements of the MSPO Standards by Jan 2020
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Select all that apply

- ☑ Risk of fires
- ☑ Risk of water stress
- ☑ Risk of biodiversity loss
- ☑ Risk of human rights issues
- ☑ Commodity sourcing footprint
- ☑ Organization has operational presence in area
- ☑ Presence of a neutral convener or implementer
- ☑ Supply of commodities strategically important
- ☑ Opportunity for increased human well-being in area
- ☑ Local government's commitment to sustainable land use
- ☑ Opportunity to protect and restore natural ecosystems
- ☑ Opportunity to increase market access for smallholders and local communities
- ☑ Ability to contribute to/ build on existing landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
- ☑ Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems
- ☑ Recognized as priority landscape by credible multi-stakeholder groups or industry platforms
- ☑ Current and future sourcing risk
- ☑ Risk of supplier non-compliance in area
- ☑ Opportunity to build resilience at scale
- ☑ Response to voluntary sectoral agreement
- ☑ Risk of issues related to land tenure rights

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Wilmar continues to actively support jurisdictional approaches to sustainable palm oil production in Malaysia and Indonesia. In Sabah, Wilmar is part of the Sabah Jurisdictional Certification Steering Committee (JCSC), which supports the Sabah Government's ambition to achieve 100% certified sustainable palm oil production through a jurisdictional approach. This approach is particularly important for ensuring that smallholders are not left behind, with approximately 25,000 smallholders managing around 170,000 hectares in Sabah potentially brought into sustainable production. Wilmar is also actively involved in the RSPO Smallholder National Interpretation processes for both Malaysia and Indonesia, contributing our operational experience and technical expertise to support practical implementation of the RSPO requirements for smallholders. In Indonesia, Wilmar is a member of ASPIRAN (Asosiasi Bapakat Sawit Berkelanjutan Seruyan) Working Group, which is supporting the development of jurisdictional certification for Seruyan District in Central Kalimantan. In Sabah, Wilmar also serves on the Board of Directors of the Sabah Oil Palm Industry Authority (SOPIA), which supports the Sabah Jurisdictional Approach for Sustainable Palm Oil (JASPO). These engagements provide Wilmar with opportunities to share knowledge and expertise, support stakeholders in developing sustainable practices at a jurisdictional level, and actively participate in initiatives that advance sustainable palm oil production across the wider landscape. Through these platforms, Wilmar believes that jurisdictional approaches can help create a more inclusive and practical pathway towards sustainable palm oil production, particularly by bringing smallholders and other stakeholders into the certification and sustainability journey.

[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to increase 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

Sabah Jurisdictional Approach

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Sabah Jurisdictional Approach

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☑ No, other reason, please specify :Under management of Jurisdictional Certification Steering Committee (JCSC), not within our purview

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Convener: Leads or facilitates the design, set-up, and high-level management of the initiative

☑ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

☑ Implementer: Executes actions based on the collective goals

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

2016

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Please specify :2026

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Decreased ecosystem degradation rate

☑ Forest fires monitored and prevented

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

☑ Increased and/or maintained protected areas

☑ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

☑ Ecosystem services maintained and/or enhanced

☑ Improved rate of carbon sequestration (e.g., through restoration)

☑ Reduced emissions from land use change and/or agricultural production

☑ Improved community resilience from climate adaptation plans or mitigation efforts

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

☑ Adequate water availability, water quality or access to WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) services

Governance

☑ Governance forums that represent all relevant stakeholders in place and maintained

☑ Promotion of transparency, participation, inclusion, and coordination in landscape policy, planning, and management

Social

☑ Respect, protect, and fulfil human rights

☑ Income diversification amongst producers in area

☑ Improved business models that enable inclusion (including smallholders)

☑ Improved capacity for community engagement in multi-stakeholder processes

☑ Implementation of livelihood activities/practices that reduce pressure on forests

☑ Improved standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups

☑ Rights to land and resources recognized and protected, and related conflicts reduced

☑ Ensuring local communities and smallholders benefit from the outcomes of landscape/jurisdictional initiative

Production

☑ Increased uptake of certification

☑ Improved and/or maintained soil health

☑ Reliable commodity traceability and landscape monitoring/data collection system

☑ Multi-commodity production promoted and farmer/supplier dependency on individual companies reduced

☑ Increased adoption of sustainable production practices (e.g., input use efficiency and water management practices)

☑ Sustainability of other natural resource-based production sectors promoted to and recognized by relevant stakeholders (e.g. mining, natural forest management and non-extractive uses)

(8.15.2.15) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Collaborate to maintain representation from all relevant stakeholders within governance structure of initiative

☑ Help establish a transparent governance platform responsible for managing the initiative and its activities with clear roles, responsibilities and balanced decision-making

☑ Help establish effective mechanisms for undertaking human rights due diligence, risk management, monitoring, verification, and grievance resolution

☑ 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

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply
☑ Producers
☑ Private sector
☑ Local communities
☑ Indigenous peoples
☑ National government
☑ Sub-national government
☑ NGO and/or civil society

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

Wilmar is part of the Sabah Jurisdictional Certification Steering Committee (JCSC), which functions to help the Sabah government to achieve its vision of producing 100% certified sustainable palm oil under RSPO certification by 2025. To help establish an entity responsible for managing the initiative and its activities with clear and transparent governance roles, responsibilities and decision-making for different stakeholders in that initiative

(8.15.2.18) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:
☑ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.19) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

https://www.conservation.org/docs/default-source/publication-pdfs/jurisdictional_approach_full_report_march2019_published.pdf?sfvrsn=23c977ae_3
https://www.tropicalforestalliance.org/assets/Uploads/Sabah_Case_study-July2021-Final.pdf

(8.15.2.20) Claims made

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

Row 2

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ2

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

ASPIRAN (Asosiasi Bapakat Sawit Berkelanjutan Seruyan) Working Group

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.15.2.4) Latitude

5

(8.15.2.6) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Seruyan District in Central Kalimantan.

(8.15.2.8) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☑ No, other reason, please specify :Under purview of ASPIRAN, not within our purview

(8.15.2.10) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Convener: Leads or facilitates the design, set-up, and high-level management of the initiative

☑ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

☑ Implementer: Executes actions based on the collective goals

(8.15.2.11) Engagement start year

2015

(8.15.2.12) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Please specify :2026

(8.15.2.13) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.14) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Decreased ecosystem degradation rate

☑ Forest fires monitored and prevented

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

☑ Increased and/or maintained protected areas

☑ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

☑ Ecosystem services maintained and/or enhanced

☑ Improved rate of carbon sequestration (e.g., through restoration)

☑ Reduced emissions from land use change and/or agricultural production

☑ Improved community resilience from climate adaptation plans or mitigation efforts

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

☑ Adequate water availability, water quality or access to WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) services

Governance

☑ Governance forums that represent all relevant stakeholders in place and maintained

☑ Promotion of transparency, participation, inclusion, and coordination in landscape policy, planning, and management

Social

☑ Respect, protect, and fulfil human rights

☑ Income diversification amongst producers in area

☑ Increased rate of employment in the rural economy
☑ Improved business models that enable inclusion (including smallholders)
☑ Improved capacity for community engagement in multi-stakeholder processes
☑ Implementation of livelihood activities/practices that reduce pressure on forests
☑ Improved standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups
☑ Rights to land and resources recognized and protected, and related conflicts reduced
☑ Ensuring local communities and smallholders benefit from the outcomes of landscape/jurisdictional initiative

