Ingredion Incorporated

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

10/02/2024, 07:59 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Ingredion Incorporated is a Fortune 500 global ingredient solutions company with 2023 net sales of 8.2 billion. We turn corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia, grains, fruits, and vegetables into value-added ingredients and biomaterials for the food, beverage, brewing and other industries. Headquartered in Westchester, IL, Ingredion employs approximately 11,600 people world-wide and operates global manufacturing, R&D and sales offices. Our product lines include starches, both food-grade and industrial based, sweeteners, such as glucose and fructose syrups, stevia, and maltodextrins, plant based proteins, animal feed products, and edible corn oil. Our products are derived primarily from the processing of corn and other starch-based materials, such as tapioca, potato, and rice. We continue to expand our product portfolio through capital investments and acquisitions. We are making investments through our plant-based protein product lines, including pulse-based concentrates, flours and isolates. We believe our approach to production and service, focusing on local management and production improvements of our worldwide operations, provides us with a unique understanding of the cultures and product requirements in each of the geographic markets in which we operate, bringing added value to our customers through innovative solutions. At the same time, our corporate functions allow us to identify synergies and maximize the benefits of our global presence. We have a global network of more than 500 scientists working on research and development in 32 Ingredion Idea Labs innovation centers. Activities include plant science and physical, chemical and biochemical modification to food formulations, food sensory evaluation, and development of non-food applications such as starch-based biopolymers. In addition, we have product application technology centers that direct our product development teams worldwide to create product application solutions to better serve the ingredient needs of our customers. Our people are our strength. We take pride in continuing to be recognized by reputable third parties as an *employer of choice, leading and operating with a purpose, making values-based decisions, and creating positive change in global communities. In 2023, Ingredion was recognized by Fortune magazine for the 14th consecutive year as one of the World's Most Admired Companies. We are proud to be included on the Bloomberg Gender-Equality Index for the fifth consecutive year and, for the second consecutive year, have earned a near-perfect score on the Human Rights Campaign Corporate Equality Index. These distinguished awards and rankings are recognition and validation for our ongoing efforts to live our purpose and values. In 2023, Ingredion published its 13th annual sustainability report and our third DEI Report, which highlight progress made across all programs in our All Life sustainability platform. From electricity sourcing to water use, we have committed to using science in the setting of our targets. Our carbon reduction targets were developed using the Science Based Target initiative (SBTi) methodology, which was validated in 2022 as aligned with a well-below two degrees Celsius pathway. Our strategy to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions includes several pathways including site energy efficiency improvements, conversion from coal to natural gas, renewable biomass energy, biogas utilization from anaerobic wastewater treatment, on-site solar, and renewable electricity procurement. We have led productive, company-wide conversations around other environmental impact reduction objectives, as well as collaboration with our customers around supply chain (Scope 3) emissions. We have worked significantly to divert waste from landfill, including 13 facilities at zero-waste status. Better understanding the ways to measure and reduce the carbon emissions of our agricultural suppliers is another way we're striving to reduce our overall environmental impact. We continue to work with our agricultural and non-agricultural suppliers to improve sustainability across our supply chain and deliver on the expectations of our stakeholders. We use Sustainable Agriculture Initiative ("SAI") Platform protocols to evaluate where we source crops and for our goals of sustainable agriculture. Ingredion is committed to operating with integrity and maintaining high ethical standards everywhere we do business. We recognize the rights of all people to fair and decent work, clean water, and to be treated with dignity and respect. As a signatory to the Global Compact, we are committed to aligning our global operations with universally recognized principles on human rights, labor, anti- corruption, and the environment.*

[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ 1 year

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

Select from:

☑ 1 year

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

Select from:

☑ 1 year

[Fixed row]

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

8200000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

US4571871023

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Peru

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Mexico

☑ Germany

☑ Colombia

☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Thailand
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan

(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	

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pakistan 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.422838

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

73.112584

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Faisalabad

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 16

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

47.0864

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-119.1171

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Moses Lake

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Thailand 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

12.776944

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.706944

(1.8.1.4) Comment

BKD

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mexico 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

20.400967

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-99.989156

(1.8.1.4) Comment

San Juan del Rio

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Brazil 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-8.248388

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-34.995039

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Cabo

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Peru 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-12.014624

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.889944

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Lima

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.775

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.822

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argo

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Canada 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.923197

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.192858

(1.8.1.4) Comment

London

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.476743

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.232979

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Belcamp

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 9

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.197178

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-119.173333

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Oxnard

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.969023

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-91.666445

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Cedar Rapids

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 4

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.468346

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-112.054355

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Idaho Falls

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 11

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

46.337314

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-119.264514

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Richland

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Colombia 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

3.462246

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.498565

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Cali

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 6

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.565708

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-89.728395

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Mapleton

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Thailand 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

16.565212

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.664254

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Kalasin

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Brazil 4

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-22.359547

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-46.920061

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Mogi Guacu

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Colombia 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

4.703715

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.927055

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Cartago

Row 24

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pakistan 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.375292

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

73.40045

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Cornwala

Row 25

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 7

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.941467

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.065868

(1.8.1.4) Comment

North Charleston

Row 26

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Brazil 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-22.81688

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-43.007988

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Alcantara

Row 27

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 15

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

46.76597

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-67.8471

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Fort Fairfield

Row 28

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 12

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.98046

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.000249

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Salem

Row 29

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Thailand 4

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

14.91466

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.70114

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Sikhiu

Row 30

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mexico 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

19.54756

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-99.203423

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Tlalnepantla

Row 31

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pakistan 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.349867

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

68.300425

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Mehran

Row 32

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 13

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.431262

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-96.425604

(1.8.1.4) Comment

South Sioux City

Row 33

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 10

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.4564

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-89.549

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Plover

Row 34

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Brazil 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-25.575692

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-49.646633

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Balsa Nova

Row 36

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

China 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.024911

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

121.272804

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Shanghai

Row 37

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 5

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.744025

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.174849

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Indianapolis

Row 39

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Colombia 4

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.811006

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.761414

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Sabanagrande

Row 40

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

China 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.191556

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

116.460134

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Shandong

Row 42

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Canada 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.785728

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.375433

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Cardinal

Row 43

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 8

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.127315

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-94.572405

(1.8.1.4) Comment

North Kansas City

Row 44

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Thailand 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

14.017771

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

100.136924

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Banglen

Row 45

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Colombia 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.856658

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.77729

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Barranquilla

Row 46

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Germany 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.542672

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

10.029786

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Hamburg

Row 47

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mexico 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

20.661283

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-103.367269

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Guadalajara

Row 48

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

US 14

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.032248

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.228682

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Winston-Salem

Row 50

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

UK 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.69732

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

0.86921

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Goole

Row 51

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Germany 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.511588

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

53.822271

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Wesenberg

Row 52

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Malaysia 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

2.737602

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.764185

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Enstek

Row 53

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

China 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.896912

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

115.053069

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Ganzhou

Row 56

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Canada 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.9936

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-106.9861

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Vanscoy

Row 57

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

India 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

72.5714

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

23.0025

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Ahmedabad

Row 58

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

India 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

73.7898

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

19.9975

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Nashik
[Add row]

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

Production

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

Select from:

☑ Value chain (excluding own land)

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

Select from:

☑ Do not own/manage land

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

Crops processed at our facilities are supplied from non-Ingredion owned land. IIngredion has a small farm used for specialty and research seeding activities but is not a significant part of our footprint or supply shed.

Processing/ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

Distribution

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify

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

Our global facilities track and report consumption of fuel wood on an energy basis (lower heating value). The total fuel consumption is converted to a mass basis using a specific heat conversion factor of 11.38 GJ per metric tonne of wood. Total energy consumed in 2023 was 2,439,910 GJ (lhv).

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Sawn timber, veneer, chips

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

We have four facilities that use biomass as the primary source of fuel energy - one located in the eastern United States and three in Brazil. Biomass represents
[Fixed row]

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

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ 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:

☑ 71-80%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

Corn, primarily yellow dent, is the primary basic raw material we use to produce starches and sweeteners. We contract directly with growers for some of our specialty grains such as waxy and high amylose corn. In other cases, we purchase corn as a commodity through brokers and do not have direct contact with growers. Corn comprises approximately 74% of our crop usage globally, while cassava makes up an additional 8%. The remaining 18% is comprised of multiple crops such as potato, rice, pulses, stevia, and blueberries, etc.

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

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

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 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

Cassava root (ie. tapioca) is sourced from growers and used to produce tapioca starches at our manufacturing locations in Thailand, Brazil and Colombia. Cassava comprises approximately 8% of our crop usage globally while corn is the majority at 74%. The remaining 18% is comprised of multiple crops such as potatos, pulses, and stevia. Pulses are used to make protein isolates flours and concentrates at our manufacturing locations in Canada and the United States. Pulses are primarily sourced through brokers and are grown in the Canadian prairies Montana and small volumes throughout the Midwest US. We are actively evaluating sourcing directly with producers as well as sourcing additional volume from the midwest United States to support our US operations. Stevia leaves are sourced from growers and used to make natural high intensity sweeteners at our manufacturing locations in Asia Pacific and South American regions. Stevia leaves are primarily sourced directly from farmers in China. All our stevia leaves originate from a closed loop control program where we use our own varieties from our multiyear program of varietal development in our Stevia Agriculture RD program. This closed loop process ensures Ingredion is able to consistently produce natural best tasting high intensity sweeteners. Potato starch recovered from potato processors is used to make our finished product starches at manufacturing locations in the USA.
[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders relevant and included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

As part of our regenerative program, we map our agricultural suppliers back to a farm level. This mapping includes smallhold farmers. For non-agricultural suppliers, we currently map suppliers to a Tier 1 level.
[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 :Direct Operations, Supply Chain

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

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

[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)

5

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

Our Business Continuity Plan (BCP) risk assessment process considers climate related risks from weather events, floods, and disruption of raw material supply and transportation. This approach and the time horizons are integrated through the BCP with other business risks.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

(2.1.3) To (years)

25

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

Our Business Continuity Plan (BCP) risk assessment process considers climate related risks from weather events, floods, and disruption of raw material supply and transportation. This approach and the time horizons are integrated through the BCP with other business risks.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

26

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

99

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

Our Business Continuity Plan (BCP) risk assessment process considers climate related risks from weather events, floods, and disruption of raw material supply and transportation. This approach and the time horizons are integrated through the BCP with other business risks.
[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:	*Select from:*

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	☑ Yes	☑ 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

☑ 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

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ SEDEX

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Materiality assessment

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

☑ Heat waves

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

Chronic physical

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Water stress

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

At a corporate level, we use an Ensemble Tool comprised of multiple models, including WRI Aqueduct current Baseline Water Stress, WWF current Water Depletion, and WWF Basin Risk projected change in drought and flood occurrence. The ensemble tool assesses various aspects of water risk, at our operating facilities, surrounding communities, and agricultural supply chain. Scenarios including both current water stress and predicted changes in water stress to 2040, as well as predicted changes for the 2 degree C climate change scenario. To ensure our materiality aligns with our customers and investors we use external guidance material from sources such as the UN SDG's, CDP, GRI, and SAI as considerations. At a local level we conduct a biennial internal water survey for sites to assess water risk at each of our facilities. Furthermore, each site is required to ensure their operations protect baseline water quality by ensuring that effluent streams are properly managed and treated to the required quality objectives set forth by local regulators. Influent water quality, and access to WASH services for all employees is *integrated in our global safety and quality systems. Each facility complies with policies which require monitoring the quality of water inputs to ensure safe, clean, sanitized water for employee and product safety requirements. By assessing the capabilities to meet withdrawal and discharge quality objectives our sites have the information to identify a future risk mitigation strategy. Ingredion considers customer and supply chain impacts due to potential disruptions in the transportation system in business continuity risk assessments. Flooding may preclude railroads operations or delay truck deliveries. The business continuity risk assessments consider the probability and likelihood of occurrence and the severity of the impact to customers. We use the WWF Water Risk Filter to map the key supplier/grower locations to understand specific water stress and ecosystem stressors. We assess agricultural supplier water usage through the SAI Platform's Farm Sustainability Assessment to understand where we have water-related risks with growers, so we can implement programs to help address them*

Row 6

(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

☑ Risks

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ Preferred by Nature Sourcing Hub

International methodologies and standards

☑ Global Forest Watch

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Other, please specify :WWF Biodiversity Risk Factor

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Wildfires

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

☑ Changes to national legislation

Reputation

☑ Stigmatization of sector

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

In 2023, Ingredion conducted a preliminary forest risk assessment with the help of a consultant. The process involved reviewing historic supplier data (actual and proxy) for the regions where we source timber fuel and conducting a risk profile for each region. Our assessment is currently ongoing and will culminate in a supplier engagement survey to better understand specific risks and opportunities present in our supply chain. Our risk analysis was completed using an assortment of tools *including the WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter and WRI Global Forest Watch Resources. Using these robust tools and data inputs we were able to identify top risks relating to Acute Physical, Chronic Physical, Regulatory, and Reputational/Markets. The output of the risk assessment, and subsequent supplier engagement surveys, will be used to refine our strategy relating to timber biofuel sourcing.*

Row 7

(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

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ Internal company methods

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Heat waves

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

Chronic physical

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

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

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We seek to be aware of and mitigate potential risks (including those related to the environment, climate change and energy) in our direct manufacturing operations, in upstream activities related to raw material supply and government regulations, and in our downstream supply chain potentially impacting our customers. We utilize a Business Continuity Plan (BCP) risk assessment process with a consistent risk prioritization ranking based on likelihood, severity and existing controls. A substantive impact would include the inability to supply product to our customers and, therefore, we identify operating scenarios that could impact our ability to serve our customers. The BCP considers short-term risk (0-5 years) medium-term risk (6-25 years) and long-term risk (26–99 years). Climate change risks assessed through the BCP include operational disruptions due to weather events, raw material supply and transportation (i.e., supply chain and commodity impacts), and inability to meet customer demand. In addition, the BCP is supplemented with knowledge attained from various models, including water availability risk assessments at our manufacturing facilities, the WWF Water Risk Filter to understand water stress in our key supplier/grower locations, agricultural supplier water usage through the SAI Platform's Farm Sustainability Assessment. As part of a broader understanding of measuring risk in our operations and supply chain we conducted a risk assessment with S&P Global Climanomics Climate Risk Analytics platform which provided insights into annual losses due to climate-related expenses and decreased revenue/business interruption. Corrective actions / risk mitigation plans are required for all "high" level RPNs calculated in the BCP, including for substantive climate-related risks. With our agricultural suppliers, we continue to work with SAI and Field-to-Market to identify areas of vulnerability and drive improvements in farming practices that reduce environmental impacts. For risk reduction opportunities with a substantive impact, projects are evaluated with respect to business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability (including achieving company goals), and employee development/ engagement. Prioritized projects are selected for funding and implementation. As an example of the process, a physical climate-related case study assessed in the BCP for our direct operations is the loss of electricity due to rolling blackouts caused by heavy demand to extreme temperatures. Potential responses include self-generation of electricity (Co-Gen, solar/wind), *moving production to other plants in the network, increased use of tollers, or short-term use of diesel generators. Ingredion's energy teams and R&D group are constantly assessing reliable sources of energy. If the RPN for the rolling black-out (or any) scenario is calculated as "high", the potential alternatives would be moved forward for a complete engineering evaluation and costs/benefit analysis with selection of the project that solves the issue with an appropriate return on investment, as applicable.*

Row 8

(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

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter

Other

☑ External consultants

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

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

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

With our 2030 All Life plan, Ingredion is focused on having a net positive impact on sustainability, particularly in our agricultural supply chain. As a starting point, we mapped our global operations and crop sourcing against the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund's (CEPF) 36 global biodiversity hotspots. This helped us identify six areas around the globe where we operate or source agricultural material that are at particular risk for biodiversity loss. From there, we sought to better understand the growers in our supply chain, particularly how they viewed biodiversity and its impacts to their farms. Ingredion uses the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform's (SAI Platform) Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) to evaluate and confirm the sustainable practices of our growers. The FSA includes over 100 questions,

including some around biodiversity. Now that Ingredion has assessed nearly half of our Tier 1 priority crop farmers using the FSA, we are in a position better understand the biodiversity considerations of our agricultural supply chain. For more information on Ingredion's work with growers, please see the Sustainable and Regenerative Agriculture section of this report. As part of our collaboration with the University of Rutgers MBS Externship Exchange Program, our company is assigned a team of students who work on a real-life project to help further our sustainability agenda. In 2022, we focused that project on biodiversity. Our student team evaluated the primary biodiversity impacts in Ingredion's agricultural supply chain and identified local and global NGOs working in those geographies that could further support Ingredion's efforts to have a net positive impact on local biodiversity. As part of the output from our Rutgers project, the student team developed a matrix to help Ingredion understand biodiversity risk causes and where geographically in our supply chain they have the biggest impact relative to sourcing volumes. This work will help us determine prioritization as we start to roll out continual improvement practices with our growers.
[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