Production
☑ Increased uptake of certification
☑ Improved and/or maintained soil health
☑ Uptake of regenerative agriculture (e.g., agroforestry) practices
☑ Reliable commodity traceability and landscape monitoring/data collection system
☑ Increased adoption of sustainable production practices (e.g., input use efficiency and water management practices)
☑ Sustainability of other natural resource-based production sectors promoted to and recognized by relevant stakeholders (e.g. mining, natural forest management and non-extractive uses)

(8.15.2.15) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment
☑ Identify and act on opportunities for pre-competitive collaboration with your sector
☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for livelihoods and human well-being
☑ 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 effective mechanisms for undertaking human rights due diligence, risk management, monitoring, verification, and grievance resolution
☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for biodiversity, habitat fragmentation and/or threats to IUCN Red List species in priority areas
☑ Help establish a transparent governance platform responsible for managing the initiative and its activities with clear roles, responsibilities and balanced decision-making

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities

☑ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation

(8.15.2.16) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Producers

☑ Private sector

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

☑ National government

☑ Sub-national government

☑ NGO and/or civil society

(8.15.2.17) Description of engagement

In Indonesia, Wilmar is a member of ASPIRAN (Asosiasi Bapakat Sawit Berkelanjutan Seruyan) Working Group, which is supporting the development of jurisdictional certification for Seruyan District in Central Kalimantan.

(8.15.2.18) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ No, but we are planning to monitor progress in the next two years

(8.15.2.20) 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:

☑ Palm oil

(8.15.3.4) % of disclosure volume from this landscape/jurisdiction

22.9

Row 2

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ2

(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:
☑ Palm oil

(8.15.3.4) % of disclosure volume from this landscape/jurisdiction

35.4
[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
☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply
☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Wilmar has been an active participant in various RSPO working groups that strive to improve standards and practices and develop solutions to complex issues through a multi-stakeholder and participatory process. We currently have representations within the RSPO, which include the Board of Governors, the Smallholder Support Fund Panel, the Steering Committee for the Sabah Jurisdictional Approach for Sustainable Palm Oil Production, the Fresh Fruit Bunch (FFB) Legality & Traceability Taskforce, the Shared Responsibility Working Group, the Biodiversity and High Conservation Values (BHCV) Working Group, the Compensation Task Force (CTF) as well as the Human Rights Working Group, which includes the related Taskforce on Labour and the Taskforce on Decent Living Wage. Within these working groups, we will be pushing for improvements and better clarity in the implementation of key components of the RSPO Principles and Criteria and RSPO Supply Chain Certification Standard.

Row 2

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Wilmar signed up as a partner to the Tropical Forest Alliance 2020 (TFA) in 2015. This initiative was founded in 2012 at Rio+20 after the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) committed to zero net deforestation by 2020 for palm oil, soy, beef, and paper and pulp supply chains. The CGF partnered with the US government to create the public-private alliance with the mission of mobilising all actors to collaborate in reducing commodity-driven tropical deforestation. In support of its partners' commitments to reduce deforestation in tropical forest countries, TFA 2020 continues to grow its partner membership and bring on board key actors committed to tackling deforestation. Since June 2015, the TFA Secretariat has been hosted at the World Economic Forum offices in Geneva, with financial support from the governments of Norway and the United Kingdom. Wilmar's Chief Sustainability Office, Jeremy Goon, is a member of the TFA 2020 Steering Committee, together with the Heads of Sustainability of various consumer business companies, as well as government officials from forest countries. Wilmar is also an active participant in TFA working groups, such as the Finance working group, to catalyse financial sector involvement in deforestation-free commodity supply chains. In November 2021, at the 26th United Nations Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26) in Glasgow, Wilmar and 12 other major agricultural commodity companies made a commitment to develop a sectoral roadmap for to decouple deforestation from their supply chains in line with a 1.5-degree Celsius pathway to be ready by COP27 in 2022. Throughout 2022, we worked closely with our peers to develop a roadmap that builds on the implementation progress made by the industry over the last decade and enhances existing commitments to address identified gaps needed to meet climate targets. The Tropical Forest Alliance facilitated the process, with support from the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). In September 2022, the Agricultural Sector Roadmap to 1.5°C for Palm Oil Sector was completed and made available for review and consultation. It represents a shared, sector-wide plan for addressing deforestation in supply chains and for accelerating collaboration to achieve that goal.

Row 3

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

The ISCC is an international certification system covering all kinds of bio-based feedstocks and renewables catering to energy, food, feed and chemicals sectors. It incorporates sustainability criteria such as reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, sustainable use of land, protection of natural biospheres and social sustainability. Wilmar is a member of the ISCC association and has been an active user of the system since 2011 to facilitate trade to European Union Renewable Energy market. Achieving ISCC certification enables delivery of products compliant with the sustainability criteria laid down by the European Union's Renewable Energy Directive (RED).

Row 4

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

The STFC seeks to incentivize the trade of sustainably produced commodities at scale. Wilmar is an active member of the STFC, providing regular inputs and feedback to the various strategies and initiatives. We also participate in STFC forums and workshops.

Row 5

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Established in February 2016, the FFA focuses on fire prevention through community engagement. Founding members include APRIL, Asian Agri, IDH, Musim Mas, PM. Haze and Wilmar. Sime Darby and IOI Group officially joined as members in March 2016, further extending the reach of the FFA's community fire prevention and management programmes across Indonesia and Malaysia. By March 2016, FFA has expanded fire prevention outreach to 218 villages in various parts of Indonesia. Of these, 77 villages signed up with FFA members for intensive fire-free programmes in 2016. FFA members have reported reductions in fire incidences of between 50% and 90% from 2015 to 2016. Since joining the FFA, Wilmar has completed a fire risk map for our concessions, which helps us to plan for the monitoring activities especially in high risk areas. We have also expanded our monitoring to areas outside our boundary up to 5 km. This is in part to ensure that any fires are quickly *detected and extinguished before it reaches our plantations. Since joining this initiative in 2016, Wilmar has launched the "Fire Free Community" programme in 145 villages across Sumatra and Kalimantan.*

Row 6

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

The Malaysian Sustainable Palm Oil (MSPO) Certification Scheme is the national scheme in Malaysia for oil palm plantations, independent and organised smallholdings, and palm oil processing facilities to be certified against the requirements of the MSPO Standards. Wilmar began implementing the MSPO certification programme at our Malaysia operations in 2016 and successfully certified 100% of our Malaysian palm oil mills and plantations in 2020. Wilmar participates as working group member on the MSPO standard development and is a member of the Technical Committee of MSPO.

Row 7

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Funding research organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Wilmar and the Royal Society's South-East Asia Rainforest Research Partnership (SEARRP) have been studying the conservation areas in Wilmar's plantations in Sabah since 2011. Wilmar and SEARRP signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in 2016 to formalize and expand our collaboration to advance the knowledge and application of sustainable plantation practices in Malaysia, Indonesia and the wider tropics. Under the 5-year MoU, both parties will establish research and training programs, commit to support and facilitate research by academics from leading universities (Universities of York, Oxford, Cambridge, Leeds, Nottingham, Aberdeen and Universiti Malaysia Sabah) with a strong focus on biodiversity conservation and the management of conservation areas within an oil palm plantation landscape. Wilmar and SEARRP also work together to develop simplified methods for environmental assessment and monitoring. By deepening the partnership between a leading palm oil processor and one of the foremost research programs in the tropics, Wilmar and SEARRP aim to make a major contribution to science which is critical to underpinning conservation, sustainability and environmental best practices for the palm oil industry. The partnership with SEARPP was renewed in 2022 for another 5-year term, Wilmar signed an MoU with Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) in 2020 to collaborate on biodiversity conservation research projects. Conservation areas outside of protected areas have become sanctuaries for many threatened and endangered species. Recognizing that landscapes of mixed land-use types play a crucial role in landscape conservation, the collaboration focuses on biodiversity research within HCV areas in Sabah (Sekar Imej). Totaling around 2,400 ha, Sekar Imej is Wilmar's largest HCV and conservation area in Malaysia. Forging close collaboration with partners such as USM is part of Wilmar's multi-stakeholder efforts to identify and develop pragmatic, actual and lasting solutions and implementation for biodiversity conservation in Wilmar operations. The partnership optimizes on the strengths and expertise in life sciences by USM, which further fortifies Wilmar's commitment to promote and implement best practices in environmental sustainability and biodiversity conservation.

Row 8

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging with communities

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

We are committed to respect and uphold legal and customary land tenure rights of communities and individual rights of Indigenous and local communities. Prior to any new planting, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) must be granted to ensure local communities have clear and specific avenues to negotiate the conditions of any project. This is in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP), the High Carbon Stock Approach (HCSA) toolkit and the RSPO Principle & Criteria (P&C). We expect the same of our suppliers. In land-related planning, participatory mapping is carried out to involve affected communities and their representative, relevant stakeholders and, where approriate supporting NGOs and independent experts. We will respond to any disputes or conflicts that arise in a timely and transparent manner following the steps stipulated in our Grievance Procedure and take action to remediate any adverse human rights impacts we have caused or contributed to. Where feasible, we seek to support food security in local communities by helping farmers grow other crops and establish food production businesses. We provide infrastructure and programs to facilitate community self-reliance at our operations for worker families and local communities. This includes the provision of schools, maintaining worker housing, and establishing public facilities in and around plantations. In 2023, Wilmar contributed over US$23.4 million towards community investment and philanthropic activities. Details on our community programs are shown on pages 122 -131 of our Sustainability Report 2023.

Row 9

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

We regularly engage with environmental NGOs and social NGOs in one-to-one meetings and multi stakeholder forums and events.

Row 10

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Engaging with policy makers or governments

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

- Facilitate peat restoration of two million hectares of peatland across seven Indonesian provinces with severely degraded lands under the supervision and support by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. - Support Wilmar's Wildlife Outreach and Awareness Project with Sabah Wildlife Department (SWD) and Sarawak Forestry Corporation, HUTAN-Kinabatangan Orangutan Conservation Project and Bornean Sun Bear Conservation Centre (BSBCC) - Honorary Wildlife Ranger and Wildlife Wardens - Riparian Rehabilitation Project to enrich and enlarge riparian areas on state and company land and restore habitats for endangered species - Assist Sabah government to achieve its vision of producing 100% certified sustainable palm oil under RSPO certification by 2025 - Support local schools

[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Threatened and protected species

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

☑ Creation of green jobs and sustainable livelihoods

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Siamang is a species of gibbon found mainly in Peninsular Malaysia and the provinces of Sumatra in Indonesia. They are categorised as vulnerable to extinction under the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of species. Wilmar has been partnering with the Kalaweit Foundation on a rehabilitation programme for rescued Siamangs to be returned to the wild. On 10 August 2016, Wilmar signed a second Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Kalaweit Foundation, to extend our partnership on rehabilitation of rescued Siamang gibbons for a further five years. Kalaweit Foundation first released three pairs of Siamangs into the HCV area in Wilmar's plantation in Sumatra in early 2015. This initial release was met with mixed results as all the original pairs had to be replaced due to injuries or disappearance. Kalaweit has since replaced the three original pairs, and continues to monitor their progress in assimilating into the environment. The extension of the MoU will enable Wilmar and Kalaweit to continue our collaboration, to monitor the three pairs and potentially release of another four more pairs in another HCV area in the same estate.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2014

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2021

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

300

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

300

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

0

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Other, please specify :gibbon rehabilitation and reintroduction

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

https://www.wilmar-international.com/docs/default-source/default-document-library/sustainability/sustainability-brief---siamang-gibbons-finding-sanctuary-in-wilmar-plantation.pdf?sfvrsn=9d241c20_0 https://www.wilmar-international.com/sustainability/conservation/biodiversity-and-ecosystem-management/projects-and-initiatives

Row 2

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Other ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Improvement to soil health

☑ Increase in carbon sequestration

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Sepapayau River, Sapi• 20m buffer zone set alongside river, amounting to 110.23 ha• ~28,000 trees seedlings of 51 tree species planted• initially degraded riparian areas now enriched and enhanced.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2014

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2021

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

110.23

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

110.23

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

5.732764

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

117.3871

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

0

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Improvement to soil health

☑ Increase in carbon sequestration

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Riparian areas bordering rivers and water bodies are critical habitats with significant environmental benefits for plants and communities. Natural vegetation also serves as a buffer to pollutants entering a stream from run-off and erosion. However, some of these areas have been disturbed in the past through community activities or agricultural development. As part of our management and monitoring plans, trained teams have worked to restore degraded areas to their original condition to enrich the HCV areas and improve the local wildlife habitat. This has been applied through frequent monitoring and management by identifying priority restoration areas, establishing nurseries and planting trees in designated areas. Wilmar commissions various experts to join field staff and HCV officers to conduct surveys and seedling collection, establishing the nurseries, planting and maintaining trees as well as monitoring and management of the area. Job opportunities are also given to local community members who are hired.

Row 3

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Other ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Improvement to soil health

☑ Increase in carbon sequestration

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Indonesia• 321.53 ha across 8 sites restored• 55,685 trees planted• 6 nurseries established, with almost 40,000 seedlings and 13,737 trees from 96 species• annual surveys conducted monitoring mortality• annual rapid survey indicate that the restored areas are now home to more birds and reptiles than prior to 2012

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2011

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2021

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

321.53

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

321.53

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

2.591074

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

112.5126

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

0

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Improvement to soil health

☑ Increase in carbon sequestration

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Riparian areas bordering rivers and water bodies are critical habitats with significant environmental benefits for plants and communities. Natural vegetation also serves as a buffer to pollutants entering a stream from run-off and erosion. However, some of these areas have been disturbed in the past through community activities or agricultural development. As part of our management and monitoring plans, trained teams have worked to restore degraded areas to their original condition to enrich the HCV areas and improve the local wildlife habitat. This has been applied through frequent monitoring and management by identifying priority restoration areas, establishing nurseries and planting trees in designated areas. Wilmar commissions various experts to join field staff and HCV officers to conduct surveys and seedling collection, establishing the nurseries, planting and maintaining trees as well as monitoring and management of the area. Job opportunities are also given to local community members who are hired to work at the nurseries.

Row 4

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Other ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Improvement to soil health
☑ Increase in carbon sequestration
☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity
☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:
☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Segama River, Sabahmas• riparian area restored and rehabilitated, river buffer zone increased from 20m to 50m; total ha increased from 93.34 ha to 380.97 ha (additional 287.63 ha)• ~68,000 trees seedlings of 19 tree species planted• suitable habitats and wildlife corridor provided for endangered and protected species e.g. proboscis monkey, silvered langur, oriented pied hornbill

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply
☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2009

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:
☑ 2021

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

380.97

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

380.97

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

5.176022

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

118.4064

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:
☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

0

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply
☑ Improvement of water availability and quality
☑ Improvement to soil health
☑ Increase in carbon sequestration
☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity
☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Riparian areas bordering rivers and water bodies are critical habitats with significant environmental benefits for plants and communities. Natural vegetation also serves as a buffer to pollutants entering a stream from run-off and erosion. However, some of these areas have been disturbed in the past through community activities or agricultural development. As part of our management and monitoring plans, trained teams have worked to restore degraded areas to their original condition to enrich the HCV areas and improve the local wildlife habitat. This has been applied through frequent monitoring and management by identifying priority restoration areas, establishing nurseries and planting trees in designated areas. Wilmar commissions various experts to join field staff and HCV officers to conduct surveys and seedling collection, establishing the nurseries, planting and maintaining trees as well as monitoring and management of the area. Job opportunities are also given to local community members who are hired.