At Ingredion, we approach our sustainability program with three themes: Everyday Life, Planet Life and Connected Life. Everyday Life focuses on human beings and making sure our processes and innovations don't come at the expense of product and people safety, human rights and diversity, equity and inclusion. Planet Life is focused on our sourcing, processing and operations as they relate to environmental impact and biodiversity. Connected Life is concerned with sustainable and regenerative agriculture, food security and community impact. We continuously work to advance the progress we make through these three lenses, both for our own sustainability goals and to help our customers meet theirs. We believe that our innovation efforts need to align with our efforts to reduce food waste, which is why our sustainability program includes a focus on promoting circularity. Not only is this good for the environment, but it is also good business. Market trends show that consumers have a growing interest in circularity as well as regenerative agriculture. In support of this, we are seeing increasing interest from our customers in ingredients made with circularity in mind. An example of the interconnection between sustainability and supply chain can be seen in our significant investment in regenerative agriculture. Sustainable and regenerative agriculture continue to be among the most common topics of discussion in sustainability engagements with our customers and other stakeholders. We continue to see many consumer-facing companies put an emphasis on sustainably sourced ingredients, leveraging continued consumer demand for sustainable products. At Ingredion, our work in this area is not only about helping our customers meet their sustainability aspirations, but also about working with our growers to support a more climate-resilient supply chain. We understand that we have an obligation to work with our grower partners across the world to support sustainable and regenerative farming.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

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

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

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

As the complexity around biodiversity planning for corporations has increased, we have sought tools and mechanisms to further our understanding of possible biodiversity considerations in the geographies where we operate. In 2023, we assessed the geographies of our global manufacturing operations using the World Wildlife Fund's (WWF) Biodiversity Risk Filter. The Biodiversity Risk Filter assesses the state of biodiversity related issues, as well as external pressures that may impact them, using 33 distinct indicators. These include items such as wild flora and fauna, soil condition, ecosystem condition, herbicide resistance, tropical cyclones, landslides and tree cover loss. Like others we use to assess water stress or labor risks, these tools help narrow our focus so we can use more in-depth means to evaluate areas for further investigation. Having insights from the WWF tool allows us to compare against farm-level results received from our growers using the SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA). While the alignment between the tools is not a perfect overlap, the FSA provides a great next level of information. From there, we can engage our growers directly with questions about their practices or information to help them make more environmentally sound decisions. In 2023, SAI Platform commissioned a study to evaluate whether or not the FSA meets the requirements of EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD). It found that evaluations at FSA Silver and Gold level could meet the requirements of CSDDD, provided the specific questions answered covered *the requirements of CSDDD. The environmental criteria of CSDDD also include biodiversity and ecosystems, further supporting Ingredion's use of the FSA as a means to enhance their knowledge of activity in operating geographies and supply chain. Water is a critical resource for our operations and we are committed to responding to current and future water risks in the communities where we operate. Our global operations network has a Manufacturing Excellence team that identifies best practices in our operational routines, equipment and technologies then shares these learnings across our global organization so they can be quickly adopted. We identified Mexico as an extremely high-water stress region that needs strong focus. In the previous decade, our Mexico team already executed on the easier opportunities to reduce water use intensity.*

(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:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For risk reduction opportunities with a substantive impact, projects are evaluated with respect to business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability, and employee development/engagement. Prioritized projects are selected for funding and implementation. In addition, we monitor proceedings which have the potential to result in the adoption or amendment of regulations, policies, and directives. Changes to government regulations, policies and directives are monitored through subscription services, trade associations and consultant newsletters/alerts. The Global Operations Sustainability Council meets at least quarterly to review the sustainability strategy, metrics, and action plans for the company's global operations. Through its monthly meetings, the Operations Leadership Team (OLT) assesses exposure to operational hazards, including those related to climate change, through internal management systems, including the BCP, and additional processes that are aligned with global standards. The OLT, led by the Sr. VP, Global Operations (a member of the company Executive Leadership Team) includes senior global leaders from: EHS&Sustainability, Operations, Supply Chain, Engineering, Finance, Legal, and Procurement. An example of a substantive impact would be a facility needing to curtail production due to lack of water or agricultural raw material availability due to climate change. In our environmental management system, we define disruption to operations of greater than seven days as high severity. The current probability of this occurring is ranked as unlikely (i.e., has not occurred or may be anticipated to occur less than once/year). This would also result in an impact to our customers if we were to be unable to supply product to them.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For risk reduction opportunities with a substantive impact, projects are evaluated with respect to business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability, and employee development/engagement. Prioritized projects are selected for funding and implementation. In addition, we monitor proceedings which have the potential to result in the adoption or amendment of regulations, policies, and directives. Changes to government regulations, policies and directives are monitored through subscription services, trade associations and consultant newsletters/alerts. The Global Operations Sustainability Council meets at least quarterly to review the sustainability strategy, metrics, and action plans for the company's global operations. Through its monthly meetings, the Operations Leadership Team (OLT) assesses exposure to operational hazards, including those related to climate change, through internal management systems, including the BCP, and additional processes that are aligned with global standards. The OLT, led by the Sr. VP, Global Operations (a member of the company Executive Leadership Team) includes senior global leaders from: EHS&Sustainability, Operations, Supply Chain, Engineering, Finance, Legal, and Procurement. An example of a substantive opportunity is to work collectively within our supply chain, from farms to customers, to reduce the environmental impact of our agricultural raw materials.

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Production capacity

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For risk reduction opportunities with a substantive impact, projects are evaluated with respect to business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability, and employee development/engagement. Prioritized projects are selected for funding and implementation. In addition, we monitor proceedings which have the potential to result in the adoption or amendment of regulations, policies, and directives. Changes to government regulations, policies and directives are monitored through subscription services, trade associations and consultant newsletters/alerts. The Global Operations Sustainability Council meets at least quarterly to review the sustainability strategy, metrics, and action plans for the company's global operations. Through its monthly meetings, the Operations Leadership Team (OLT) assesses exposure to operational hazards, including those related to climate change, through internal management systems, including the BCP, and additional processes that are aligned with global standards. The OLT, led by the Sr. VP, Global Operations (a member of the company Executive Leadership Team) includes senior global leaders from: EHS&Sustainability, Operations, Supply Chain, Engineering, Finance, Legal, and Procurement. An example of a substantive impact would be a facility needing to curtail production due to lack of water or agricultural raw material availability due to climate change. In our environmental management system, *we define disruption to operations of greater than seven days as high severity. The current probability of this occurring is ranked as unlikely (i.e., has not occurred or may be anticipated to occur less than once/year). This would also result in an impact to our customers if we were to be unable to supply product to them.*

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Direct operating costs

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For risk reduction opportunities with a substantive impact, projects are evaluated with respect to business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability, and employee development/engagement. Prioritized projects are selected for funding and implementation. In addition, we monitor proceedings which have the potential to result in the adoption or amendment of regulations, policies, and directives. Changes to government regulations, policies and directives are monitored through subscription services, trade associations and consultant newsletters/alerts. The Sustainability Council meets at least quarterly to review the sustainability strategy, metrics, and action plans for the company's global operations. Through its monthly meetings, the Operations Leadership Team (OLT) assesses exposure to operational hazards, including those related to climate change, through internal management systems, including the BCP, and additional processes that are aligned with global standards. The OLT, led by the Sr. VP, Global Operations (a member of the company Executive Leadership Team) and includes senior global leaders from: EHSS, Sustainability, Regional Operations, Supply Chain, Engineering, Finance, and Procurement An example of a substantive impact would be a facility needing to curtail production due to lack of water or agricultural raw material availability due to climate change. In our environmental management system, we define disruption to operations of greater than seven days as high severity. The current probability of this occurring is ranked as unlikely (i.e., has not occurred or may be anticipated to occur less than once/year). This would also result in an impact to our customers if we were to be unable to supply product to them.

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Capital allocation

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For risk reduction opportunities with a substantive impact, projects are evaluated with respect to business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability, and employee development/engagement. Prioritized projects are selected for funding and implementation. In addition, we monitor proceedings which have the potential to result in the adoption or amendment of regulations, policies, and directives. Changes to government regulations, policies and directives are monitored through subscription services, trade associations and consultant newsletters/alerts. The Global Operations Sustainability Council meets at least quarterly to review the sustainability strategy, metrics, and action plans for the company's global operations. Through its monthly meetings, the Operations Leadership Team (OLT) assesses exposure to operational hazards, including those related to climate change, through internal management systems, including the BCP, and additional processes that are aligned with global standards. The OLT, led by the Sr. VP, Global Operations (a member of the company Executive Leadership Team) includes senior global leaders from: EHS&Sustainability, Operations, Supply Chain, Engineering, Finance, Legal, and Procurement. An example of a substantive impact would be a facility needing to curtail production due to lack of water or agricultural raw material availability due to climate change. In our environmental management system, we define disruption to operations of greater than seven days as high severity. The current probability of this occurring is ranked as unlikely (i.e., has not occurred or may be anticipated to occur less than once/year). This would also result in an impact to our customers if we were to be unable to supply product to them.

[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

Ingredion performs a multipronged assessment to identify water pollutants. At a local level, each of our manufacturing facilities have qualified EHS&S professionals who assess the impact of jurisdictional regulatory requirements and report up corporately through segment level EHS&S Directors. At a global level, our Global Water/Wastewater Engineering Excellence team provides support to all sites in water/wastewater materiality. In addition to having membership from our local

manufacturing facilities, participation includes members of our global EHS&S teams. The Engineering Excellence team identifies and classifies hazards that are common across our sites. Our teams will also utilize external trade associations (such as the Corn Refiners Association), and consultancy services to assist in identifying and classifying pollutants. An example of a guiding policy we will use is from our Canadian sites, which are required to comply with the Provincial Water Quality Objectives (PWQO) which establishes water quality criteria and thresholds for pollutants. A metric defined by the PWQO that is material to our operations is Phosphorous – sites must ensure these limits are met to avoid adversely impacting the receiving waterway. These metrics are also reflected on the facility's operational permit.
[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

Discharge of organic material from waste effluents can lead to a reduction of dissolved oxygen (DO) in the receiving watercourse, thus leading to destruction/harm of the local water environment. Organic wastes are measured as Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) or Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD). COD/BOD waste is created through many different pathways such as; spills and leaks, non-condensable residues from the evaporation process, equipment cleaning/sanitization processes, and from process filtration backwashes.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Resource recovery

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

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Ingredion requires all sites to comply with local regulatory requirements as it relates to process wastewater discharges. Many Ingredion facilities have on-site primary, secondary, and/or tertiary treatment facilities to ensure discharged COD is within regulatory requirements. Ingredion has also initiated a sustainability goal to reduce COD discharges from the process by 10% vs a 2019 base year. Improving the resource recovery efficiency of an operations will reduce the COD loading from the facility.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Nitrates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Nitrogen is a macronutrient for corn and adequate Nitrogen availability is critical to reach optimal yield potential. Nitrogen is broken down to nitrate ions that are taken up by the plant. However, when the availability of nitrogen compounds exceed consumption by the plants, excess nitrogen carries into the environment and can cause a rapid increase in algal blooms which deplete oxygen in water and can create costal dead zones. Nitrogen is also emitted into the atmosphere from the housing, storage, and spreading of synthetic fertilizers and it acts as a base for emissions of nitrous oxide (a greenhouse gas).

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

As part of our overall regenerative agriculture program, Ingredion works with our stakeholders to promote practices that increase the resiliency of our farmers and our agricultural supply chain. As a founding member of SAI Platform's regenerative agriculture program, we continue to work as part of an industry team building and shaping a regenerative agriculture standard for the food and beverage industry. We see this alignment as critical to progressing against our goals. As an example: in

2022, Ingredion partnered with Unilever and fertilizer manufacturer Yara on a program to optimize fertilizer use to reduce CO2e emissions and maximize grower yields. Growers in five locations were provided with tailored fertilizer programs meant to optimize the timing and type of fertilizer used on their corn fields. The purpose of the custom plan is to allow growers to reduce the amount of fertilizer used by reducing losses due to volatilization and denitrification. This will allow level-to-increased yields versus typical practices while maintaining input margins for the growers. Based upon the data from the trial locations, growers using the new fertilizer products saw a 27.5% reduction of CO2e and a 10.3% yield increase vs baseline fields. Information learned in 2022 has helped Ingredion identify specific fertilizer programs to target for a larger scale rollout in 2023.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

(3.1.3) Please explain

In 2023, Ingredion conducted a preliminary forest risk assessment for our timber biofuel products. The process involved reviewing historic supplier data (actual and proxy) for the regions where we source timber and conducting a risk profile. Upon completion, this assessment will guide future strategic activities around managing specific risks

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:

☑ Evaluation in progress

(3.1.3) Please explain

Ingredion has yet to perform a plastics related risk analysis impact on our business.
[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

Chronic physical

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Brazil

☑ Canada

☑ Mexico

☑ Germany

☑ Colombia

☑ Thailand

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Ingredion relies on locally grown agricultural products as feed stocks to our processes. Extreme weather and natural disasters within or outside the United States, such as drought, wildfires, storms, changes in ocean currents and flooding, could make it more difficult and costly for us to manufacture and deliver our products to our customers, obtain raw materials from our suppliers, or perform other critical corporate functions. In particular, if such climate change impacts negatively affect agricultural productivity, we may be subject to decreased availability or less favorable pricing from certain commodities that are necessary for our products, such as corn, specialty grains, rice, stevia, peas and sugar. Adverse weather conditions and natural disasters could reduce crop size and crop quality, which could reduce our supplies of raw materials, lower recoveries of usable raw materials, increase the prices of our raw materials, increase our costs of storing and transporting raw materials, or disrupt production schedules.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ 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

If such climate change impacts negatively affect agricultural productivity, we may be subject to decreased availability or less favorable pricing from certain commodities that are necessary for our products, such as corn, specialty grains, rice, stevia, peas and sugar. Adverse weather conditions and natural disasters could reduce crop size and crop quality, which could reduce our supplies of raw materials, lower recoveries of usable raw materials, increase the prices of our raw materials, increase our costs of storing and transporting raw materials, or disrupt production schedules.

(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 in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Sustainable and regenerative agriculture continue to be among the most common topics of discussion in sustainability engagements with our customers and other stakeholders. We continue to see many consumer-facing companies put an emphasis on sustainably sourced ingredients, leveraging continued consumer demand for sustainable products. At Ingredion, our work in this area is not only about helping our customers meet their sustainability aspirations, but also about working with our growers to support a more climate-resilient supply chain. We understand that we have an obligation to work with our grower partners across the world to support sustainable and regenerative farming.

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

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Panuco

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

This site has been identified as being High or Extremely High risk utilizing our ensemble risk tool methodology; accounts for 5% of our global production by volume; In 2023, this facility represented approximately 15% of our global production volume. Increased water stress may increase the site's operating costs primarily due to increased cost of water supply. While this may impact site operating costs, it is not expected to have a substantial financial impact on the overall company. Operating costs with respect to water increased in 2023 primarily related to increased production rates.

(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:

☑ Unlikely

(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

If the site were unable to meet all the water supply needs from the on-site water wells, water could be purchased from third party suppliers.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

756000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

If the site were unable to meet all the water supply needs from the on-site water wells, water could be purchased from third party suppliers. It is estimated that the cost to obtain water from third party suppliers could increase operating costs by approximately 756,000/year. This figure assumes transportation of water using water trucks and was calculated assuming that truck value replaced 20% of the water withdrawal volume for 2023 (581,100 m3), and the average cost of water delivered by truck is 1.30 per m3. The calculation is 581,100 X 1.30 755,950.

(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

10000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Projects at this site are being evaluated to: 1. Increase the percentage of recovered water for reuse 2. Longer-term achieve zero discharge. Cost estimates for these strategies are based on preliminary engineering evaluations, implementation of similar projects at other facilities, and in accordance with our capital strategic planning guidelines. The 10,000,000 cost of response estimate is based on engineering estimates of capital expenditures required to upgrade wastewater treatment facilities to treat water to a level that it can be recycled and used in cooling towers and non-food related processes. This would reduce water use. As Ingredion begins implementation of its 2030 Sustainability target to reduce our water use intensity by 30% in all extremely high-stress geographies where we manufacture, including this site, it is likely that additional treatment capacity for this facility will occur within the next ten years.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The company would deploy several risk control strategies depending on the types and magnitude of risk posed. To address increased operating costs, the site will continue their continuous improvement strategies around water efficiency, water re-use, recycling and conservation practices and request capital to expand the wastewater treatment plant to facilitate additional treatment and recycle of treated wastewater in non-food related processes. In addition, we continue to research new technologies, including zero liquid discharge strategies, which would allow treatment of wastewater to a level that would be acceptable for reuse in food production. Acceptance by both regulators and customers will also be needed to deploy this strategy. These response actions are in line with the UN Sustainable Development Goal 6 - Clean Water and Sanitation.
[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

Mexico

☑ Panuco

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The facility represents approximately 14% of our global production volume.
[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?