[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

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

Select from:
☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each site and/or facility is required to measure the volume of water withdrawn via metering or estimation using internal calculation if meter is available each month in our Enablon system.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Total water withdrawal volume is one of our key environmental performance indicators and is used to track water efficiency. We collect the data quarterly and report it externally on an annual basis. The site refers to each location where the farming, milling or manufacturing processes take place. Within one site, there can be multiple plants which called facilities.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each site and/or facility is required to measure the volume of water withdrawn by source via metering or estimation using internal calculation if meter is available each month in our Enablon system.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Measuring this aspect allows us to identify priority areas and to further refine water-related targets and performance improvements. In addition, overall exposure to potential water risks (source dependency) can be quickly evaluated on a site-by-site basis with detailed information on water withdrawal volumes by source. The site refers to each location where the farming, milling or manufacturing processes take place. Within one site, there can be multiple plants which called facilities.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals quality is monitored can be tested and monitored by either own lab or water suppliers. Parameters measured include pH, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Total Suspended Solids (TSS), etc.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Being one of the biggest companies, we require the sites or facilities which are certified to Food Safety Standards to test the incoming water supply and to ensure compliance with the limits where applicable

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each site and/or facility is required to measure the volume of water discharged via metering or estimation using internal calculation if meter is available each month in our Enablon system.

(9.2.4) Please explain

It is considered part of the usual management for our sites. The site refers to each location where the farming, milling or manufacturing processes take place. Within one site, there can be multiple plants which called facilities

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each site and/or facility is required to measure the volume of water discharged by destination via metering or estimation using internal calculation if meter is available each month in our Enablon system.

(9.2.4) Please explain

It is considered part of the usual management for our sites. This aspect is relevant because our sites treat and discharge water volumes to freshwater bodies. As part of our compliance with standards and regulations, we monitor the volumes of our discharges by destination. The site refers to each location where the farming, milling or manufacturing processes take place. Within one site, there can be multiple plants which called facilities

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The wastewater treatment plant at each site has been designed to treat the wastewater to meet the local regulatory limits before discharging. The volume discharged by treatment method can be monitored based on the treatment plant.

(9.2.4) Please explain

It is considered part of the usual management for our sites. This aspect is relevant because our sites treat and discharge water volumes to freshwater bodies. We are committed to reducing water pollution. For this, we are required to ensure that quality and quantity of discharged water complies with standards and regulations

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We monitor monthly water discharge quality by standard effluent parameters at the site level via either internal or external lab. Key parameters include Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), pH, temperature, etc.

(9.2.4) Please explain

It is considered part of the usual management for our sites. This aspect is relevant because our sites treat and discharge water volumes to freshwater bodies. We are committed to reducing water pollution. For this, we are required to ensure that quality and quantity of discharged water complies with standards and regulations.

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

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

This water aspect is not monitored in our sites; discharge quality is only monitored by standard effluent parameters and temperature. We will consider to monitor this aspect in the near future depending on operational relevance.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The temperature is monitored through temperature probes or sensors installed at the discharge outlets.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The testing of temperature is subject to local regulatory requirements and site priorities.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each site and/or facility is required to report volume of water withdrawn and discharged each month in our Enablon system. The water consumption can be self-calculated by deducting total volume discharged from total water withdrawn.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Total water consumption is calculated monthly from water withdrawals volumes minus water discharges in all our operational sites. The site refers to each location where the farming, milling or manufacturing processes take place. Within one site, there can be multiple plants which called facilities

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each site and/or facility is required to report if any water recycling or/and reuse taking place every month via Enablon system

(9.2.4) Please explain

The site refers to each location where the farming, milling or manufacturing processes take place. Within one site, there can be multiple plants which called facilities. As example, the effluent from mills is recycled to irrigate the crop fields while the refineries mainly recycle the water back to its own processes, especially for cooling water.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is not currently monitored or reported as a Group-wide performance indicator during the reporting year.
[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)

171004

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. The volume of water withdrawn is measured and monitored using meter in most of the site or facilities. Where the meters are not available, we will estimate the volume of water withdrawn based on internal calculation. As compared to last year's water withdrawal data, there was an decrease of around 6% and mainly led by the growth in business activities. Wilmar expects that the business will continue to grow with a continued commitment to explore available opportunities and technologies to improve water efficiency where possible.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

100845

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. The volume of water withdrawn is measured and monitored using meter in most of the site or facilities. Where the meters are not available, we will estimate the volume of water withdrawn based on internal calculation. As compared to last year's water withdrawal data, there was an increase of around 10% and mainly led by the growth in business activities. Wilmar expects that the business will continue to grow with a continued commitment to explore available opportunities and technologies to improve water efficiency where possible.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

70158

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. The volume of water withdrawn is measured and monitored using meter in most of the site or facilities. Where the

meters are not available, we will estimate the volume of water withdrawn based on internal calculation. As compared to last year's water withdrawal data, there was an decrease of around 22% and mainly led by the growth in business activities. Wilmar expects that the business will continue to grow with a continued commitment to explore available opportunities and technologies to improve water efficiency where possible.
[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)

62463

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

36.53

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Identification tool used

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Using WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas allows us to identify which sites are located in areas with high (40-80%) and extremely high (80%) water-stressed risk. As compared to previous disclosure, the number of sites in water-stressed areas increased to 80 from 78. In anticipation of possible business expansion in five-year horizon, we forecast the volume of water withdrawn from water-stressed areas to be higher.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.5) What proportion of the produced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Palm oil

(9.2.5.1) The proportion of this commodity produced in areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.5.2) % of total agricultural commodity produced in areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.2.5.3) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.5.4) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

☑ Reduce impact on water resources

(9.2.5.5) Please explain

Using WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas with 'water stress' as the indicator, one of our plantations is located at high-risk area (40-80%) while the rest are located in the areas with water risk less than or equal to 40%. The denominator used to calculate the percentage of total palm oil produced in areas with water stress was the quantity of Fresh Fruit Bunch (FFB) produced from all of our plantations. The percentage had been maintained compared to previous year and is anticipated to be relatively stagnant next year because the countries where we operate own plantations have high annual precipitation. This location-based metric is actively monitored to inform strategy in addressing any potential shortage of water supply, where the quantity of water available is very critical in growing the crops and it directly impacts the production volume.

Sugar

(9.2.5.1) The proportion of this commodity produced in areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.5.2) % of total agricultural commodity produced in areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 0%

(9.2.5.3) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.5.4) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

☑ Reduce impact on water resources

(9.2.5.5) Please explain

Using WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas with 'water stress' as the indicator, the region where we have our sugarcane farms (Australia & Myanmar) have low water stress risk (10%) and thus not considered water-stressed areas (minimum more than 40%). The percentage was the same as the previous year and is anticipated to be similar next year. This location-based metric is actively monitored to inform strategy in addressing any potential shortage of water supply, where the quantity of water available is very critical in growing the crops and it directly impacts the production volume.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Palm oil

(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) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.6.4) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

☑ Reduce impact on water resources

(9.2.6.5) Please explain

Using WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas with 'water stress' as the indicator, 0.41% of total sourced volume are from the areas with water stress. The percentage had been maintained compared to previous year and we expect this percentage to be stagnant in subsequent years because the countries where our suppliers are based in have high average rainfall and lower water stress risk. This location-based metric is actively monitored to inform strategy in addressing any potential shortage of water supply across our supply chain which may directly disrupt the supply of palm oil materials to our processing plants

Soy

(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

(9.2.6.5) Please explain

We do not operate soy plantations, nor is it produced in any of our plantation areas. We just trade and retail soy.