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*In 2023, Ingredion was not subject to any substantive fines/enforcement orders/ penalties*

[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
☑ Canada federal Output Based Pricing System (OBPS) - ETS
☑ EU ETS

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

Canada federal OBPS - ETS

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

1.5

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2024

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2024

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

12243

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

2437

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

135000

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Scope 2 emissions are not taxed in this program.

EU ETS

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

0.8

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

18161

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

2100

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

20177

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

One facility.
[Fixed row]

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

Our strategy is to utilize existing residual or banked allowances, incorporate carbon pricing into business decisions, reduce CO2e through energy efficiency and other projects such as fuel switching, and purchase allowances as necessary. We also look to take advantage of government grants/incentives that are offered from the proceeds from carbon market auctions. In general, carbon pricing is being incorporated into business decisions at the local level and we recognize that free allowances issued various programs will gradually be reduced. The cost of carbon allowances to cover Scope 1 emissions has led us to explore alternate options (such as biogas, increasing purchased electricity from low carbon sources, or combusting lower carbon fuels).

(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:*

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Other resource efficiency opportunity, please specify :Reduced energy use 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

☑ India

☑ Canada

☑ Germany

☑ Colombia

☑ Pakistan

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Ingredion has a publicly stated goal to reduce our Scope 1 and 2 GHG footprint by 28% by 2030. Energy efficiency will be a critical driver for achieving our CO2 reductions. INGREDION PERFORMANCE SYSTEM (IPS) is the implementation of standard tools and routines for operations processes that apply best practices that enable continuous improvement of our operation leading to energy, water and waste optimization. IPS implementation is progressing across our global sites to become the standard way of working.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ High

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

Each 1% reduction in process energy use intensity results in savings in our energy purchases. Energy costs represent approximately 8% of our cost of sales. Ingredion has a publicly stated goal to reduce our Scope 1 and 2 GHG footprint by 28% by 2030. Energy efficiency will be a critical driver for achieving our CO2 reductions while potentially delivering cost savings.

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

0

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

4133000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

4.13MM is the approximate cost savings realized from energy reduction/ continuous improvement initiatives for the 7 year period from 2023 to 2030 resulting in 1% energy savings per year. The number was calculated by multiplying the energy savings 1% per year X 7 years by the 2023 average cost for energy (% per energy use). Additional cost reductions can be anticipated in the future with installation of more energy efficient equipment.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

8260000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Ingredion has consistently achieved energy reductions primarily related to continuous improvement efficiency initiatives which require low capital requirements. Our financial costs were calculated assuming an average payback period of two year. Two years was chosen to account for both zero/low capital projects, as well as capital investments for larger projects.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our global engineering and Continuous Improvement teams regularly shares best practices for energy use and monitoring. Energy savings ideas can be scaled up and have a global impact. Furthermore, we will continue to drive energy improvements as we adopt more advanced monitoring software and replacement of older equipment with more energy efficient equipment.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Other markets opportunity, please specify **:**Sustainable sourcing of woody biomass for use as a fuel (in steam boilers) will reduce fossil fuel consumption and lower Scope 1 CO_2 emissions.

(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

☑ Brazil

☑ Colombia

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Ingredion has a GHG reduction target to reduce Scope 1 & 2 emissions by 28% by 2030 which includes biogenic emissions. An element of our strategy considers increasing alternative fuels in place of fossil fuels as energy sources. The technical experience required to execute this opportunity exists in our organization as biomass is currently used in two facilities for the purposes of generating steam. Investment in biomass boilers at other facilities would be possible if sustainable sourced biomass is available in the market, there was a net climate benefit, and the project is not cost-prohibitive.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Energy prices fluctuate globally. In certain markets the cost of fuel wood offers significant savings compared to traditional fuel sources such as coal and gas. While biomass boilers require an initial capital investment, operating costs will be lower if the fuel wood is much lower. Furthermore, the project would significantly reduce scope 1 emissions at a facility, which could lead to further operational savings in a carbon tax environment.

(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

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(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

☑ China

☑ Colombia

☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Mexico
☑ Germany
☑ Pakistan
☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Eastmain
☑ Ebro

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Reducing water consumption in our process has the potential to reduce our operating costs. We use a project prioritization scoring system to define opportunities with a substantive impact. The scoring system includes metrics on business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability (including achieving company goals), and employee development/engagement. Our continuous improvement teams continually seek opportunities to reduce water consumption, which in turn has a positive cost impact. Many of these opportunities include behavioral changes, employee awareness and operational changes to improve production efficiency.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:
☑ Likely (66–100%)

(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

Every 1% reduction in process water use intensity results in savings up to approximately 1,140,000 annually when considering purchase, pumping, preparation, and subsequent wastewater treatment costs.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

7980000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Each 1% reduction in process water use intensity results in savings up to approximately 1,140,000 annually when considering purchase, pumping, preparation, and subsequent wastewater treatment costs. The figure of 7,980,000 represent the potential cumulative savings for a 1% reduction over the next 7 years (1,140,000 X 7).

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

2900000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost to realize water savings is estimated as 25 to 50% of the realized savings (1.9 to 3.9MM). The average was presented. Each 1% reduction in process water use intensity results in savings up to approximately 1,140,000 annually when considering purchase, pumping, preparation, and subsequent wastewater treatment costs.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our local team of engineers, and technical professionals collaborate and innovate through a global Manufacturing Excellence Water and Wastewater team. This allows our facilities to share best practices, and facilitates the rapid deployment of proven, cost effective technologies across our network of plants. Ingredion has implemented an environmental conservation initiative to reduce water use intensity 10-30% by 2030 from a baseline of 2019. This strategy has been implemented and is allowing us to track and realize the opportunity of and track water savings initiatives, which leads to cost savings, improved community relations, and improved water efficiency. For example, upgrades to existing wastewater treatment facilities, recovery of several wastewater streams including condensed process vapors (CPV), condensate, and steam (which also are used as heat recovery and energy savings), and reuse of treated wastewater for cooling towers.
[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.

	Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)
Climate change	*0*

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

Ingredion's 2024 proxy (page 16) explains Ingredion's approach to Board diversity and inclusion. The Corporate Governance and Nominating (CGN) Committee and the Board consider the composition of the entire Board and the entire range of diversity (including gender, race, ethnicity, geographic background, and personal experience) in its determinations. We do not have a formal diversity policy, but we have historically had a diverse board. Our director qualifications and the diversity matrix below illustrate the diversity of experiences, qualifications, and backgrounds of our board nominees. The nominees include four women directors, one male director of Hispanic ethnicity, one African-American male director, and one director who lives outside the United States.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

0001193125-23-079105.rtf
[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-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

☑ Individual role descriptions

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charters

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

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

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board meets at least quarterly with scheduled topics covered each meeting. Environmental and sustainability matters, which include climate-related issues, are on the agenda four times per year. The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee reviews and guides the sustainability strategy and risk management plans. The committee reviews the sustainability goals and metrics and status of actions to achieve objectives. Additionally, potential climate change risks may be discussed during meetings on business continuity planning; engineering and capital projects; acquisitions and divestures; compliance, and risk management. Subject matter experts reporting either to the Chief Sustainability Officer or the Sr. VP of Global Operations, brief the Board on these topics. This approach provides the board insight into potential climate change related issues through multiple touch points. An example of a climate-related decision made by The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee was the approval of our plan to have our GHG targets validated by the SBTi. Based on the review, the Committee decided that we should proceed with the validation.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charters

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements
☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Forestry-related issues are a critical element in the broader topic relating to sustainable sourcing of our Tier 1 crops (Corn, Cassava, Stevia, Pulses and Potatoes). Since agricultural raw materials are a crucial resource to our business, we remain dedicated to evaluating and finding ways to help protect biodiversity in our agricultural supply chain which includes progressing efforts around deforestation. All items in our All Life Plan are reported to the board on at least an annual basis. An example of a forestry-related decision made by The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee was the approval of our goal to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops by 2025. Based on the review, the Committee decided that the goals should be published in Ingredion's publicly available Sustainability Report. At this time, forestry-related issues relating to fuel wood are not part of our agenda as the use of fuel wood is not material. Fuel Wood represents

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charters

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

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

☑ Other, please specify :Reviewing and guiding corporate responsibility strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board meets quarterly with scheduled topics covered each quarter. Environmental and sustainability matters are on the agenda at least quarterly. However, potential water-related risks may be discussed during meetings on business continuity planning; engineering and capital projects; acquisitions and divestures; and compliance and risk management. Subject matter experts reporting either to the Chief Sustainability Officer or Sr. VP Global Operations, brief the Board on these topics. The Vice President of Sustainability and the Director of Environmental Affairs are primarily responsible for briefing the board on sustainability initiatives and risks as well as our progress on sustainability goals and targets. These briefings with the Board allow insight into potential water-related issues which can then be addressed, as applicable, in risk management policies, strategy and action plans, including setting aggressive 2030 sustainability targets. An example of a water related decision made by The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee was the approval of our All Life Strategy, which includes a 2030 goal to reduce water use in all extremely high-stress geographies where we manufacture products. Based on the review, the Committee decided that the goals should be adopted and published in Ingredion's publicly available Sustainability Report

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Board Committee Charters

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

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

☑ Other, please specify :Reviewing and guiding corporate responsibility strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee has direct oversight for environmental and sustainability related matters, including climate-related issues. Ingredion's Executive Leadership Team (C-Suite Officers), including the Chief Sustainability Officer, attends Board Meetings and reports progress on initiatives. The SVP, Chief Commercial and Sustainability Officer is the Executive Leadership Team member responsible for Ingredion's sustainability program. The Chief Sustainability Officer reviews sustainability, including biodiversity issues, at the Board Level. Environmental and sustainability matters are discussed with the Board of Directors at least semi-annually. In addition, climate issues, as applicable, are addressed at meetings of the Ingredion Sustainability Council and Operations Leadership Team. An example of a biodiversity-related decision made by The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee was the approval of our All Life Strategy, which includes a 2030 goal to protect and improve biodiversity to drive a net positive impact in our crop sourcing areas. Based on the review, the Committee decided that the goals should be published in Ingredion's publicly available Sustainability Report.
[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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

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

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience
☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience
☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ 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 Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain 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

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues
☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues
☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is responsible for reviewing sustainability at the board level. The CEO is supported by the SVP, Chief Commercial and Sustainability Officer (CSO), a member of the executive leadership team. Environmental and sustainability matters, which include our goals and programs to reduce GHG emissions, are discussed with the Board of Directors at least quarterly. In addition, climate-related issues, as applicable, are addressed at meetings of the ESG Executive Advisory Committee, Ingredion Global Sustainability Council, Global Operations Leadership Team, and Global Operations Sustainability Council. Ingredion's ESG Executive Advisory Committee oversees the company's ESG agenda, establishes near-term sustainability deliverables, evaluates partnerships and external commitments, as well as other changes that might impact our strategy or approach. Chaired by the CSO, the Committee includes the CEO, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), SVP Global Operations and Chief Supply Chain Officer, SVP and Chief Human Resources Officer, and SVP and Chief Legal Officer, Corporate Secretary, and Chief Compliance Officer, and Vice President Corporate Sustainability. Ingredion's Global Sustainability Council is made up of senior leaders within the organization and is tasked with establishing and executing the sustainability strategy. The Council is responsible for making certain the sustainability strategy helps mitigate potential long-term risks for the organization, while aligning us with the needs and expectations of external stakeholders. Chaired by the Vice President Corporate Sustainability, the Council includes functional leads from Innovation, Commercial, EHS&Sustainability, Procurement, Human Resources, Government Affairs, Marketing, Legal, Investor Relations, and our segment businesses.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Half-yearly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is responsible for reviewing sustainability at the board level. The CEO is supported by the SVP, Chief Commercial and Sustainability Officer (CSO), a member of the executive leadership team. Environmental and sustainability matters, which include our goals and programs related to regenerative agriculture, are discussed with the Board of Directors at least half yearly. In addition, sustainability-related issues, as applicable, are addressed at meetings of the ESG Executive Advisory Committee, Ingredion Global Sustainability Council, Global Operations Leadership Team, and Global Operations Sustainability Council. Ingredion's ESG Executive Advisory Committee oversees the company's ESG agenda, establishes near-term sustainability deliverables, evaluates partnerships and external commitments, as well as other changes that might impact our strategy or approach. Chaired by the CSO, the Committee includes the CEO, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), SVP Global Operations and Chief Supply Chain Officer, SVP and Chief Human Resources Officer, and SVP and Chief Legal Officer, Corporate Secretary, and Chief Compliance Officer, and Vice President Corporate Sustainability. Ingredion's Global Sustainability Council is made up of senior leaders within the organization and is tasked with establishing and executing the sustainability strategy. The Council is responsible for making certain the sustainability strategy helps mitigate potential long-term risks for the organization, while aligning us with the needs and expectations of external stakeholders. Chaired by the Vice President Corporate Sustainability, the Council includes functional leads from Innovation, Commercial, EHS&Sustainability, Procurement, Human Resources, Government Affairs, Marketing, Legal, Investor Relations, and our segment businesses.

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee has direct oversight for environmental and sustainability related matters. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is responsible for reviewing sustainability at the board level and is supported by the Senior Vice President, Chief Commercial and Sustainability Officer (CSO). Topics of discussion include water-related issues, progress on our water reduction goals and alignment with stakeholders on environmental sustainability considerations. Environmental and sustainability matters are discussed with the Board of Directors quarterly. In addition, water issues, as applicable, are addressed at meetings of the Ingredion Sustainability Council and Operations Leadership Team (OLT). The CSO and the OLT Chair (Senior VP Global Operations) bring issues or concerns, including those related to water, to the Executive Team (i.e., C-Suite) and the Board of Directors, as applicable.

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

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Board of Directors Governance and Nominating Committee has direct oversight for environmental and sustainability related matters. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is responsible for reviewing sustainability at the board level and is supported by the Senior Vice President, Chief Commercial and Sustainability Officer (CSO). Topics of discussion include regenerative agriculture progress, progress on our water reduction goals and alignment with stakeholders on environmental sustainability considerations. Environmental and sustainability matters are discussed with the Board of Directors quarterly. In addition, water issues, as applicable, are addressed at meetings of the Ingredion Sustainability Council and Operations Leadership Team (OLT). The CSO and the OLT Chair (Senior VP Global Operations) bring issues or concerns, including those related to water, to the Executive Team (i.e., C-Suite) and the Board of Directors, as applicable.

[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

(4.5.3) Please explain

C-suite executives have annual goals related to attaining climate change related goals. Monetary incentive is linked to reaching the annual goal target. An example of a climate change KPI would be achieving our Tier 1 crop sustainability sourcing targe and annual global absolute greenhouse gas emissions.

Forests

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.3) Please explain

C-suite executives have annual goals related to attaining forest related goals. Monetary incentive is linked to reaching the annual goal target. An example of a forest KPI would be achieving our Tier 1 crop sustainability sourcing target.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.3) Please explain

C-suite executives have annual goals related to attaining water related goals. Monetary incentive is linked to reaching the annual goal target. An example of a forest KPI would be achieving our Tier 1 crop sustainability sourcing target.
[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 - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Other targets-related metrics, please specify :Progress to reaching Tier 1 crop sustainable sourcing

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Other strategy and financial planning-related metrics, please specify :Define strategy options for Net Zero

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:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Ingredion grants monetary awards (bonuses) to eligible employees based on company and employee performance. Performance is evaluated in accordance with company strategy, goals and expectations including its publicly stated sustainability targets.

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

The incentives drive achievement of our 2030 All Life Sustainability goals, which include absolute greenhouse gas reductions and sustainably sourcing Tier 1 crops.

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 - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Other targets-related metrics, please specify :Progress to reaching Tier 1 crop sustainable sourcing

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:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Ingredion grants monetary awards (bonuses) to eligible employees based on company and employee performance. Performance is evaluated in accordance with company strategy, goals and expectations including its publicly stated sustainability targets.

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

The incentives drive achievement of our 2030 All Life Sustainability goals, which include sustainably sourcing Tier 1 crops.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Other targets-related metrics, please specify :Progress to reaching Tier 1 crop sustainable sourcing

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Ingredion grants monetary awards (bonuses) to eligible employees based on company and employee performance. Performance is evaluated in accordance with company strategy, goals and expectations including its publicly stated sustainability targets.

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

The incentives drive achievement of our 2030 All Life Sustainability goals, which include sustainably sourcing Tier 1 crops.
[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

☑ Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Ingredion recognizes the threat deforestation and forest degradation plays on our global climate, the economy, and the social impacts to people living in forested areas. We are committed to the sustainable management and use of the world's forests and to ending deforestation. We have undertaken to evaluate deforestation and forest degradation risks across our supply chain. Ingredion is a member of the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform (SAI Platform), which enables us to collaborate with customers, growers, and non-government organizations to assess potential risks in our supply chain. We utilize the SAI Platform's Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) to evaluate the farms from which we source agricultural raw materials. We believe the biggest risk for deforestation in our supply chain comes for our agricultural suppliers. The FSA helps us to determine if any removal of forest has occurred on a particular farm within the past 5 years. If deforestation has occurred, this automatically disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable. Ingredion has committed to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 agriproducts by 2025 using the SAI. One such consideration may be an increased use of timber fuel wood as an energy source for our manufacturing facilities. Finally, Ingredion publishes a separate policy on respecting Indigenous Populations and a commitment to not impact the land use rights of indigenous populations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to no-deforestation by target date, please specify :2030

Social commitments

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

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Other additional reference/description, please specify :Recognition of the overall importance of forests and other natural ecosystems

(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 :Sustainable Development Goal 15 - life on land

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Policy COM-EHSS-EN 2024 (002) v2 FINAL.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Description of the scope (including value chain stages) covered by the policy Description of business dependency on water Description of business impact on water Commitment to align with international frameworks, standards, and widely-recognized water initiatives Commitment to prevent, minimize, and control pollution Commitment to reduce or phase-out hazardous substances Commitment to reduce water withdrawal and/or consumption volumes in direct operations Commitment to reduce water withdrawal and/or consumption volumes in supply chain Commitment to safely managed Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in the workplace Commitment to safely managed Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in local communities Commitment to stakeholder education and capacity building on water security Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems Commitments beyond regulatory compliance Reference to company water-related targets Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation Recognition of environmental linkages, for example, due to climate change

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

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

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

☑ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Water-Policy-Statement.pdf

Row 3

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ 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

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Ingredion does not have a published written policy on biodiversity however biodiversity materiality considerations are interwoven in all elements of our All Life sustainability strategy. As an example, we have included our statement on Agriculture which covers our commitment the efficient use of natural resources, reduction of pesticides, and ensuring social responsibility is a key factor in our sourced products. This policy governs our All Life goal to have 100% sustainable sourced Tier 1 crops by 2025. As the complexity around biodiversity planning for corporations has increased, we have sought tools and mechanisms to further our understanding of possible biodiversity considerations in the geographies where we operate. In 2023, we assessed the geographies of our global manufacturing operations using the World Wildlife Fund's (WWF) Biodiversity Risk Filter. The Biodiversity Risk Filter assesses the state of biodiversity related issues, as well as external pressures that may impact them, using 33 distinct indicators. These include items such as wild flora and fauna, soil condition, ecosystem condition, herbicide resistance, tropical cyclones, landslides and tree cover loss.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to Net Positive Gain

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

(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 :Sustainable Development Goal 15 - life on land.

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Agricultural-Sustainability-Statement-05-11-21.pdf

Row 4

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Ingredion remains committed to protecting the environment across our operations and has made a publicly available science-based commitment. Ingredion remains focused on trying to identify a pathway to a Scope 1 and 2 SBTi 1.5-degree target, which is required before we can have a validated Net Zero target as well. We believe that the SBTi methodology establishes criteria aligned with our own beliefs that reducing physical emissions in our value chain is essential to mitigating climate change. Our strategy to reduce Scope 3 emissions is focused on the categories most relevant to our supply chain emissions, specifically those related to Purchased Goods and Services, Transportation and Processing of Sold Product. Ingredion also supports a Climate Resilient Supply Chain through our Sustainable Agriculture program. See page 16 of the attachment for full wording of our commitments.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify **:**Commitment to source at least 50% renewable energy by 2030.

Social commitments

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

COM-CODE-EN.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

☑ Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI)

☑ UN Global Compact

☑ Other, please specify :Field to Market

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

Ingredion is proud to be a signatory to the United Nations Global Compact since 2016 and is committed to upholding its Ten Principles in how we do business. We disclose progress as part of our annual sustainability report. Ingredion uses the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform's (SAI Platform) Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) to evaluate and confirm the sustainable practices of our growers. Ingredion also serves on the executive leadership committee. As an active member in Field to Market, Ingredion will work together with grower organizations, academia, conservation groups, public sector partners and other leading companies representing over 1.3 trillion in combined revenue to deliver sustainable outcomes for U.S. agriculture.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Our Vice President, Global Government Affairs and other trade association representatives are senior leaders knowledgeable of Ingredion's climate change strategy and consult with internal stakeholders as required. Ingredion has an ESG Executive Advisory team that ensures that activities/decisions regarding climate change that

would impact the organization are fully discussed and vetted prior to final action. If an inconsistency was observed between our internal policies on water management and a trade association we were working with, we would engage further with that party to understand their position.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global
☑ Other global trade association, please specify :Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform (SAIP)

(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
☑ Water

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

Select from:
☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

We continue to see regenerative agriculture as an important component of our sustainability strategy, helping both to build more climate resilient farms in our supply chain, but also as a mechanism to reduce the agricultural Scope 3 emissions of both Ingredion and our customers. As such, in 2022, we continued to look for opportunities for new or expanded regenerative agriculture projects with our growers. As a founding member of SAI Platform’s regenerative agriculture program, we continue to work as part of an industry team building and shaping a regenerative agriculture standard for the food and beverage industry. We see this alignment as critical to progressing against our goals. As there are varying definitions and expectations around the terminology “regenerative agriculture,” a common framework is expected to help us move farther and faster together with customers and other industry leaders. Ingredion uses the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform’s (SAI Platform) Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) to evaluate and confirm the sustainable practices of our growers. The FSA includes over 100 questions, including some around biodiversity. Now that Ingredion has assessed nearly half of our Tier 1 priority crop farmers using the FSA, we are in a position better understand the biodiversity considerations of our agricultural supply chain. In an effort to continue to play a valuable role in collaborating with SAI Platform and other member organizations, Ingredion applied in 2022 for a position on the SAI Platform’s Executive Committee. We are very pleased that Andy Utterback, our head of global sustainable and regenerative agriculture, was elected in October by the member organizations to a seat on the Executive Committee.

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

36000

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

The 36,000 USD represents annual membership fees.

(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

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :SAI platform is aligned with Sustainable Develpment Goal 13 (Climate Action) and 15 (Life on Land)

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Water pollution indicators

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Page 32 lists our environmental performance data related to climate, water, waste, and COD. Page 43 discusses our biodiversity strategy and relevant actions. Page 47 provides overview of regenerative agriculture engagements.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2023-Ingredion-Sustainability-Report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

The report summarizes 2023 performance.

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Risks & Opportunities

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Page 16 of our annual 10-k discloses specific business risks related to climate change and water availability.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Ingredion 10-k 2023.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

The report summarizes our 2023 performance.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Not defined

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :S&P Global Climanomics

(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

☑ Policy

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Ingredion utilized the S&P Global Climanomics platform to conduct a climate impact study across our global operations and supply chain. To ascertain materiality, a cross functional Ingredion team worked with Climanomics to quantify 500 assets for which to include in the global model - the assets included all our manufacturing facilities as well as key upstream agricultural sourcing areas, and critical supply chain infrastructure (such as 3rd party toll manufacturers and warehouses). The Climanomics platform provides climate risk analytics for seven physical hazards (drought, wildfire, temperature extreme, water stress, coastal flooding, river flooding, and tropical cyclones) to real assets, under four climate scenarios based on the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs). Adopted by the IPCC, the pathways describe different climate futures, all of which are considered possible depending on the volume of GHGs emitted in the years to come. The Climanomics platform is built on the world's latest, most rigorous climate science datasets, including from the IPCC, the NOAA and the WWF. The platform utilizes customized models to develop the scenarios and then present the results as Modeled average annual loss (MAAL) which represents the sum of climate-related expenses, decreased *revenue, and/or business interruption and is represented as the percentage (or amount) of loss relative to the total asset value. Physical losses were modelled along 4 scenarios - RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Observations from the climate analysis are important for Ingredion as we evaluate expansions to our manufacturing capacity and plan our global agriproducts sourcing supply chain. Strategy development falls into two categories. First, is how can we use the model to plan future investment/expansion in manufacturing capacities for our business. Secondly, how does the modelling influence our Sustainable Agriculture strategy.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Forests scenarios

☑ Bespoke forests scenario

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Reputation

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The study was constrained to global locations that source fuel wood for our operations (North America and South America). We gathered supplier data when possible and supplemented the information with proxy locations that are within the boundaries of the site that sourced the material. Physical and socio-political risks were assessed using WWF tools.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Observations from the forest analysis are important for Ingredion as we evaluate considerations for expanding timber as biofuel. A sustainable biomass supply chain offers a feasible alternative to decarbonize fossil fuel operations. Biofuel timber is a small portion of our overall energy spend and our approach to use the WWF tools is consistent with our water/biodiversity screening methods.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Our water risk ensemble tool is comprised of multiple models: WRI Aqueduct current Baseline Water Stress, WWF current Water Depletion, Aqueduct future change in water stress, and WWF Basin Risk projected change in drought and flood occurrence. The tool assesses current water stress and predicted changes in water *stress to 2040, and predictions for the 2º C climate change scenario. The following future change scenarios were also assessed: • SSP2 RCP4.5 denotes a world with stable economic development and carbon emissions peaking/declining • SSP2 RCP8.5 denotes a world with stable economic development and steadily rising global carbon emissions. • SSP3 RCP8.5 denotes a fragmented world with uneven economic development and steadily rising global carbon emissions.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Observations from the water analysis are important for Ingredion as we evaluate expansions to our manufacturing capacity and plan our global agriproducts sourcing supply chain. Strategy development falls into two categories. First, is how can we use the model to plan future investment/expansion in manufacturing capacities for our business. Secondly, how does the modelling influence our Sustainable Agriculture strategy.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 6.0

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Ingredion utilized the S&P Global Climanomics platform to conduct a climate impact study across our global operations and supply chain. To ascertain materiality, a cross functional Ingredion team worked with Climanomics to quantify 500 assets for which to include in the global model - the assets included all our manufacturing facilities as well as key upstream agricultural sourcing areas, and critical supply chain infrastructure (such as 3rd party toll manufacturers and warehouses). The Climanomics platform provides climate risk analytics for seven physical hazards (drought, wildfire, temperature extreme, water stress, coastal flooding, river flooding, and tropical cyclones) to real assets, under four climate scenarios based on the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs). Adopted by the IPCC, the pathways describe different climate futures, all of which are considered possible depending on the volume of GHGs emitted in the years to come. The Climanomics platform is *built on the world's latest, most rigorous climate science datasets, including from the IPCC, the NOAA and the WWF. The platform utilizes customized models to develop the scenarios and then present the results as Modeled average annual loss (MAAL) which represents the sum of climate-related expenses, decreased revenue, and/or business interruption and is represented as the percentage (or amount) of loss relative to the total asset value. Physical losses were modelled along 4 scenarios - RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0, and RCP 8.5.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Observations from the climate analysis are important for Ingredion as we evaluate expansions to our manufacturing capacity and plan our global agriproducts sourcing supply chain. Strategy development falls into two categories. First, is how can we use the model to plan future investment/expansion in manufacturing capacities for our business. Secondly, how does the modelling influence our Sustainable Agriculture strategy.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes to the state of nature

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Our water risk ensemble tool is comprised of multiple models: WRI Aqueduct current Baseline Water Stress, WWF current Water Depletion, Aqueduct future change in water stress, and WWF Basin Risk projected change in drought and flood occurrence. The tool assesses current water stress and predicted changes in water stress to 2040, and predictions for the 2º C climate change scenario. The following future change scenarios were also assessed: • SSP2 RCP4.5 denotes a world with stable economic development and carbon emissions peaking/declining • SSP2 RCP8.5 denotes a world with stable economic development and steadily rising global carbon emissions. • SSP3 RCP8.5 denotes a fragmented world with uneven economic development and steadily rising global carbon emissions.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Observations from the water analysis are important for Ingredion as we evaluate expansions to our manufacturing capacity and plan our global agriproducts sourcing supply chain. Strategy development falls into two categories. First, is how can we use the model to plan future investment/expansion in manufacturing capacities for our business. Secondly, how does the modelling influence our Sustainable Agriculture strategy.
[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

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

The climate scenario analysis identified what expected losses exist across critical elements in our global operations. The scenario analysis revealed that our agricultural supply chain has the greatest risk due to physical risks, whereas our operations are exposed to both physical and transitional risks. Of the physical risks identified, the balance of the agricultural risks are due to temperature extremes and drought. As our corn supply chain represents over 74% of our agricultural feedstock this represents the largest absolute risk, however, the study allowed us to identify other tier 1 crops, as well as specific corn sourcing regions, which have higher relative risks and where regenerative agriculture practices could have an outsized impact due to local stressors in the coming decades. This is critical insight as we continue to expand our regenerative agriculture program with our growing partners. The analysis allows us a tool to compare climate risk when comparing greenfield sites. When evaluating perspective sites we have the tools to prioritize where we may face challenges with current and future water stress that may influence our operating costs and raw material supplies. Ingredion can build resiliency into supply chains before the water risk becomes apparent. Predictive analysis is an important tool for Ingredion to use in partnering with growers to increase productivity and resiliency, thus decreasing the risk associated with climate change to our business.

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:

☑ Organization-wide

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

The forest scenario analysis included a detailed review of our operations and the physical and socio-political risks prevalent in these sourcing areas. Biomass is sourced in two regions (North America, South America) and supports four facilities in these areas. We observed that the risks in the two areas vary - our North American review highlighted a highly fragmented ownership structure which leads to increased barriers in traceability and transparency, as well as a mixed perception of biomass within communities largely due to the complexity around biomass and bioenergy. Mapping of supply chains and identifying best practices is a viable solution to mitigate these risks. Our review in South America identified potential risks of increased wildfires, and the risk of deforestation due to illegal forestry practices. We have shared this information with our internal procurement team to ensure our sourcing is done with all the required permits and traceability measures.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

A specific water related outcome identified in our scenario analysis is the quantification of water risk at each of our global facilities based on current and predicted changes to water stress. Furthermore, our scenario analysis identified one site as having the potential for substantive impact based on future scenarios.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ No, but we have a climate transition plan with a different temperature alignment

(5.2.2) Temperature alignment of transition plan

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

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

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

Ingredion remains focused on trying to identify a pathway to a Scope 1 and 2 SBTi 1.5-degree target, which is required before we can have a validated Net Zero target as well. We believe that the SBTi methodology establishes criteria aligned with our own beliefs that reducing physical emissions in our value chain is essential to mitigating climate change.

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

Select from:

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

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

Our transition plan relies on four levers – optimize energy consumption, substitute energy sources, capture CO2, and purchased offsets. OPTIMIZING ENERGY CONSUMPTION is reducing our energy consumption used to manufacture our products. This relies on us implementing tools and routines that apply best practices that enable continuous improvement of our operations leading to energy optimization. It also involves deploying our capital resources effectively to improve existing plant equipment energy efficiency. SUBSTITUTING ENERGY SOURCES is the substitution of less intensive CO2 sources (i.e. Natural gas to Coal) and increasing our consumption of renewable electricity and biomass. Zero/low carbon fuels, such as renewable natural gas and green hydrogen, provide a significant future opportunity to reduce carbon emissions in processes that have traditionally consumed natural gas. Our procurement team continues to scout for suppliers with capability to provide renewable natural gas at cost parity to conventional natural gas as maintaining a competitive cost is an important consideration for our customers. Green hydrogen is a potential long-term solution and we continue to monitor technology opportunities for it to become cost competitive. CARBON CAPTURE (CCUS) technologies have been evaluated for Ingredion's corn wet milling processes with a third-party consultant. The flue gas streams from our corn wet mill operations that serve as potential targets for carbon capture possess a relatively low CO2 concentration compared to other processes such as fermentation that produce a high-concentration CO2 stream. The low CO2 concentration stream impacts the economic feasibility of using the current carbon capture technology available, but we continue to monitor the technological advances in this area. Finally, PURCHASED OFFSETS are not a priority for Ingredion at this time because we have prioritized reducing our physical emissions in our operation.