Sugar

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 11-25

(9.2.6.3) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.6.4) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

☑ Reduce impact on water resources

(9.2.6.5) Please explain

Using WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas with 'water stress' as the indicator, 24.1% of total sourced volume are from the areas with water stress. There was no significant change compared to previous year and we project it to be almost similar next year. This location-based metric is actively monitored to inform strategy in addressing any potential shortage of water supply across our supply chain which may directly disrupt the supply of sugarcane and raw sugar to our processing plants
[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)

74501

(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 efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. The water withdrawn from fresh surface water is mostly metered with some estimated when metering is not a necessity. The estimations are calculated based on total operational hours multiply with average water consumed per hour for process. The main sources of fresh surface water that are metered are from rivers, dams and lakes while that for rainwater are either estimated or measured in some cases. There is a 10% difference as compared to previous year's disclosure which is significant.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

49411

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. The water withdrawn from brackish surface water is mostly metered and used for cooling towers at our processing plants. Compared with the previous reporting year, water withdrawal from brackish water sources increased by 12% due to shift in water sourcing towards greater use of brackish water.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

8930

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. The groundwater volume is metered in most of the sites otherwise it will be estimated based on internal methods. As compared to last year reporting, there was a 57% decrease from this source with sites using alternative sources of water instead (e.g. Brackish water sources).

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

7281

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. The groundwater volume is metered in most of the sites otherwise it will be estimated based on internal methods. As compared to last year reporting, there was a 48% decrease from this source with sites using alternative sources of water instead (e.g. Brackish water sources).

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

The water is produced mainly during our milling of sugarcane. The volume of produced water is estimated based on the water content and total quantity of sugarcane processed. There was an insignificant volume of produced water reported in 2025 after alignment in classifying water sources to avoid double accounting with recycled water.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

30686

(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 efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. For this category, we withdraw most of the third-party water from local municipal suppliers. The volume is metered and verified before payment. We recorded 13% decrease in using third-party water as compared to the last year figure which caused by alternative sources of water instead (e.g. brackish water source).
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

12782

(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:

☑ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation + /- 15% much higher / lower. Most of the volume of water discharged is metered otherwise it will be estimated based on internal methodology. As compared to last year reporting, there was less than 1% decrease which is not significant.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

55444

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation + /- 15% much higher / lower. Most of the volume of water discharged is metered otherwise it will be estimated based on internal methodology. As compared to last year reporting, there was 12% increase due to improved water-use efficiency and enhanced water management practices, resulting in greater proportion of treated water being discharged to this destination.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation + /- 15% much higher / lower. Most of the volume of water discharged is metered otherwise it will be estimated based on internal methodology. Compared with the previous reporting year, groundwater discharge decreased by 100% as treated wastewater was discharged to alternative destinations instead of groundwater.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

32620

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation + /- 15% much higher / lower. Most of the volume of water discharged is metered otherwise it will be estimated based on internal methodology. Compared with previous reporting year, discharge to third-party destinations increased by 12% due to improved water-use efficiency and enhanced water management practices, resulting in greater proportion of treated water being directed to third-party treatment.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Indicate the highest level to which your wastewater is treated (either by your organization or a third party) before being discharged to the environment.

Quaternary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

No wastewater was treated to the quaternary treatment level during the reporting year. Existing wastewater treatment systems at the relevant sites were sufficient to meet applicable regulatory requirements and operational needs using lower treatment levels.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

27832

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 21-30

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ Internally developed water quality standards or guidelines

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

The treatment is in place to meet the stringent regulatory thresholds while recycling the treated water back to own operations for cost savings. Given that there is unlikely change to treatment method, the volume was estimated based on similar proportion between the treatment methods. We are looking to monitor the changes in treatment method once every few years or more. Compared with previous reporting year, tertiary-treated wastewater increased due to improved water management practices and water use efficiency.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

43770

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 41-50

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ Internally developed water quality standards or guidelines

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

The treatment is in place to meet the stringent regulatory thresholds while recycling the treated water back to own operations for cost savings. Given that there is unlikely change to treatment method, the volume was estimated based on similar proportion between the treatment methods. We are looking to monitor the changes in treatment method once every few years or more. Compared with previous reporting year, secondary treated wastewater increased due to improved water management practices and water use efficiency.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

27409

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 21-30

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ Internally developed water quality standards or guidelines

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

The treatment is in place to meet the stringent regulatory thresholds while recycling the treated water back to own operations for cost savings. Given that there is unlikely change to treatment method, the volume was estimated based on similar proportion between the treatment methods. We are looking to monitor the changes in treatment method once every few years or more. Compared with previous reporting year, primary treated wastewater increased due to improved water management practices and water use efficiency.

No treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

128

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Some of the sites have just commenced operations whereby their effluent is still meeting the discharge limits without treatment.

Unknown

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

1706

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

When some of the sites do not have treatment plants, they have to send out to the third-party treatment companies before being able to release to the environment due to strict regulations.
[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 substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

80

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

80 sites, representing 19% of total number of sites globally are located in water-stressed areas in the reporting year. Those sites with high (40-80%) and extremely high (80%) baseline water stress risk score were considered located in water-stressed areas via World Resources Institute's Aqueduct tool. Note that for the purpose of reporting, our definition of 'facility' is the same as our definition for a site i.e. for which there could be several different types of plants operating in the same location.

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 substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

We are still in progress in engaging relevant stakeholders in order to map our supply base for other key commodities outside of palm and sugar. This process might take more than 2 years due to the number of commodities we source and prioritization of other environmental issues such as climate change.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Camellia

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.8197

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

151.0331

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

16

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

16

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Darra

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-27.5666

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

152.9625

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

3.59

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

3.59

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

3.59

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Erskine Park

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.8197

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

151.0331

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

83.82

(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

83.82

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

77.94

(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

77.94

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

5.89

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Forestville

(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

(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 :South Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-34.9487

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

138.5812

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

23.39

(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

23.39

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

2.33

(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

2.33

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

21.05

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Glebe Island Depot

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.86687

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

151.1821

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

19.11

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

19.11

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

0.37

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.37

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

18.74

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Keilor Park

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.7174

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

144.8468

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(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

0

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

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 coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Moorebank

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.9426

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

150.9245

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

49.78

(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

49.78

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

24.51

(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

24.51

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

25.27

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

North Fremantle Depot

(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

(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 :West Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-32.035921

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

115.748789

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

7.44

(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

7.44

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

1.43

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

6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Rydalmere

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.8197

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

151.0331

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(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

0

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

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 coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

West Footscray

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.8015

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

144.8746

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

16.47

(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

16.47

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

4.08

(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

4.08

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

12.39

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

West Richmond (Adel. Airport)

(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

(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 :South Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-34.9409

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

138.5486

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(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

0

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

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 coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Yarraville Bioethanol