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

In 2023, Ingredion made significant strides in reducing Scope 1 and 2 emissions through strategic initiatives focused on several key levers. Optimizing Energy Consumption remains central to our approach, driven by the Ingredion Performance System. This system implements standardized tools and operational routines across global sites, leading to continuous improvements in energy efficiency, water usage, and waste reduction. With a 12 million investment in energy efficiency capital projects, Ingredion enhanced sustainability efforts, notably at our Guadalajara plant where heat recovered from boiler stacks was repurposed, resulting in an estimated 3,400 metric tons of CO2 reduction. Ingredion has also prioritized Substitute Energy Sources, significantly increasing the use of renewable electricity which accounted for approximately 25% of global purchased electricity in 2023. This growth was particularly pronounced in Brazil and China, supported by new on-site solar installations in Pakistan and planned expansions in Thailand estimated completion by 2024. Additionally, renewable biomass boilers were commissioned at the Mogi Guaçu and Balsa Nova plants in Brazil. Procurement efforts have focused on identifying suppliers capable of delivering renewable natural gas at cost parity with conventional options. Process Electrification emerged as another viable pathway to carbon emissions reduction, particularly beneficial in new plant constructions, expansions, or equipment upgrades. Benchmarking visits by Ingredion's global engineering team explored the feasibility of electric boilers, highlighting potential applications for future deployments. In addressing CCUS, Ingredion has evaluated technologies for potential deployment in our corn wet milling operations. In parallel, Ingredion has pursued strategies to mitigate Scope 3 Emissions, particularly in categories like Purchased Goods and Services and Transportation. Sustainable and regenerative agriculture practices have been integrated into supply chain strategies, with 66% of Tier 1 crops sustainably sourced in 2023 and ongoing engagements with farmers in key regions such as Brazil, Mexico, and the United States. Supplier engagement initiatives have commenced, prioritizing sustainability discussions and GHG emissions data with top suppliers to drive emissions reduction strategies forward. Transportation-related emissions reduction efforts include minimizing air freight and optimizing logistics through enhanced forecasting and operational planning. Ingredion's Global Supply Chain team has implemented Sales and Operations Planning processes to optimize production globally, thereby reducing reliance on carbon-intensive transportation modes. Throughout these efforts, Ingredion remains committed to leveraging innovative solutions, strategic investments, and collaborative partnerships to achieve our environmental sustainability goals, ensuring a sustainable future for all stakeholders involved.

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

2023 Ingredion Sustainability Report.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other environmental issue considered

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**The timeline for new technology needed to achieve this is still uncertain.

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

In 2023, Ingredion successfully validated our Scope 1 and 2 reduction targets through the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), aligning with a 'Well below 2 degree Celsius' scenario. Our Scope 3 reduction targets were also validated against a "2 degrees Celsius" scenario. We are actively pursuing a pathway to achieve an SBTi 1.5-degree target, a crucial step toward validating our Net Zero target. As part of our commitment to minimizing physical emissions within our operations, we have prioritized reducing emissions directly rather than relying on purchased offsets, in line with SBTi guidelines. Ingredion believes that the SBTi methodology reinforces our dedication to reducing emissions across our value chain to combat climate change. The electrification of assets, particularly when coupled with renewable electricity, presents significant opportunities for emission reduction. While we have not yet quantified the required capital investment, we acknowledge that economic factors and investment pace are critical considerations. Looking forward, emerging technologies like green hydrogen and renewable natural gas hold promise as essential tools for achieving long-term Net Zero goals. Despite uncertainties surrounding their development timeline, we remain optimistic and proactive in seizing opportunities as they become available.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

As a plant-based ingredients company, we are poised to help our customers with the increasing demand to create sustainable products that provide consumers with an exceptional experience. In support of our current All Life Plan, we have enhanced this process by aligning our new product development with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). We believe that this will better align with our customers' needs, and ultimately the needs of society. Our specialty products, such as specialty starches, have proven to be resilient to risk and have created an opportunity for us to supply versatile and affordable ingredients. In 2022, we were the first major food ingredients company to partner with HowGood, a sustainable food and beverage data platform. This partnership will allow us to continue to be transparent and insight innovation in sustainable food ideas. Many experts agree that alternative proteins have a vital role to play in the world achieving food security by 2030. At Ingredion, our Plant-Based Protein growth platform is well aligned to play a part in the broader evolution of a sustainable food system. Growing consumer demand for plant based and hybrid products is expected to drive dramatic increases in sales of these products. Our plant based protein Ultra Performance line was named the Best Plant-Based Sustainability winner at the World Plant Based Awards. This line does not generate any wastewater during processing, nor include any chemicals or additives. We continue to partner with the EVERY Company to create plant based protein solutions that our customers enjoy. Staying connected with innovation and thought leadership in the plant protein space is critical to our strategy in this area. Also in acknowledgement that agriculture is heavily impactful on the environment and it's contributions to climate change, Ingredion has committed to having 99 percent of all crops and 100 percent of the company's Tier 1 crops (corn, tapioca, potato, stevia and pulses) to be sustainably sourced by 2025. The Asia Pacific segment has made significant strides to do this, including the release of two new *products: next generation waxy tapioca and waxy rice. This strategy aligns us with a climate forward mindset and allows us to manufacture quality ingredients to feed the world's people.*

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Changing temperature and precipitation patterns, as indicated in our climate model scenarios, have the potential to significantly impact water availability and plant-based agriculture, our most significant raw materials. Therefore, we have established goals to increase sustainably sourced agriculture and reduce our water use intensity. In 2023, 67% of our Tier 1 Priority Crops were sustainably sourced in support of our goal to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 Priority Crops by 2025. Multiple initiatives helped us achieve this performance, including continued interest and support from our growers, enhanced knowledge on SAI Platform implementation within Ingredion's agricultural teams, increased efforts with some of our grain provider partners and continued collaboration with customers, particularly as part of our work with the SAI Platform. As a result of climate related risks, our 2030 goals and milestones are more aggressive in these areas, including implementing water conservation projects with growers in 100% of extremely high water stressed sourcing geographies by the end of 2025; and reducing our water use intensity by 30% in all extremely high-stress geographies where we manufacture products by 2030.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

At our heart, Ingredion is an innovation company. Every day we work to deliver our customers ingredient solutions that enhance functionality, align with consumer preference, and help those customers achieve their own sustainability goals. And while we know that aligning our product development with sustainability is the right thing to do, we also believe it makes great business sense. For example, we see a growing number of consumers looking to reduce sugar in their diets, which is driving some customers to examine how they formulate certain products to align with this trend. Ingredion continues to develop nature-based, low calorie sweetener solutions like our stevia products that not only help formulate low-sugar consumer products, but which can also help our customers lower their product carbon footprint. In 2022, Ingredion announced the completion of a peer-reviewed LCA study on several of its sweetener solutions products, such as stevia. This study shows that Reb M stevia innovations offer great-tasting sugar reduction options while simultaneously reducing negative environmental impacts. The findings show fermentation and bioconversion technologies have significantly improved the sustainability of Reb M – a next-generation stevia sweetener from PureCircle by Ingredion.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

The greatest potential climate-related risk to operations is lack of water and agricultural raw materials, which have been addressed above. However, we also have goals to reduce water and CO2e at our manufacturing locations: Achieve a 28% reduction in absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions by the end of 2030; Source 50% of our purchased electricity from renewable sources by the end of 2030; Reduce our water use intensity by 30% in all extremely high-stress geographies where we manufacture products by the end of 2030. These goals were developed to address the impact our operations may have on climate-related risks, including

changes in temperature and precipitation as identified in our climate scenario analysis. Throughout 2023 Ingredion worked with Schneider Electric to evaluate opportunities around renewable energy in North America, our largest regional business. This work included evaluating opportunities for both purchase and installation of renewable energy. Having more insight into renewable energy options has helped us evaluate a range of opportunities to progress our efforts towards our CO2 and Renewable Electricity goal.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply
☑ Revenues
☑ Direct costs
☑ Indirect costs
☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water

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

Our continuous improvement teams are highly focused on implementing energy and water efficiency initiatives at our manufacturing facilities through auditing, tracking, trending, and sharing learnings and best practices. These continuous improvement initiatives decrease energy and water inputs resulting in improvement in indirect operating costs. Capital expenditures that reduce our CO2e footprint and climate impact include purchase and installation of more efficient pumps and compressors; installation of variable frequency drives (VFDs) on motors; evaporator improvements, installation of LED lighting), and energy recovery projects (e.g., reuse of steam or heated water in other processes, use of biogas generated from wastewater treatment to replace natural gas in some equipment. In addition, installation of on-line meters to trend and reduce process variability in real-time, results in decrease energy and raw material inputs. For several years we have been evaluating climate impacts and water availability in our due diligence assessment process for mergers and acquisitions. Identification of this aspect of risk influenced decisions on whether to continue with potential acquisitions. The aspects of climate change that influenced this decision were primarily related to the availability of a reliable power grid, water availability, access to sustainable raw materials, and the ability to discharge wastewater in compliance with applicable regulations. These are short-term initiatives.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

12

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

2

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

11

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

2

(5.9.5) Please explain

CAPEX projects have been implemented to improve compliance, implement water recycling initiatives and other water efficiency projects. In 2023 we invested in 10 significant capital project installations globally which prioritized water recovery, water efficiency, and water infrastructure. Commissioning of some of these projects will continue into 2024. It is expected that our CAPEX on water spend will increase by 2% annually to support future targeted water reduction projects. OPEX includes purchase costs, discharge fees, chemical costs, treatment and pumping costs. OPEX spend in 2023 was higher than 2022, driven by operating costs for recent waste treatment expansion projects installed and inflationary pressures on chemicals and raw water supply. In future years we expect overall costs to generally trend upward for purchased water as well as additional chemical costs to support increased water reuse as cooling tower make-up water.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Drive low-carbon investment

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment to international standards

☑ Benchmarking against peers

☑ Scenario analysis

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

The carbon price was developed by a cross functional leadership team from finance, engineering, operations, and Global EHS and Sustainability. The team evaluated the impact of various pricing mechanisms and concluded that an ICP will offer a pricing mechanism that will have a material impact on business decisions. Capital spend is a key influencer on global CO2 emissions and investment in low carbon technology is a lever identified in our Climate Transition Plan. The key assumption is that focusing an ICP on capital allocation for projects will maintain a robust network of projects in our pipeline. During the development of the carbon tax we stress tested the price using select efficiency and growth projects to ensure the desired outcome was met.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Differentiated

(5.10.1.7) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

A standard price of 40/MT CO2 is used globally for all jurisdictions that do not have an existing regulatory scheme that imposes a carbon price. If a regulated carbon price exists, a cost sensitivity is performed using the difference between Ingredion's ICP and the actual jurisdictional carbon price. If the jurisdictional carbon price is greater than our ICP then no sensitivity is required.

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Static

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

40

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

40

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

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Procurement

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify **:**The carbon price is applied to all capital projects globally with greater than $1MM spend.

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

20

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Our capital approval process is centrally managed consisting of senior leaders from operations, finance, and engineering. The use of an ICP is a critical and mandatory piece of the global capital approval process for select capital approved projects. When projects are submitted for capital approval, the application includes a detailed calculation of carbon impacts – both increases and decreases. As part of their overall sensitivity analysis, the business uses a carbon price of 40/mt of CO2e and evaluates how it influences key financial metrics (i.e. NPV, IRR, Payback Period). An example of the application of the ICP is seen in a recent investment in solar technology at a plant in Asia. Capital expenditure in carbon efficient technology is a key element of our Low Carbon Transition Plan which is overseen by our VP Global EHS & Sustainability. The ICP is intended to facilitate a steady stream of capital projects that can deliver CO2 reductions across our organization and help us meet our SBTi target ambition. It may be periodically required to update the ICP to ensure this objective is met.

[Add row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

For the purposes of this question, Ingredion does not currently engage with smallholders in our timber wood sourcing. Timber wood sourcing represented

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

[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

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

We have a goal to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops (Corn, Cassava, Potatoes, Pulses, and Stevia) by the end of 2025. Furthermore, in 2023 we began the screening process of our non-agricultural suppliers to identify our largest CO2 emitters so we can develop an engagement strategy. In 2024 we began the process of reviewing CO2 emissions by key suppliers for future possible engagements.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

20000

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:

☑ 26-50%

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

We assess the deforestation impact in our diverse network of global farms. We have a goal to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops (Corn, Cassava, Potatoes, Pulses, and Stevia) by the end of 2025. As part of this assessment, we as essential questions on deforestation in their operations. Deforestation will not be certified as sustainable.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

20000

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 condition

☑ Dependence on water

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

We assess the water security impact of our diverse network of global farms. Given water stressors due to climate-change, it is critical to maintain a resilient agri-business supply chain and understand how our growers manage water resources - both consumption and quality.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

20000
[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

☑ Material sourcing

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In alignment with our milestone target to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops by the end of 2025, we require all our Tier 1 crop agricultural suppliers to have achieved a FSA bronze level (or equivalent under a benchmark program) to qualify as met the program objective. The Sustainable Agriculture Initiative's (SAI) Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) platform was developed as a way for farmers to assess their ability to meet environmental, economic, and social requirements set forth by supply chains and is based on sustainable farming practices recognized in the food and drink industry. The assessment is conducted via a questionnaire (self-assessment) or a third party verification against the requirements (FSA or benchmark equivalent). A negative response to any essential questions automatically disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable. A specific example as to how this program fosters resiliency to climate can be seen through the implementation of on-farm programs and policies to minimize the use of fertilizers and adopt better farm management processes.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Material sourcing

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In alignment with our milestone target to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops by the end of 2025, we require all our Tier 1 crop agricultural suppliers to have achieved a FSA bronze level (or equivalent under a benchmark program) to qualify as met the program objective. The Sustainable Agriculture Initiative's (SAI) Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) platform was developed as a way for farmers to assess their ability to meet environmental, economic, and social requirements set forth by supply chains and is based on sustainable farming practices recognized in the food and drink industry. The assessment is conducted via a questionnaire (self-assessment) or a third party verification against the requirements (FSA or benchmark equivalent). A negative response to any essential questions automatically *disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable. A specific example as to how this program fosters resiliency to forests can be seen through deforestation transparency; deforestation is one of 23 essential questions on the survey, and a negative response to any essential question automatically disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable*

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Material sourcing

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In alignment with our milestone target to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops by the end of 2025, we require all our Tier 1 crop agricultural suppliers to have achieved a FSA bronze level (or equivalent under a benchmark program) to qualify as met the program objective. The Sustainable Agriculture Initiative's (SAI) Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) platform was developed as a way for farmers to assess their ability to meet environmental, economic, and social requirements set forth by supply chains and is based on sustainable farming practices recognized in the food and drink industry. The assessment is conducted via a questionnaire (self-assessment) or a third party verification against the requirements (FSA or benchmark equivalent). A negative response to any essential questions automatically disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable. A specific example as to how this program fosters resiliency to water can be seen through the reporting on-farm water management programs to prevent excessive fertilizer runoff and groundwater contamination.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

To qualify our corn as sustainable we utilize the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative's (SAI) Farm Sustainability Assessment platform, or a benchmark program equivalent. The FSA platform acts as the starting point for identifying sustainability elements in our agricultural supply chain. The FSA is divided into three types of questions: Essential, Intermediate and Advanced and a negative response to any essential questions automatically disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable. Recognizing that different global regions may face unique local challenges (Infrastructure, government policy, access to raw material inputs, economic challenges, etc), Ingredion may engage with suppliers who have not met the requirements set forth in the sustainability assessment process and help identify a pathway for improvement. At the end of 2023, 66.8% of our crops have been certified as sustainable. Ingredion has a supplier code of conduct which requires compliance with all laws/regulations as well as encouraging suppliers to identify and set targets for reducing environmental impacts to water, wastewater, GHG, waste and packaging.

Forests

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

☑ No, we do not have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

To qualify our corn as sustainable we utilize the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative's (SAI) Farm Sustainability Assessment platform, or a benchmark program equivalent. The FSA platform acts as the starting point for identifying sustainability elements in our agricultural supply chain. The FSA is divided into three types of *questions: Essential, Intermediate and Advanced and a negative response to any essential questions automatically disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable. Recognizing that different global regions may face unique local challenges (Infrastructure, government policy, access to raw material inputs, economic challenges, etc), Ingredion may engage with suppliers who have not met the requirements set forth in the sustainability assessment process and help identify a pathway for improvement. At the end of 2023, 66.8% of our crops have been certified as sustainable.*

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

To qualify our corn as sustainable we utilize the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative's (SAI) Farm Sustainability Assessment platform, or a benchmark program equivalent. The FSA platform acts as the starting point for identifying sustainability elements in our agricultural supply chain. The FSA is divided into three types of questions: Essential, Intermediate and Advanced and a negative response to any essential questions automatically disqualifies the farm from being considered sustainable. Recognizing that different global regions may face unique local challenges (Infrastructure, government policy, access to raw material inputs, economic challenges, etc), Ingredion may engage with suppliers who have not met the requirements set forth in the sustainability assessment process and help identify a pathway for improvement. At the end of 2023, 66.8% of our crops have been certified as sustainable. Ingredion has a supplier code of conduct which requires compliance with all laws/regulations as well as encouraging suppliers to identify and set targets for reducing environmental impacts to water, wastewater, GHG, waste and packaging.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We require all our Tier 1 crop agricultural suppliers to have achieved a FSA bronze level (or equivalent under a benchmark program) to qualify as met the program objective.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Off-site third-party audit

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

For suppliers that are non-compliant, Ingredion meets with the supplier and looks at the gaps that caused them to fail and then puts together training to get the grower to an acceptable level.

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**FSA

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Off-site third-party audit

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(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:

☑ 76-99%

(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:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

For suppliers that are non-compliant, Ingredion meets with the supplier and looks at the gaps that caused them to fail and then puts together training to get the grower to an acceptable level.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We require all our Tier 1 crop agricultural suppliers to have achieved a FSA bronze level (or equivalent under a benchmark program) to qualify as met the program objective.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Off-site third-party audit

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(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:
☑ 76-99%

(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:
☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:
☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

For suppliers that are non-compliant, Ingredion meets with the supplier and looks at the gaps that caused them to fail and then puts together training to get the grower to an acceptable level.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Carbon emissions related to agricultural operations have a material impact on our Scope 3 footprint and offer an opportunity to reduce our footprint by better understanding our suppliers' practices. The purpose of this engagement is to encourage the uptake of sustainable agriculture practices that help reduce climate change (e.g. no tillage, reduced chemical usage, reduced water irrigation, etc.). Through Field to Market we track the carbon footprint of farm-level activity and can provide farmers with a comparison of their carbon footprint versus other farmers in their areas. We collect carbon emission information annually on our growers using Field to Market's Field print Calculator in conjunction with data collected via Ingredion's "Sell your corn" web platform and our Ag Software partner MyFarms. The *environmental data collected through this platform will allow us to determine the positive environmental impacts (e.g. lower carbon emissions, lower water use) of our sustainable agriculture efforts. By having accurate, representative, and transparent farm-level data Ingredion can strategically pursue opportunities to collaborate on projects that deliver tangible CO2 reductions as part of our overall sustainable agriculture program.*

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

Select from:

☑ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

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

Select from:

☑ No, because our tier 1 suppliers are producers, and have no suppliers of commodities

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Water resilience related to agricultural operations have a material impact on our business and it is critical that we work to better understand our suppliers' practices around stewardship. The purpose of this engagement is to encourage the uptake of sustainable agriculture practices that help reduce climate change and water stress. Through Field to Market we track water and carbon footprint of farm-level activity and can provide farmers with a comparison of their metrics versus other farmers in their areas. We collect water and carbon emission information annually on our growers using Field to Market's Fieldprint Calculator in conjunction with data collected via Ingredion's "Sell your corn" web platform and our Ag Software partner MyFarms. The environmental data collected through this platform will allow us to determine the positive environmental impacts (e.g. lower carbon emissions, lower water use) of our sustainable agriculture efforts. By having accurate, representative, and transparent farm-level data Ingredion can strategically pursue opportunities to collaborate on projects that deliver tangible Water and CO2 reductions as part of our overall sustainable agriculture program. Further to this, through our sustainable sourcing program, we collect grower information on water management utilizing the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative's (SAI) Farm Sustainability Assessment platform. As part of the sustainability assessment, the survey requires our suppliers to disclose essential elements of their water management strategy. We use this information to evaluate which suppliers we will source from and where to deploy resources to help drive improvements.

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

Select from:
☑ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

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

Select from:
☑ No, because our tier 1 suppliers are producers, and have no suppliers of commodities
[Add row]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Timber products

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building
☑ Provide training, support and best practices on sustainable agriculture practices and nutrient management

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Ingredion has a goal to Implement agricultural efficiency initiatives in support of smallholder farmers in 100% of applicable geographies in our supply chain by the end of 2027.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

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

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

When considering the scope and scale of Ingredion's operations and the goals we have committed to in sustainable and regenerative agriculture, it is necessary for us to find like-minded partners for collaboration. Driving change in agricultural supply chains takes time, resources and, most importantly, consistent and strong signals to suppliers about what change is needed. Ingredion has found that the most efficient way to meet these needs is by working with as many members of a supply chain as possible to drive change. When a regenerative ag project is supported by cooperatives and suppliers that work directly with the grower, purchasers and processors of commodities, and the downstream users of the ingredients made from the commodities such as Consumer Product Goods (CPGs), collective action can be harnessed to lower the strain on any one supply chain member without reducing the environmental outcomes targeted in the project. Showing growers supply chain alignment around sustainable and regenerative agriculture sends a powerful message about the importance and endurance of these initiatives. Supply chain collaboration also connects the grower more closely to the consumer-facing products that their commodities go into, which allows them to conceptualize and take pride in the positive effects their participation has on people and the environment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We measure success by the number of acres we have under regenerative agricultural programs. As of 2023 we have 74 thousand acres under regenerative agriculture programs. As founding members of the Sustainable Ag initiative (SAI) Platform's effort to develop a standard regenerative agriculture platform, Ingredion is excited to use the Regenerative Together global framework for regenerative agriculture. The framework aligns the food and beverage industry behind a shared definition of regenerative agriculture and a shared set of outcomes to facilitate the transition to regenerative agriculture. Ingredion sees this progress as an important step forward in scaling a transition to regenerative agriculture practices with our suppliers. By focusing on four environmental impact areas of regenerative agriculture—Soil Health, Water, Biodiversity and Climate—Regenerating Together will allow Ingredion to identify common practices to address each impact area, choose meaningful KPIs to measure progress, follow guidance on measurement tools and gain assurance in reporting outcomes. Agreement across supply chain members in the food and beverage Industry on these regenerative agriculture practices will allow for easier scale-up of projects, streamlined collaboration between different links in the supply chain and the ability to work on landscape-level solutions to environmental challenges in agriculture.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

When considering the scope and scale of Ingredion's operations and the goals we have committed to in sustainable and regenerative agriculture, it is necessary for us to find like-minded partners for collaboration. Driving change in agricultural supply chains takes time, resources and, most importantly, consistent and strong signals to suppliers about what change is needed. Ingredion has found that the most efficient way to meet these needs is by working with as many members of a supply chain as possible to drive change. When a regenerative ag project is supported by cooperatives and suppliers that work directly with the grower, purchasers and processors of commodities, and the downstream users of the ingredients made from the commodities such as Consumer Product Goods (CPGs), collective action can be harnessed to lower the strain on any one supply chain member without reducing the environmental outcomes targeted in the project. Showing growers supply chain alignment around sustainable and regenerative agriculture sends a powerful message about the importance and endurance of these initiatives. Supply chain collaboration also connects the grower more closely to the consumer-facing products that their commodities go into, which allows them to conceptualize and take pride in the positive effects their participation has on people and the environment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We measure success by the number of acres we have under regenerative agricultural programs. As of 2023 we have 74 thousand acres under regenerative agriculture programs. As founding members of the Sustainable Ag initiative (SAI) Platform's effort to develop a standard regenerative agriculture platform, Ingredion is excited to use the Regenerative Together global framework for regenerative agriculture. The framework aligns the food and beverage industry behind a shared definition of regenerative agriculture and a shared set of outcomes to facilitate the transition to regenerative agriculture. Ingredion sees this progress as an important step forward in scaling a transition to regenerative agriculture practices with our suppliers. By focusing on four environmental impact areas of regenerative agriculture—Soil Health, Water, Biodiversity and Climate—Regenerating Together will allow Ingredion to identify common practices to address each impact area, choose meaningful KPIs to measure progress, follow guidance on measurement tools and gain assurance in reporting outcomes. Agreement across supply chain members in the food and beverage Industry on these regenerative agriculture practices will allow for easier scale-up of projects, streamlined collaboration between different links in the supply chain and the ability to work on landscape-level solutions to environmental challenges in agriculture.
[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

Ingredion reports environmental performance from all locations where it has direct control over operations, and where it can influence decisions that impact environmental performance. This includes all Ingredion global manufacturing facilities and non-manufacturing facilities (such as Ingredion owned offices).

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Ingredion reports environmental performance from all locations where it has direct control over operations, and where it can influence decisions that impact environmental performance. This includes all Ingredion global manufacturing facilities and non-manufacturing facilities (such as Ingredion owned offices).

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Ingredion reports environmental performance from all locations where it has direct control over operations, and where it can influence decisions that impact environmental performance. This includes all Ingredion global manufacturing facilities and non-manufacturing facilities (such as Ingredion owned offices).

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Ingredion reports environmental performance from all locations where it has direct control over operations, and where it can influence decisions that impact environmental performance. This includes all Ingredion global manufacturing facilities and non-manufacturing facilities (such as Ingredion owned offices).

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Ingredion reports environmental performance from all locations where it has direct control over operations, and where it can influence decisions that impact environmental performance. This includes all Ingredion global manufacturing facilities and non-manufacturing facilities (such as Ingredion owned offices).
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, an acquisition

☑ Yes, a divestment

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

In 2023, Ingredion signed a definitive agreement to divest its business in South Korea to an affiliate of the Sajo Group, a leading food company headquartered in Seoul, North Korea.. Furthermore, Ingredion purchased 2 facilities in India in 2022 which are being reported on for the first time. We acquired Amishi Drugs and Chemicals Private Limited on August 1, 2022. On December 1, 2022, we acquired a 65 percent controlling interest in Mannitab Pharma Specialties Private Limited.

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

As a result of the divestment, two facilities operating in Korea were removed from our inventory boundary and baseline effective Feb 1, 2024. As a result of the acquisition, two facilities operating in India were added to our inventory boundary and baseline. Note: This was reported in our 2023 survey however we did not yet have all the required information to include their performance in our CDP survey last year. This year both facilities have been added.
[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]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2, location-based

☑ Scope 2, market-based

☑ Scope 3

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

Ingredion is committed to updating base year data to reflect changes in operational boundary, and to reflect changes in calculation methodologies, updated emissions factors, or error corrections. A Change will be made to the underlying inventory in the following cases: a) A change in operational boundary, such as when manufacturing facilities are divested from our inventory boundary or when new plants are acquired. B) If a previously excluded source (i.e. non-manufacturing) become significant. C). When base year errors or omissions are identified during internal or external reviews. D). When the quality of activity data is improved (such as when a meter is installed on a source that was previously estimated during the base year). E. If a published emission factor, energy conversion factor, or global warming potential is revised and retroactive to the base year. Ingredion does not use a significance threshold for A), however will restate B-E if the emissions lead to an increase of 5% or more.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2006

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

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.3) Comment

Ingredion's Scope 2 emissions arise from imported electricity and steam, utilized for processing equipment like motors and compressors. The company procures electricity from various utilities, including PG&E and Southern California Edison, while also generating its own electricity through cogeneration and on-site solar PV arrays. Scope 2 emissions reporting includes both location-based and market-based methods, with the former relying on regional grid-average emission factors and the latter considering contractual instruments between consumers and providers. Ingredion calculates emissions by subtracting REC purchases from total electricity purchases and multiplying the balance by market-based emission factors, with data sourced from metered electricity consumption or utility bills. Both location-based and market-based emissions are converted to CO2e using GWP values, with primary data from bills/inventories ensuring quality and audits minimizing assumptions. Additionally, Scope 2 emissions from steam are obtained from suppliers or estimated based on fuel type and thermal efficiency, with emissions calculated using IPCC factors and data sourced from metered consumption or utility bills, ensuring high-quality data with minimal assumptions.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Company Owned Vehicles

(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

0.1

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

Compared with our manufacturing operations, the emissions from our company owned vehicles are not significant. Company owned vehicles located at our manufacturing sites often fuel onsite and would be included in scope 1 emissions. Ingredion does not own/operate the vehicles that transfer product/materials to our facilities, or to our customers - these emissions are included in Scope 3. Total emissions are less than 0.005% of our overall scope 1 and 2 footprint.

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

Estimates were based on accounting for one on-site utility vehicle at each manufacturing facility. The most recent EPA transportation factors were applied to estimate overall CO2 emissions

Row 2

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Two small farms used primarily for research and development and one greenhouse.

(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

0.1

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

Ingredion leases 2 farm properties globally (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (

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

Life cycle emissions were calculated based on the quantity of crops grown at the research farms. Greet 1 V1.8d.1 with agronomic data from Greet for U.S. corn purchases assumed representative and applied to all farms.

Row 3

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Leased Vehicles

(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

0.1

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

Calculated emissions from leased vehicles are not relevant when compared with our manufacturing operations. Calculated emissions for leased vehicles are less than 0.05% of Global Scope 1 emissions.

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

Emission estimates for our North American fleet are provided by our third party fleet management firm who used EPA emission factors applied to total mileage driven. Estimates for the remaining global fleet were estimated by applying EPA emission factors to estimated distances traveled on our global leased fleet of automobiles.
[Add row]

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2562940

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. This total excludes the CO2 fraction from direct biogenic emissions. It is important to note that our company reduction goal includes biogenic CO2 emissions.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

791128

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

769412

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3208522

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. We calculate the cradle to gate emissions from the production of products purchased or acquired in the reporting year. Products purchased include agricultural feedstocks (corn, cassava, stevia, pulses, potatoes), processing aids, chemicals, packaging, maintenance consumables used at our facilities, and product purchased from third party toll packers. This category also includes emissions from intangible services such as marketing, consulting, real estate, and other business support services. Purchased Goods and

Services excludes capital goods, which are included separately under Category 2: Capital goods, as well as transportation and distribution related items which are captured in Category 4: Upstream Transportation and Distribution.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35509

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. This includes all upstream emissions from the production of capital goods purchased or acquired by the reporting company in the reporting year. Capital goods emissions involve the final products that have an extended life and are used by Ingredion to manufacture a product, provide a service, or sell, store, and deliver merchandise. In financial accounting, capital goods are treated as fixed assets or as plant, property, and equipment (PP&E). Examples of capital goods include equipment, machinery, buildings, facilities, and vehicles. Emissions from the use of capital goods are accounted for in either Scope 1 or Scope 2, rather than in Scope 3.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

485205

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. Category 3 involves emissions related to the production of fuels and energy purchased and consumed by Ingredion that are not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. This includes well-to-tank emissions for all upstream purchased fuel consumed at Ingredion facilities, upstream emissions of purchased electricity, and transportation and distribution emissions from all purchased electricity.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1242988

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. This category includes the Transportation and Distribution (T&D) of purchased products from suppliers and transportation between Ingredion facilities. This includes only shipment in vehicles not owned by Ingredion to avoid double counting with Scope 1 company vehicle emissions. Category 4 also includes emissions involved with warehousing products. Ingredion uses a spend based method to calculate emissions for warehouses. Actual spend for warehousing was gathered from corporate finance. T&D emissions may come from Rail, Truck, Ocean Vessel, or Air, and includes the storage of purchased products in warehouses, distribution centers, and retail facilities. To avoid double counting, emissions from T&D of purchased products upstream of Ingredion's tier 1 suppliers (e.g., transportation between tier 2 and tier 1 suppliers) are accounted for in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased Goods and Services. For Ingredion, Category 4 emissions include shipments of raw materials to our manufacturing facilities and warehouses, semi-finished goods transfers to affiliates, and outbound products where Ingredion paid for the transportation. Ingredion only reports T&D for raw material agriculture products in this category, not chemicals, packaging, or other purchased upstream products, as these are accounted for in Category 1 or Category 2. Transportation for waste is also excluded as these emissions are accounted for in Category 5.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

97199

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. Waste Generated in Operations involves the third-party removal and disposal of solid and liquid waste from Ingredion operations. The category quantifies solid waste emissions associated with offsite *disposal of waste, recovery for recycling, incineration, and composting operations. Offsite liquid waste treatment emissions include emissions associated with the anaerobic/aerobic digestion of liquid waste effluents, as well as CH4 and N2O emissions from the subsequent release of final effluent to natural waterways, as well as the land application of sludges. Emissions associated with on-site waste-water treatment activities are not included in this section as they are quantified in our Scope 1 boundary.*

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1830

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. Business Travel emissions involve the transportation of all global employees for business related activities in vehicles owned or operated by third parties, such as aircraft, trains, buses, and passenger cars. Emissions by vehicles or business travel that are owned or controlled by Ingredion are not counted in this category, as they fall under Scope 1 fuel use or Scope 2 electricity use for electric vehicles.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14941

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. This category includes an estimation of the annual commute emissions of our global workforce for our manufacturing facilities as well as our corporate and regional offices. Employee commute may include automobile, bus, subway/rail, air, or other mode of transportation (biking, walking).