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.8182

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

144.9019

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0.77

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0.77

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

0.13

(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

0.13

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

0.65

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Yarraville Sugar Refinery

(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

(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

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-37.817724

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

144.901142

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

6770.02

(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

6497.64

(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

0.97

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

271.41

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

6744.98

(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

6653.04

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

91.94

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

25.04

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ANY

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.893508

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

114.396756

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

76.19

(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

76.19

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

76.19

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

BCH

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Amur

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

45.58

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

122.88

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

158.03

(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

158.03

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

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

15.09

(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

15.09

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

142.94

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

BJG

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.710857

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

116.344407

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

67.59

(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

67.59

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

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

15.55

(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

15.55

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

52.04

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

BNQ

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.641123

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.461775

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2828.08

(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

2828.08

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

1284.26

(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

1284.26

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

1543.82

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

BZH

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.127083

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

116.35006

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

56.97

(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

56.97

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

56.97

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

CDG

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.895629

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

104.215584

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

65.66

(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

65.66

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

65.66

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 20

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

CHJ

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Gobi Interior

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

43.964771

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

87.195393

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

98.37

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

98.37

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

33.86

(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

33.86

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

64.52

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 21

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 21

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

DZH

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.5

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

116.32

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

67.04

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

67.04

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

67.04

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 22

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 22

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

GHN

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.969129

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

104.261884

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

246.77

(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

246.77

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

80

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

80

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

166.77

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 23

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 23

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

HZH

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.409357

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.135477

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

206.49

(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

23.03

(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

183.46

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

13.44

(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

13.44

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

193.05

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 24

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 24

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

JNZ

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Huang He (Yellow River)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.402748

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

112.384268

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

136.28

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

136.28

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

58.62

(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

58.62

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

77.66

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 25

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 25

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

JZH

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

36.077102

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.941445

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

59.66

(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

59.66

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

26.41

(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

26.41

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

33.25

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 26

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 26

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

KSHFKL

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.317773

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.980008

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

238.8

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

238.8

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

238.8

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 27

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 27

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

LYAC

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.747832

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.383441

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

57.45

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

57.45

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

38.58

(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

38.58

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

18.88

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 28

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 28

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

LYGAM

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.72349

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.303797

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

953.6

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

953.6

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

649.75

(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

567.19

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

82.57

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

303.84

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 29

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 29

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

LYK

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.5965

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.2213

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

815.81

(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

158.73

(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

657.08

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

815.81

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 30

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 30

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

PJN

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Bo Hai - Korean Bay, North Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.250966

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

122.016523

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

216.31

(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

216.31

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

151.8

(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

151.8

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

64.51

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 31

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 31

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

QDO

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

36.0126

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.1789

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

0

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 32

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 32

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

QHDS

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Bo Hai - Korean Bay, North Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.917235

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.603583

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

924.78

(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

924.78

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

422.77

(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

422.77

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

502.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 33

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 33

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SHF

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.3424

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.6222

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

325.71

(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

325.71

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

264.87

(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

264.87

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

60.84

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 34

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 34

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SHG

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Bo Hai - Korean Bay, North Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.9912

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.8282

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

3135.55

(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

2406.88

(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

728.68

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

2107.24

(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

2107.24

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

1028.31

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 35

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 35

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SHYL

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Bo Hai - Korean Bay, North Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.9219

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

123.5514

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

30.82

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

30.82

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

23.55

(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

23.55

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

7.27

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 36

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 36

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SJZ

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.0291

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

114.717

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

153.73

(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

153.73

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

51.7

(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

51.7

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

102.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 37

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 37

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

TAN

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Huang He (Yellow River)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

36.026482

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

117.095062

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

51.5

(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

51.5

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

21.9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

21.9

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

29.6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 38

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 38

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

TYN

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Huang He (Yellow River)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.683586

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

112.602536

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

37.13

(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

37.13

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

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

37.13

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 39

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 39

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

XPGL

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Huang He (Yellow River)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.3051

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

108.6005

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

711.3

(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

711.3

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

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

172.46

(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

172.46

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

538.85

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 40

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 40

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

YKO

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Bo Hai - Korean Bay, North Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.288222

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

122.1138

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

475.6

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

475.6

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

146.13

(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

146.13

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

329.47

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 41

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 41

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

YNT

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.569104

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.374729

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

328.45

(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

328.45

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

27.11

(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

27.11

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

301.34

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 42

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 42

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

YNZ

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.5833

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

116.8171

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

203.74

(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

203.74

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

33.09

(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

33.09

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

170.66

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 43

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 43

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ZHK

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.596261

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

114.666964

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

317.02

(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

317.02

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

12.3

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

12.3

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

304.72

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 44

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 44

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ZKW

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.640248

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

114.624096

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

65.39

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

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

65.39

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

65.39

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 45

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 45

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ZHZL

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.729344

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

113.784938

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

109.44

(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

109.44

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

109.44

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 46

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 46

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ZJK

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.832884

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

114.633521

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.44

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

2.44

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2.44

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 47

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 47

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Ajinkyatara - Site

(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

(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

India
☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

17.666041

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.988591

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

140.48

(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

140.48

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

140.48

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 48

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 48

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Anamika - Site

(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

(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

India

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.539638

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.933538

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

91.54

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

91.54

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

91.54

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 49

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 49

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Athani -Site

(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

(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

India
☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

16.7032

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

75.1792

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

513.16

(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

513.16

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

513.16

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 50

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 50

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Gandhidham- Site

(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

(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

India

☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.0035

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

70.0903

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

521.53

(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

521.53

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

521.53

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 51

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 51

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Havalga -Site

(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

(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

India

☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

17.118347

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

76.401813

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

858.67

(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

858.67

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

514.81

(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

514.81

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

343.87

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 52

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 52

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Kolavi - Site

(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

(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

India
☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

16.0787

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.8297

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

43.6

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

43.6

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

43.6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 53

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 53

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Munoli - Site

(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

(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

India

☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

15.854746

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

75.101708

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

616.87

(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

329.04

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

287.84

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

152.48

(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

152.48

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

464.4

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 54

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 54

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Panchaganga - Site

(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

(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

India

☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

16.7125

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.4427

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

293

(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

293

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

303.21

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 55

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 55

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Pathri - Site

(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

(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

India
☑ Godavari

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

19.269546

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

76.437301

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

30.01

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

30.01

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

15

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

15

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

15.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 56

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 56

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Raibag -Site

(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

(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

India
☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

16.45023

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.748602

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

36.65

(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

36.65

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

36.65

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 57

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 57

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

DSI Serang

(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

(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

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-5.940742

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.102046

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

525.2

(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

525.2

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

6.32

(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

6.3

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.02

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

518.88

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 58

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 58

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Flextech Serang

(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

(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

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.00788

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.10451

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

4.32

(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

4.32

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

4.32

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 59

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 59

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

JMR Cilegon

(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

(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

Åland Islands
☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.023328

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

105.964542

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

8933.51

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

8136

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

245.92

(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

551.6

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

8185.95

(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

8185.23

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.72

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

747.57

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 60

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 60

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

KITW Serang

(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

(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

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.01073

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.108

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

68.53

(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

68.53

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

68.53

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 61

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 61

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MNA Pulo Gadung

(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

(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

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Cisadane

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.192125

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.910466

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.85

(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

2.85

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.16

(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

1.16

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.69

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 62

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 62

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MNA SERANG

(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

(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

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.011046

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.108174

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

612.42

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

612.42

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

612.42

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 63

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 63

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

PHP 1 Estate

(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

(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

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Sumatra West Coast 2

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

0.010841

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

99.737656

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

226.2

(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

3.44

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

218.36

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

4.4

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

226.2

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 64

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 64

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Pundi Kencana Cilegon

(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

(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

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.026

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

105.9705

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

44.76

(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

44.76

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

44.76

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 65

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 65

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SATP Bali (BT)

(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

(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

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-8.742629

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

115.208804

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.12

(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

0.12

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.02

(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

0.02

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 66

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 66

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SATP Cirebon (BT)

(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

(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

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.710916

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

108.567388

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.39

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0.39

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.39

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 67

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 67

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SATP Lombok (BT)

(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

(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

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-8.728141

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

116.072184

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.44

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0.44

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.32

(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

0.32

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.12

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 68

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 68

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SATP Semarang (BT)