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

475956

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. Downstream transportation and distribution involves the movement or storage of finished goods to Ingredion's customers where the transportation was not paid for by Ingredion. This includes only shipment in vehicles not owned by Ingredion to avoid double counting with Scope 1 company vehicle emissions. Like Category 4, this can include emissions from Rail, Truck, Ocean Vessel, or Air, and includes the storage of finished goods and sold products in warehouses, distribution centers, and retail facilities. Since Ingredion Incorporated sells mainly intermediate products, this category reports emissions of T&D from the point of sale to the end consumer only when the eventual end use of our product is known, otherwise only the T&D to business customers is reported.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2583200

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. As a business-to-business supplier, our ingredients are processed by our customers into final products. Category 10 calculates the emissions involved in processing our sold intermediate products by third parties before it is received by their end consumer.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6477.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No change from previous base year calculations.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1705313

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. End-of-life emissions are generated through the disposal of our products at the end of their use by the consumer. This includes emissions from the disposal of end product consumer food waste and disposing of solid waste packaging from which our product is shipped. As an intermediate product, this does not include the waste involved in the whole final product, but rather only the mass of our sold product within the processed good.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

178878.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The base year emissions have been recalculated to account for recent acquisitions and minor corrections to base year data. Investment emissions are included in the GHG IMP because providing capital or financing is a downstream service provided by a company. Investment types include: equity investments, debt investments, project finance, and managed investments and client services. Ingredion's investments are included in Scope 3 rather than Scope 1 or 2 because of the organizational boundary of a control approach, rather than an equity approach, selected for reporting. Emissions for investments are allocated based on proportional share of investment.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant.
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

1897186

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 covers direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by Ingredion. These emissions are generated through stationary combustion activities, transportation emissions, fugitive emissions, and on-site waste management. Primary operations include drying products using fuel fired flash dryers and product dryers, generating steam that is used in our processes, and generating efficient on-site power through cogeneration systems. Our scope 1 emissions also include refrigerants from on-site chillers and coolers, and process emissions from soda ash. Stationary fuel combustion emissions are calculated using the IPCC 2006 Volume 2 Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion Tier 1 Approach equation. GHG emissions associated with fugitive emissions were calculated using IPCC Volume 3: Industrial Processes and Product Use Chapter 7: Emissions of Fluorinated Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances. Ingredion employs a Tier 1 Emission Factor Approach at the Application Level. This methodology focuses on consumption and application rather than equipment and product type used, where net consumption of each refrigerant is multiplied by the relevant emission factor. Soda ash is calculated using IPCC Volume 3 Chapter 2: Mineral Industry Emissions, using a Tier 2 Approach.

Past year 1

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

2198870

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 covers direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by Ingredion. These emissions are generated through stationary combustion activities, transportation emissions, fugitive emissions, and on-site waste management. Primary operations include drying products using fuel fired flash dryers and product dryers, generating steam that is used in our processes, and generating efficient on-site power through cogeneration systems. Our scope 1 emissions also include refrigerants from on-site chillers and coolers, and process emissions from soda ash. Stationary fuel combustion emissions are calculated using the IPCC 2006 Volume 2 Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion Tier 1 Approach equation. GHG emissions associated with fugitive emissions were calculated using IPCC Volume 3: Industrial Processes and Product Use Chapter 7: Emissions of Fluorinated Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances. Ingredion employs a Tier 1 Emission Factor Approach at the Application Level. This methodology focuses on consumption and application rather than equipment and product type used, where net consumption of each refrigerant is multiplied by the relevant emission factor. Soda ash is calculated using IPCC Volume 3 Chapter 2: Mineral Industry Emissions, using a Tier 2 Approach.
[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)

743250

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

673973

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ingredion gathers emission factors for both location-based and market-based accounting. Ingredion abides by general rules for purchased electricity emission factors per the GHG Corporate Accounting Protocol. Ingredion relies on various sources for purchased electricity emission factors which are defined in table 6.2 of the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance. For Location-Based Emission Factors are as follows: The US relies on Regional or Subnational emission factors from eGrid. Australia, Brazil, China, Columbia, India, Malaysia, Pakistan, Peru, Thailand, and the UK rely on National emission factors from the IEA National electricity emission factors. Mexico relies on National emission factors from the Comision Federal de Electricidad. Germany relies on National emission factors from the Government of Germany.

Canada relies on National emission factors from the Government of Canada. Market-Based Emission Factors are as follows: Cabo, Goole, Lima, and Shanghai use Energy Attribute Certificates and the REC's are retired on behalf of Ingredion. Cedar Rapids, Guadalajara, Oxnard (Kerr), San Juan del Rio, and Tlalnepantla use Supplier Utility Emission rates and are supplier specific. Argo, Belcamp, Grand Forks, North Charleston, and Winston Salem use Supplier Utility Emission rates provided by Edison Electric. Alcantara, Balsa Nova, Ban Khao Din, Banglen, Barranquilla, Cabo, Cali, Cardinal, Cartago, Cornwala, Enstek PC, Faisalabad, Ganzhou PC, Kalasin, London, Lima, Mehren, Mogi Guacu, Sabanagrande, Shandong, Shandong South, Shanghai, Sikhiu, Vanscoy use other Grid Average Emission Factors provided by the IEA. Ingredion chose to report purchased steam separately from purchased electricity to have a more accurate representation of Scope 2 emissions. However, there are limited resources available on purchased steam reporting. We elected to use the reporting guidance for stationary combustion using the IPCC 2006 Volume 2 Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion Tier 1 Approach equation. The calculation is modified for purchased steam by dividing the steam usage gathered from activity data by the thermal efficiency for the steam generation. The thermal efficiency of the steam generation is assumed to be 80% for all purchased steam. Stationary combustion IPCC emission factors for fuel sources used to generate steam are applied.

Past year 1

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

841801

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

809882

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ingredion gathers emission factors for both location-based and market-based accounting. Ingredion abides by general rules for purchased electricity emission factors per the GHG Corporate Accounting Protocol. Ingredion relies on various sources for purchased electricity emission factors which are defined in table 6.2 of the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance. For Location-Based Emission Factors are as follows: The US relies on Regional or Subnational emission factors from eGrid. Australia, Brazil, China, Columbia, India, Malaysia, Pakistan, Peru, Thailand, and the UK rely on National emission factors from the IEA National electricity emission factors. Mexico relies on National emission factors from the Comision Federal de Electricidad. Germany relies on National emission factors from the Government of Germany. Canada relies on National emission factors from the Government of Canada. Market-Based Emission Factors are as follows: Cabo, Goole, Lima, and Shanghai use Energy Attribute Certificates and the REC's are retired on behalf of Ingredion. Cedar Rapids, Guadalajara, Oxnard (Kerr), San Juan del Rio, and Tlalnepantla use Supplier Utility Emission rates and are supplier specific. Argo, Belcamp, Grand Forks, North Charleston, and Winston Salem use Supplier Utility Emission rates provided by Edison Electric. Alcantara, Balsa Nova, Ban Khao Din, Banglen, Barranquilla, Cabo, Cali, Cardinal, Cartago, Cornwala, Enstek PC, Faisalabad, Ganzhou PC, Kalasin, London, Lima, Mehren, Mogi Guacu, Sabanagrande, Shandong, Shandong South, Shanghai, Sikhiu, Vanscoy use other Grid Average Emission Factors provided by the IEA. Ingredion chose to report purchased steam separately from purchased electricity to have a more accurate representation of Scope 2 emissions.

However, there are limited resources available on purchased steam reporting. We elected to use the reporting guidance for stationary combustion using the IPCC 2006 Volume 2 Chapter 2: Stationary Combustion Tier 1 Approach equation. The calculation is modified for purchased steam by dividing the steam usage gathered from activity data by the thermal efficiency for the steam generation. The thermal efficiency of the steam generation is assumed to be 80% for all purchased steam. Stationary combustion IPCC emission factors for fuel sources used to generate steam are applied.
[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)

3102233

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Average data method
☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We use a mixed approach for calculating category 1 emissions. Agriproducts are calculated using average data methods (i.e. emission factors), and all non-agricultural spend is calculated using spend based methods. For Maize, we used Greet 1 V1.8d.1 (life cycle CO2e results) with agronomic data from Greet for U.S. corn purchases assumed representative and applied to corn purchases in other parts of the world. Emission reductions achieved from our Verified Emission Reduction Project (VER) were applied to our emissions. For Cassava, Pulses, Stevia, Potatoes: Ingredion utilized an outside consultant to identify relevant LCA *inventory factors from published sources that were then used to calculate farming emissions and third party pre-processing emissions (where applicable). Weights for all agricultural products were collected from certified weight scale receipts that were compiled at every operating facility. Non-agricultural goods and services used spend based method. Actual spend data for 2023 was used to calculate emissions from toll packing operations, as well as emissions for the production of processing aids, chemicals, packaging, and maintenance consumables used at our facilities. Complete global spend for all relevant activities was obtained from our procurement team, and emission factors (EEIO) used for our spend based analysis were taken from "Supply Chain Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries" published by the Environmental Protection Agency.*

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

25712

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category represents emissions from the manufacturing of equipment used at our facilities to produce our final products. Emissions are calculated using spend based methods. Complete global spend for all relevant activities was obtained from our procurement team and emission factors (EEIO) used for our spend based analysis were taken from "Supply Chain Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries" published by the Environmental Protection Agency.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

452551

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Well to tank emissions for all purchased fuels and electricity were calculated using fuel based method. Actual consumption data for electricity and fuel usage was obtained from vendor invoices, compiled at our local facilities and managed in a central database. For electricity: T&D losses were estimated using Country level "correction for transportation and distribution loss induced emission factors" published by the EPA. For fuels: Well to tank fuel emission factors were published by the United Kingdom, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1357173

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Upstream transportation and distribution includes shipment of raw materials to Ingredion's manufacturing facilities and warehouses, semi finished goods transfers to affiliates, and outbound products where Ingredion paid for the transportation. This year we have also included a spend based estimate for estimating emissions from warehousing activities. Inbound and outbound material transportation data (Rail, Truck, Ocean, and Air shipments), which includes cargo weight and average length of haul (shipping distances), was collected from Ingredion's commodity and logistics department. Once collected, Ingredion used emission factors from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership and GHG global warming potentials from IPCC AR5 to calculate total CO2e. The emission calculations include Well to tank fuel emission factors, which were published by the United Kingdom, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). To calculate the emissions from our warehousing activities, actual spend for warehousing was gathered from corporate finance. 2022 emission factors (EEIO) used for our spend based analysis were taken from "Supply Chain Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries."

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

97482

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes the removal and disposal of solid and liquid waste from operations. Solid waste: Volumes for all waste landfilled, recycled, land applied, and incinerated were provided by each of our manufacturing facilities. 'Mixed MSW', 'Mixed Recyclables' and 'Mixed Organics' emission factors published by the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership (Table 9) were used to calculate emissions. Liquid waste: Most Ingredion sites have liquid waste discharges, of which many sites have on site wastewater treatment facilities. CH4 and N2O emissions from third party treatment of discharged waste, associated biomass, and the final discharge to the natural environment were calculated based on Chapter 6 of the IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories - section 6.2.3.1 & 6.4.1.1 Industrial Wastewater Emissions. Primary process data on treatment methods and effluent quality/quantity was obtained from all manufacturing sites. Emission factors were chosen from the relevant section of the IPCC guidelines. Reasonable technical based assumptions from subject matter experts were made regarding third party treatment capabilities (Anaerobic vs Aerobic treatment), and composition of biogas emissions.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2722

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category represents emissions from air travel, hotels, car rentals, and livery services for work related travel for all global employees. Emissions are calculated using spend based methods. Complete global spend for all relevant travel activities was obtained from financial records and emission factors used for our spend based analysis were taken from "Supply Chain Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries" published by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

8552

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Employee transit emissions are calculated based on total headcount at all our manufacturing and non-manufacturing sites. Global headcount by site was used for our calculations, and remote work estimations were made in alignment with internal Human Resource Policies. Distances, and mode of transportation were estimated using the website www.numbeo.com, which breaks down average commute mode and distance for major global cities. Emissions were calculated by multiplying the distance travelled by employee (per annum) by an emission factor for that mode of transportation, obtained by the Environmental Protection Agency, Center for Corporate Climate Leadership (Table 9). The emission calculations include Well to tank fuel emission factors, which were published by the United Kingdom, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

All leased assets are consolidated within Scopes 1 & 2 under the operational boundary. Ingredion does not have any emissions falling within this category.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

332717

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Downstream transportation and distribution includes shipment of finished product to Ingredion customers where the transportation was not paid for by Ingredion. Outbound material transportation data (Rail, Truck, Ocean, and Air shipments), which includes cargo weight and average length of haul (shipping distances), was collected from Ingredion's commodity and logistics department. Once collected, Ingredion used emission factors from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership and GHG global warming potentials from IPCC AR5 to calculate total CO2e. WTT emission factors, published by DEFRA, have also been applied.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

332717

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

As a business-to-business supplier our ingredients are processed by our customers, and in this category we calculate the emissions associated with processing our products into final products. Global weights for all product sold globally was obtained from our finance team and multiplied by a life cycle emission factor. Ingredient specific emission factors for our customer's processes are not readily available so we systematically divided our sold product into 12 broad consumer end product categories and chose an emission factor from public LCA databases that best represent the category. As the 12 categories represent 90% of our sold product, the remaining emissions were estimated using the weighted average emission factor for the 12 categories. Ingredion worked with a third party consultant to identify relevant emission factors from a variety of academic sources.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Downstream emissions from the use of ethanol (during combustion) are estimated based on volume of Ethanol produced and uses IPCC emission factors for the denaturant and biofuel. Note: Ingredion ceased production of Ethanol in 2020.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1458391

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This represents packaging waste that is disposed of by our business to business customers as well the disposal of end product consumer food waste that includes our products. Packaging waste: Due to the diverse nature of our global product offering and customer operations, we do not have specific waste information. Our packaging is broken down into 4 categories - resin, fiber, pallets, and metal. For each category we developed a custom weight of package based on dollar spend, and estimate the mass of packaging sold based on our annual global spend in those categories. We use an average US recycling rate provided by Statista, and apply this to the entire weight of calculated packaging to determine the ultimate disposal mechanism and 'Mixed MSW', 'Mixed Recyclables' and 'Mixed Organics' emission factors published by the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership (Table 9) were used to calculate overall emissions. Food Waste: We estimated waste emissions from the disposal of end product consumer food waste by assuming a small portion of our global production will end up wasted due to various reasons. Information provided by ReFED was used to quantify the percentage/method of food waste disposal, and we used emission factors published by the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership (Table 9) to calculate overall emissions.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

All leased assets are consolidated within Scopes 1 & 2 under the operational boundary. Ingredion does not have any emissions falling within this category.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not have any franchises, so this category is not relevant to our organization

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

152724

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Ingredion calculates the majority of our investment emissions using direct Scope 1 and Scope 2 emission data provided by the investee company. For the balance, emissions are calculated using a cost base analysis using investee revenue. Corporate finance provides investee revenue from our investments. EEIO emission factors used for our spend based analysis were taken from "Supply Chain Emission Factors for US Commodities and Industries" published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. When data was not available, emissions were estimated based on the average emissions for Ingredion investments in a similar industry sectors.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

At this time, Ingredion believes that the existing scope 3 screening is a comprehensive profile of all our Scope 3 emissions and has not identified any further scope 3 emissions relevant to our organization.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

At this time, Ingredion believes that the existing scope 3 screening is a comprehensive profile of all our Scope 3 emissions and has not identified any further scope 3 emissions relevant to our organization.

[Fixed row]

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

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

3677868

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

35509

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

413555

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

1307212

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

112971

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

2288

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

12264

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

0

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

426487

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

3810916

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

0

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

1592669

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

0

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

0

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

152724

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Emissions have been recalculated due to change in operational boundary (Divestment of Korean operations
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Ingredion 2023 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final Rev 1_mg.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Page 1 - Page 3

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Ingredion 2023 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final Rev 1_mg.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 1 - Page 3

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Ingredion 2023 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final Rev 1_mg.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Investments
☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
☑ Scope 3: Business travel
☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3: Processing of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

Ingredion 2023 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final Rev 1_mg.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

Page 1 - Page 3

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100723

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Gross global emissions of scope 1 and scope 2 for Ingredion were 2,571,159 metric tonnes of CO2e in 2023. Its gross global emissions for the previous year were 2,875,232 metric tonnes of CO2e. The total change in emissions is 304,073 metric tonnes, equal to a 10.6% decrease, according to the formula in the explanation of terms, above: (304,073 / 2,875,232) -10.6%. The change in emissions is attributed to 4 reasons: 1) An increase in renewable energy consumption, 2) A decrease in production, and 3) the implementation of reduction initiatives, and 4) the temporary switch of fuels from Coal to Natural gas in our Pakistan plants. Specific to renewable energy consumption, Ingredion saw a reduction of 9,124 MT due to the procurement of new REC's, and a decrease of 91,598 MT due to the start up of a new biomass steam facility in two facilities in South America. The % change in emissions due to these activities is calculated as (91,598 9,124)/2,875,232 X 100 3.5%.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

91929

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3.2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Gross global emissions of scope 1 and scope 2 for Ingredion were 2,571,159 metric tonnes of CO2e in 2023. Its gross global emissions for the previous year were 2,875,232 metric tonnes of CO2e. The total change in emissions is 304,073 metric tonnes, equal to a 10.6% decrease, according to the formula in the explanation of terms, above: (304,073 / 2,875,232) -10.6%. The change in emissions is attributed to 4 reasons: 1) An increase in renewable energy consumption, 2) A decrease in production, and 3) the implementation of reduction initiatives, and 4) the temporary switch of fuels from Coal to Natural gas in our Pakistan plants. Specific to other emission reduction activities, Ingredion saw a reduction of 91,929 MT. The % change in emissions due to these activities is calculated as (91,929)/2,875,232 X 100 3.2%.