(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

(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

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.953121

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

110.427805

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.87

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0.43

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0.44

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.87

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 69

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 69

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

WICA Cikarang

(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

(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

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.311513

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

107.158853

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.04

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

2.04

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.26

(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

1.26

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.78

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 70

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 70

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Padi Indonesia Maju - Serang

(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

(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

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.00587

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.10305

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

12.43

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

12.43

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12.43

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 71

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 71

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

WINA Serang

(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

(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

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.00549

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.11287

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

14.36

(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

14.36

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

14.36

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 72

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 72

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Padi Indonesia Maju - Ngawi

(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

(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

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

☑ Other, please specify :Java - TImor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-7.411991

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

111.479148

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

16.61

(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

16.61

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

16.61

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 73

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 73

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

WILMACO SA

(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

(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

Morocco
☑ Other, please specify :(Africa, North West Coast)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.605584

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-7.571015

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

29.36

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

29.36

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

29.36

(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

29.36

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 74

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 74

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Wilmar SA (Pty) Ltd - Site

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa
☑ Limpopo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-26.165

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

27.7108

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

283.7

(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

283.7

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

78.02

(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

78.02

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

205.69

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 75

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 75

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Wilmar Stockton Ca

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :(California Calaveras)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.9502

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-121.3202

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

28.15

(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

28.15

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

15.45

(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

15.45

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12.69

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 76

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 76

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

CNT-LAP

(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

(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

Viet Nam
☑ Saigon

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

10.604984

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.328554

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

11.4

(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

11.4

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

4.49

(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

4.49

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

6.91

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 77

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 77

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Olivine Industries

(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

(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

Zimbabwe
☑ Zambezi

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-17.852289

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

31.028541

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

71.6

(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

71.6

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

71.6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The coordinates as provided point to the exact location of the site without any aggregation. The site was identified to be located in water-stressed area via WRI's Aqueduct Tool. Those sites which have "Baseline Water Stress (BWS)" more than 40% (high and extremely high risk) will be classified to be under water-stressed areas. The volume of water sourced and discharged was measured using either metering or estimation based on internal calculation when there is no meter available. The water withdrawn was consumed due to evaporation, recycling/reuse or controlled storage for operational use. For those zero volumes, they indicate no water movement depending on the nature and location of the operation. For any change more than 15% as compared to last year, it will be considered as "much higher" or "much lower".

Row 78

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 78

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ZHKBC

(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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.586245

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

114.689234

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3837.92

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

3837.92

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2226.97

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

2226.97

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1610.95

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is a new site that has been acquired within this assessment year.

Row 79

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 78

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SRS Haldia- Site

(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

(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

India

☑ Other, please specify :Yasai

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

22.0578

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

88.0884

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.55

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

2.55

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2.55

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is a new site that has been acquired within this assessment year.

Row 80

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 80

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Delta Wilmar

(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

(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

Ukraine
☑ Other, please specify :Black Sea, North Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

46.632338

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.99377

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

398.24

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

398.24

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

110.53

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

110.53

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

287.71

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is a new site that has been acquired within this assessment year.
[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:
☑ 51-75

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :The volume of water withdrawn is metered and verified when payment is made to third-party water suppliers. The % verified was estimated based on number of sites under water-stressed areas

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 51-75

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :The volume of water withdrawn is metered and verified when payment is made to third-party water suppliers. The % verified was estimated based on number of sites under water-stressed areas

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 26-50

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :All the consumer food factories in China are required to send incoming water samples for official quality tests due to strict food safety standards.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 26-50

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :The volume of water discharged is metered and verified when payment is made to third-party water processors. The % verified was estimated based on number of sites under water-stressed areas.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 26-50

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The volume of water discharged is metered and verified when payment is made to third-party water processors. The % verified was estimated based on number of sites under water-stressed areas.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The volume of water discharged is metered and verified when payment is made to third-party water processors. The % verified was estimated based on number of sites under water-stressed areas.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :All the sites are required to send the discharged water for official quality tests as required by the local authorities under environmental regulations.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The volume of water discharged is metered and verified when payment is made to third-party water processors. The % verified was estimated based on number of sites under water-stressed areas.

[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	70416000000	*411779.84*	*We expect the efficiency to improve with strong revenue growth.*

[Fixed row]

(9.8) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you produce.

Palm oil

(9.8.1) Water intensity information for this produced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.8.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

1

(9.8.3) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.8.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.8.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.8.6) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.8.7) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

☑ Monitor progress against targets

(9.8.8) Please explain

The overall water consumption per ton of FFB processed reduced by about 1% as compared to previous year's intensity and it was mainly driven by reduction initiatives at our palm oil mills across Malaysia, Indonesia, Ghana and Nigeria.

Sugar

(9.8.1) Water intensity information for this produced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.8.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

65.06

(9.8.3) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.8.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.8.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.8.6) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.8.7) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

☑ Monitor progress against targets

(9.8.8) Please explain

The water consumption intensity is based on our Australia's sugar farms data which we actively track against Bonsucro's limit. There has been 10% increase from last year's intensity figure.
[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

Palm oil

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:
☑ No, not currently and we have no plans to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.8) Please explain

For the water intensity for this sourced commodity, it is not an immediate priority and we are focusing to improve the water efficiency across own operations.

Soy

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:
☑ No, not currently and we have no plans to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.8) Please explain

For the water intensity for this sourced commodity, it is not an immediate priority and we are focusing to improve the water efficiency across own operations.

Sugar

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:
☑ No, not currently and we have no plans to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.8) Please explain

For the water intensity for this sourced commodity, it is not an immediate priority and we are focusing to improve the water efficiency across own operations.
[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Crude Palm Oil (CPO) from palm oil mills

(9.12.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

1

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

Ton of Fresh Fruit Bunches (FFBs) processed

(9.12.5) Comment

The unit of numerator is m3 water consumed. The figure is the water consumption intensity for our palm oil mills in Indonesia, Malaysia, Nigeria and Ghana.

Row 2

(9.12.1) Product name

Sugarcane from farms

(9.12.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

65.06

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

Kilogram of sugarcane produced

(9.12.5) Comment

The unit of numerator is kg water consumed. The figure is the water consumption intensity for our sugar farms (irrigated) in Australia.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

(9.13.1) Products contain hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ No

(9.13.2) Comment

Being one of the biggest food companies, we comply with strict food safety regulations in serving our products in global markets. In order to continue supplying safe food products to end consumers, none of our products is flagged to contain hazardous substances.

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years

(9.14.6) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(9.14.7) Please explain

We have not conducted detailed comparison to any reference products in term of water consumption and not able to classify the products that have lower water impact. Currently, we are focusing on water efficiency projects to lower our overall water consumption. With this, we may be able to reduce overall water impact by our products.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

Water pollution

(9.15.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.15.2) Science-based target set in this target category according to SBTN guidance

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.15.2) Science-based target set in this target category according to SBTN guidance

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(9.15.3) Primary reason for not setting a target in this category

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(9.15.4) Explain why you do not have a target set in this category

The organization has not established a science-based target for WASH services under the SBTN framework and does not plan to do so within the next two years.

Other

(9.15.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(9.15.1) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 1

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per unit of production

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

06/28/2023

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/30/2028

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

3

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

4

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

133

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

None, alignment not assessed

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

By the end of 2025, our operations in Indonesia, Malaysia, Ghana and Nigeria achieved a reduction of more than 9% in water consumption intensity compared with the baseline. Water consumption intensity data for each region/country was externally verified by Ernst & Young (EY).

(9.15.1.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Continue to implement water reduction and efficiency initiatives and share successful projects with other regions that are lagging to achieve target.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

No further details.

Row 2

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 3

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Other water withdrawals, please specify :Ensure effluent discharge levels are maintained well within local thresholds for palm oil mills and refineries' discharges to waterways.

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

12/31/1990

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/1990

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/30/2100

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

None, alignment not assessed

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

For our upstream and downstream sites, we monitor biological oxygen demand and chemical oxygen demand levels for both land application and river discharge, to ensure these are maintained within the threshold limits on a continuous basis. This target is an ongoing goal that we strive to achieve annually for all of our operations for different discharge pathways in different regions/countries.

(9.15.1.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Upkeep the robust system of monitoring and effluents from palm oil mills and refineries.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

No further details.
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets?

	Targets in place
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(10.1.1) Provide details of your plastics-related targets.

(10.1.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Plastics target 1

(10.1.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Country/area/region

(10.1.1.3) Category of target & quantitative metric

Plastic packaging

☑ Reduce the total weight of plastic packaging used and/or produced

(10.1.1.4) Date target was set

06/30/2022

(10.1.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(10.1.1.6) Base year figure

0

(10.1.1.7) End date of target

12/31/2025

(10.1.1.8) Target year figure

15000

(10.1.1.9) Reporting year figure

24199

(10.1.1.10) Target status in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(10.1.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

161.32666666666665

(10.1.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

None, alignment not assessed

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(10.1.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target is scoped only for the packaging materials used for our products produced from our China subsidiary, Yihai Kerry Arawana (YKA).

(10.1.1.14) Investment made toward achieving target during the reporting year

0

(10.1.1.16) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

For the reporting year, YKA continued their efforts to reduce material usage by implementing 12 initiatives aimed at lightweighting packaging and the use of eco-friendly materials. The range of measures implemented include formula optimization, material substitution, structural design and process improvement optimization projects. For more details on the packaging reduction initiatives, please refer to pg 77 in YKA SR2025 (link: https://www.yihaikerry.net/admin/upload/2026-05/177935910623100800.pdf). As the projects implemented this year were related to optimization of materials, no further investment was incurred.
[Add 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

(10.2.3) Please explain

Not applicable.

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.3) Please explain

Not applicable.

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.3) Please explain

Not applicable.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

(10.2.3) Please explain

Several of our sites are equipped with melting and moulding facilities to produce plastic packagings for own use.

Usage of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Usage of plastic packaging

Select all that apply
☑ Production/commercialization of goods or products packaged in plastics

(10.2.3) Please explain

We produce goods that require plastic packaging like cooking oil bottles, handles, noodles packaging etc.

Provision of waste management

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.3) Please explain

Not applicable.

Other plastics-related activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.3) Please explain

Not applicable.
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

320000

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Percentage available

☑ % virgin fossil-based content

☑ % virgin renewable content

☑ % pre-consumer recycled content

(10.5.3) % virgin fossil-based content

100

(10.5.4) % virgin renewable content

0

(10.5.5) % pre-consumer recycled content

1.7

(10.5.10) Certification of renewable and/or recycled content

Select from:

☑ No, we have not certified our renewable or recycled content

(10.5.12) Please explain

We collect plastics use data across our operations that are involved with packaging to determine the percentage of renewable plastics used as well as recycled content percentage within our packaging. As of end 2025, 100% of our plastic packaging was fossil-based (not renewable) and around 1.7% of total plastic used was recycled HDPE and PET. There is no third party verification for the reported data.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.2) Is any of your packaging designed in compliance with design for recycling and/or composting guidelines?

(10.5.2.1) Is any of your packaging designed in compliance with design for recycling and/or composting guidelines?

Select from:
☑ Yes, recycling

(10.5.2.2) Select the design guidelines you are in compliance with

Design for recycling guidelines
☑ Local design for recycling guidelines

(10.5.2.3) Provide more detail on the local/regional design for recycling guidelines

Our China (YKA) operations' design is guided by the national standard GB/T 16716 Packaging and the Environment. Similarly for our Goodman Fielder operations in Australia and New Zealand, we comply with all relevant packaging regulations and are align with the Australian Packaging Covenant Organisation (APCO)'s on-pack labelling requirement (Australiasian Recycling Lable Program). We continued to adhere to APCO's Packaging Recyclability Evaluation Portal standards to ensure the accuracy of its packaging recyclability assessment.

(10.5.2.5) % of packaging that is designed for recycling

94.1

(10.5.2.8) Please explain

We consider packaging materials made of the following four plastic types to be recyclable (PET, HDPE, LDPE and PP).
[Fixed row]

(10.5.3) Indicate the reusability and recyclability of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

(10.5.3.1) Percentages available to report

Percentage available

☑ % recyclable in practice and at scale

(10.5.3.3) % of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale

94.1

(10.5.3.4) Assessment tool for recyclability

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Internal assessment based on types of plastic used

(10.5.3.5) Please explain

We consider packaging materials made of the following four plastic types to be recyclable (PET, HDPE, LDPE and PP).
[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: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ Pressure indicators

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
		☑ Other, please specify :Land Use Change Analysis, Species List and RTE status

[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:* ☑ Yes	*Some of our operation areas are near to legally protected areas such as forest reserve. Refer example in 11.4.1*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ No	*N/A*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ No	*N/A*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ No	*N/A*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Two concessions, one each in Malaysia and Indonesia, are located near KBA. Refer detail in 11.4.1.*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*N/A*

[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

☑ Legally protected areas

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category Ia-III

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Tabin Forest Reserve (Class V- Virgin Jungle Reserve) and Tabin Wildlife Reserve (Class VII- Wildlife Reserve), Sabah, Malaysia

(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

The management and monitoring of the High Conservation Value (HCV)-High Carbon Stock (HCS) areas adjacent to the area important for biodiversity is guided by the management and action plan of HCV/conservation area. We actively monitoring the threats of our HCV and its boundary and ensure biodiversity is protected. This approach is applicable to all our HCV/conservation areas in Wilmar operation.

(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

We conducted HCV assessment or integrated HCV-HCS assessment for our operation areas to identify environment and biodiversity sensitive area and identified area is managed as conservation area to protect biodiversity. We implement Best Management Practices in Conservation including regular monitoring for threats and HCV management within our concession to ensure no disturbance/impact to the area important for biodiversity.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category Ia-III

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Kerinci Seblat National Park, Sumatra, Indonesia.

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

The management and monitoring of the High Conservation Value (HCV)-High Carbon Stock (HCS) areas adjacent to the area important for biodiversity is guided by the management and action plan of HCV/conservation area. We actively monitoring the threats of our HCV and its boundary and ensure biodiversity is protected. This approach is applicable to all our HCV/conservation areas in Wilmar operation.

(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

We conducted HCV assessment or integrated HCV-HCS assessment for our operation areas to identify environment and biodiversity sensitive area and identified area is managed as conservation area to protect biodiversity. We implement Best Management Practices in Conservation including regular monitoring for threats and HCV management within our concession to ensure no disturbance/impact to the area important for biodiversity.

[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Business strategy

☑ Supplier compliance with environmental requirements

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ AA1000AS

Forests-related standards

☑ IRF data verification protocol

☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Refer to page 184-186 of Wilmar's Sustainability Report 2025 for the assurance statement with details.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Wilmar SR2025.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Forests

☑ Origins of sourced volume

☑ Traceability data

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ AA1000AS

Forests-related standards

☑ IRF data verification protocol

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Refer to page 184-187 of Wilmar's Sustainability Report 2025 for the assurance statement with details.

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ Water intensities of products and services

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Refer to page 182-183 of Wilmar's Sustainability Report 2025 for the assurance statement with details.
[Add row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Sustainability Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

[Fixed row]