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

Divestments and acquisitions trigger a recalculation of prior year emissions.

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

Divestments and acquisitions trigger a recalculation of prior year emissions.

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Mergers trigger a recalculation of prior year emissions.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21269

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.7

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Gross global emissions of scope 1 and scope 2 for Ingredion were 2,571,159 metric tonnes of CO2e in 2023. Its gross global emissions for the previous year were 2,875,232 metric tonnes of CO2e. The total change in emissions is 304,073 metric tonnes, equal to a 10.6% decrease, according to the formula in the explanation of terms, above: (304,073 / 2,875,232) -10.6%. The change in emissions is attributed to 4 reasons: 1) An increase in renewable energy consumption, 2) A decrease in production, and 3) the implementation of reduction initiatives, and 4) the temporary switch of fuels from Coal to Natural gas in our Pakistan plants. Specific to production change, Ingredion saw a reduction of 21,268MT of CO2e due to lower global demand for products. The % change in emissions due to these activities is calculated as (21,268)/2,875,232 X 100 0.7%.

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

There were no changes in methodology in 2023

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

There were no changes in boundary in 2023.

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

There were no changes in physical operating conditions in 2023.

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

There were no unidentified reductions in 2023.

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

91912

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3.2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Gross global emissions of scope 1 and scope 2 for Ingredion were 2,571,159 metric tonnes of CO2e in 2023. Its gross global emissions for the previous year were 2,875,232 metric tonnes of CO2e. The total change in emissions is 304,073 metric tonnes, equal to a 10.6% decrease, according to the formula in the explanation of terms, above: (304,073 / 2,875,232) -10.6%. The change in emissions is attributed to 4 reasons: 1) An increase in renewable energy consumption, 2) A decrease in production, and 3) the implementation of reduction initiatives, and 4) the temporary switch of fuels from Coal to Natural gas in our Pakistan plants. Specific to other changes, Ingredion saw a reduction of 91,929MT of CO2e due to a temporary transition away from Coal. The % change in emissions due to these activities is calculated as (91,929)/2,875,232 X 100 3.2%.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Sequestration during land use change

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Currently, Ingredion does not quantify CO2 sequestration from land management change. Ingredion is currently working on our methods to provide this data in the future.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery) is not material for our organization.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

26507

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors
☑ Other, please specify **:**Removals are calculated using the GWPbio method.

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Ingredion reports net biogenic emissions from the combustion of on-site and off-site biofuels. Note: CH4 and N2O emissions for the biofuels are calculated and reported as Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. On site biofuels primarily include woody biomass and methane from on-site waste treatment operations. Offsite biofuels include woody biomass and municipal waste (biomass portion) used to produce third party steam. CO2 emissions are quantified by calculating total CO2 emissions using IPCC emission factors and subtracting gross biogenic removals. Gross biogenic removals are calculated differently depending if the fuel source is agriculturally derived material (ADM) or harvested wood products. ADM - Ingredion aligns its removal approach with the IPCC guidelines Tier 1 method approach that considers that over the course of the year emissions from combustion/oxidation/decay of annual biomass (e.g. corn) are balanced by carbon uptake prior to harvest, within the uncertainties of the estimates, so the net emission is zero. Based on the neutrality principle, biogenic CO2 emissions from fuels derived from annual crops are assumed to be fully removed. Harvested Wood Products - The GWPbio method was introduced to measure the GWP of a pulse of CO2 caused by the combustion of biomass, taking into account that harvesting is followed by regrowth of trees in a forest stand and that other dynamic processes are triggered by harvesting. A third party calculator (provide by Quantis) is used to quantify what the representative GWPbio factor would be for a specific geographical region and woody biomass fuel.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other) is not material for our organization.
[Fixed row]

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

Maize/corn

(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)

1973629

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Denominator is '1' as we are reporting absolute value.

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

We calculate life cycle GHG emissions from the farming of all sourced Corn using a model based on Greet 1 V1.8d.1 (Life cycle CO2e results), with U.S agronomic data for growing areas. U.S. corn purchases are assumed representative and applied to corn purchases in other parts of the world. This is a company-wide assessment. We also engage with agricultural suppliers on sustainable agriculture practices that help reduce climate change (e.g. no tillage, reduced chemical usage, reduced water irrigation, etc). Through Field to Market, we track the carbon footprint of farm-level activity in the United States and provide farmers with a comparison of their carbon footprint versus other farmers in their areas. We collect carbon emission information annually on our specialty corn growers in the United States through Field to Market. In other cases, we purchase corn as a commodity through brokers and do not have direct contact with growers or access to this information. Calculated emissions are approximately 1.9% lower than 2022 emissions which is why we identified the change as 'about the same.'

Other commodity

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

60384

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Denominator is '1' as we are reporting absolute value.

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

We calculate GHG emissions related to sourced farming of Stevia utilizing a life cycle created in 2022, and raw material receipts. The life cycle factor was calculated by a third party consultant. Calculated emissions are approximately 0.2% lower than 2022 emissions which is why we identified the change as 'about the same.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

1875855

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

1738

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ N2O

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

14203

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :CFCs

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

5391

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

[Add row]

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

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

229047

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

33937

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

3932

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

231147

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

5153

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

5153

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9046

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

101251

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

69771

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

78642

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

1275

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

1275

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18086

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

29347

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

37083

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

85.42

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

2106

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

2106

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7286

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

11882

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

11882

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

376589

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

137104

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

147933

Pakistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

143623

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

34308

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

34308

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10417

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

2547

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

0

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

34901

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

40129

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

36596

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2116

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

349

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

349

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

756200

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

343872

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

325209
[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	*Texture & Healthful Solutions*	*176534*
Row 3	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - LATAM*	*694696*
Row 4	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - U.S./Canada*	*866094*
Row 5	*All Other*	*159862*

[Add row]

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.

Row 1

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1897186

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

☑ Region-specific emissions factors

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

This total includes all of our direct operation manufacturing plant scope 1 emissions. The total excludes biogenic CO2 while including CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials.
[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	*Texture and Healthful Solutions*	*310647*	*300308*
Row 3	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - LATAM*	*174853*	*151866*
Row 4	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - U.S./Canada*	*159638*	*128910*
Row 5	*All Other*	*98113*	*92890*

[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)

2562940

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

791128

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

769412

(7.22.4) Please explain

For purpose of survey we report as one consolidated group. Ingredion uses third-party verification for assurance that all emissions are accounted for as well as the correct amount is totaled.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

Response does not include any other entities.
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

35555

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6485.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon.

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

48292

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6884.8

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

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

106561

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20254.5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

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

16351

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2316.4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

4378

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

699.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

5968

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1198

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

913

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

73

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

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

1570

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

282.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

165

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

31

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

9051

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1512.5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

31262

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

12135.2

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

1167

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

128.9

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

10698

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1890.2

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 15

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO_2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

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

372495

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

65647.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO_2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 16

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

13798

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2471.3

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 17

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 18

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

80337

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

16668.5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 19

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

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

700

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

141.4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 20

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

393

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

55.2

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 21

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO_2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO_2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO_2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO_2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO_2e totals reported include CH_4 and N_2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO_2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 22

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

473

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

101.1

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Boilers, turbines, and energy efficient cogeneration units are our major source of scope 1 CO2e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Fuels and other sources of GHG emissions are tracked at all manufacturing facilities. Our methodology for estimating CO2e emissions and the accuracy of fuel and other GHG emission records for our global manufacturing operations are included in a 3rd party verification program. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Note that Scope 1 CO2e totals reported include CH4 and N2O from combustion of biogenic materials, while excluding CO2 from biologically sequestered carbon. 678/5000

Row 23

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

35555

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1696.7

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 24

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

48292

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3641.9

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 25

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

106561

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5512.4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 26

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 27

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

16351

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1120.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 28

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

4378

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

640.7

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 29

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

5968

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

510.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 30

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

913

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

28.1

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 31

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

1570

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

99

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 32

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

165

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1.4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 33

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

9051

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1165.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 34

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

31262

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1398.4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 35

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

1167

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

40.4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 36

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

10698

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

613.9

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 37

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

372495

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

7067.7

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 38

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

13798

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1908.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 39

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 40

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

80337

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2546.1

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 41

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

700

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9.8

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 42

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

393

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

30.8

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 43

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.

Row 44

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

CO2e emissions are aggregated at a facility level and are allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by the facility where manufactured.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

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

473

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

46.4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity and to a lesser extent purchased steam are our major sources of scope 2 CO2e emissions.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Purchased electricity emissions are based on supplier emission factors, or residual grid mix from Green-e in the United States, the Association of Issuing Bodies in Europe, and either government published or International Energy Administration (IEA) emission factors for other countries. Scope 2 emissions from purchased steam are calculated based on the fuel type, an efficiency estimate, and IPCC 2006 emission factors. Our methodology and emission factors used are included in a 3rd party verification program for our global manufacturing operations. Resulting CO2e emissions were aggregated at the regional level and were allocated to customers based on the mass of products purchased weighted by regions where manufactured. We are not able to estimate CO2e emissions at the product line level. Some of our facilities purchase Renewable Energy Certificates which are applied in the reported market-based numbers.
[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

It would require an exponential increase in costs, engineering resources, and installation and upkeep of metering equipment to track and calculate energy use at the product/product line level on an ongoing basis.
[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

We are currently expanding our methods to provide scope 3 emissions allocated to customers. We are also ensuring our product footprint information aligns with global frameworks (i.e. Pathfinder initiative).
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ 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

817586.82

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

9152203.81

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

9969788.63

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

358255.48

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1079519.1

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

1437774.58

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

352717.66

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1452273.27

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

1804990.93

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1026.51

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

1026.51

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1529586.47

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

11683996.18

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

13213582.65
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

139834.05

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

0

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

139834.05

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Sustainable biomass includes the consumption of reclaimed biogas from onsite wastewater treatment facilities, as well as the consumption of purchased bio-diesel fuels.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

677752.77

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

62251.12

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

0

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

615501.65

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Other biomass includes the consumption of woody biomass.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

There was no consumption of other biomass during 2023.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

194516.45

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

20186.16

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

0

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

174330.29

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Two facilities had coal consumption in 2023.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

170972.69

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

725.86

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

169067.04

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

1179.79

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Oil includes Fuel oil grades 1,2,3, and residual fuel oil.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

8786714.64

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

14509.52

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

5538993.91

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

500020.99

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

2733190.25

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Gasoline includes natural gas, diesel gas, Kerosene, and Propane (LPG).

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

There was no consumption in this category in 2023.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

9969790.63

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

97672.66

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

5847895

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

1291032.72

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

2733190.25

(7.30.7.8) Comment

.
[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)

853946.94

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

851966.12

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

59592.36

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

59592.36

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

6115246.32

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

6115246.32

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

139834.05

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

139834.05

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

1079262.23

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

1079262.23

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

535693.16

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

535693.16

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Peru

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

13678846

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Peru

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2016

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our facility in Lima Puru purchases from the Cerro del Aguila Hydro Plant.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

1755

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Spain

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our facility in Goole, U.K., procures 100% RE supported with certificates through a local Utility.
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

233648

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

118999

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

264166

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

1185251

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

1802064.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24292

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

199887

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

0

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

942948

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

1167127.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

58488

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

0

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

152614

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

44615

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

255717.00

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8339

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

68975

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

0

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

318959

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

396273.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

30944

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

0

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

37124

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

89395

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

157463.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2940

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

0

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

5738

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

114.08

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

8792.08

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19155

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

0

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

0

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

36041

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

55196.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

226337

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

178786

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

193012

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

1698488

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

2296623.00

Pakistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

92775

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

22454

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

0

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

585087

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

700316.00

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13679

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

0

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

0

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

51078

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

64757.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

85255

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

0

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

0

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

226360

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

311615.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1755

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

0

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

0

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

10466

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

12221.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

640167

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

264846

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

296087

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

3927041

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

5128141.00
[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.000313556

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

2571159

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

8200000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

18

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Divestment

(7.45.9) Please explain

The intensity figure has lowered primarily due to the divestment of our Korea Operations. The Korea business was divested in Q1 of 2024, and once divested, the operations was removed from our inventory boundary for the purposes of GHG reporting and re-baselining. As a result, total revenue includes revenue received from our Korea business, however reported Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions do not include the corresponding emissions. Furthermore, Ingredion reduced our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions due to process improvements and the increased consumption of renewable electricity.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Water Use Intensity

(7.52.2) Metric value

4.71

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Cubic meters of water

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Metric tons of finished product

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0.15

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

As part of our All Life sustainability strategy, all of Ingredion sites have a water reduction goal that is reflective of the water stress for the basin where the facility operates. Facilities in extreme high water stress areas have a 30% reduction by 2030, facilities in high stress areas have a 20% reduction, and facilities in low and medium water stress areas have a 10% reduction goal. The metric presented is a composite of the three goals. Our water intensity was slightly higher in 2023 (4.71) vs 2022 (4.56) due to continuous improvement initiatives being offset by higher production rates and product mix. However, we have achieved 1.45% reduction in water use compared to our base year (2019) and we continue to identify opportunities and make strategic investments which will help us attain our goal by 2030. Additionally, in extreme high stressed geographies we have lessened our water intensity in these areas by 2% in the reporting year.
[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

INGR-USA-001-OFF Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2022

(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)

(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

12/31/2019

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

2562940

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

769412

(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)

3332352.000

(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

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

28

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

2399293.440

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

1897186

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

673973

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

2571159.000

(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

81.58

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target covers all emissions from our global operations as defined by our operational boundary. Note: Our science based target includes biogenic emissions. For disclosure purposes they have been included in the reported Scope 1 emissions for this question.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To reduce our scope 1 and 2 CO2 emissions consistent to a climate transition plan with an alignment of a well below 2 degrees celsius.

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

Ingredion will implement its Scope 1 emission reduction target through a portfolio of projects across its network of manufacturing plants. These projects include: reduction of coal energy sources; capital investment in more energy efficient process technologies; continuous improvement of daily operating routines to ensure optimal efficiency of existing assets; and conversion to biomass energy sources at select locations. Ingredion will implement its Scope 2 emission reduction targets by; improving the efficiency of our plant consumption of third party electricity and steam; on-site solar at select locations; and, purchasing third-party renewable electricity. The primary drivers to our improvement in Scopes 1 and 2 GHG emissions vs. 2022 were lower product demand, Pakistan energy mix, higher renewable electricity usage and the start-up of two renewable biomass boilers in Brazil

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 3

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 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

INGR-USA-001-OFF Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2022

(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)

(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 5 – Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3, Category 10 – Processing of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2019

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

3208522

(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)

485205

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

1242988

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

97199

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3583200

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

8617114.000

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

8617114.000

(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)

100.0

(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)

100.0

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(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)

57.7

(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)

67.0

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

67.0

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

15

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

7324546.900

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

3102233

(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)

452551

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

1357173

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

97482

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3211116

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

8220555.000

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

8220555.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

30.68

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

In alignment with the SBTi guidance our target covers 67% of our Scope 3 inventory boundary. Covered categories were chosen based on materiality to Ingredion and to our external stakeholders, overall size of emissions, and our ability to influence reductions across our value chain. Our target excludes emissions in the following relevant categories: Capital Goods, Business Travel, Employee Commuting, Downstream transportation, End of Life Treatment, and Investments.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To reduce our scope 3 emissions consistent to a climate transition plan with an alignment of a well below 2 degrees Celsius.

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

Ingredion will implement our reduction targets by improving operational efficiency and engaging with key stakeholders within our supply chain. Improving the operational efficiency of our manufacturing facilities will lead to reductions in well to tank (WTT) emissions from our purchased fuels and electricity, reduce the generation of waste, and reduce the consumption of raw materials. Furthermore, we will increase our engagement activities with our farmers to reduce emissions from agricultural operations through the promotion of regenerative agriculture practices. We will also increase our collaboration with customers as it relates to *reducing the CO2 footprint needed to process our final product. We are evaluating engaging with our suppliers through the CDP to enable us to collect primary data for categories that currently use secondary data (such as chemicals and packaging materials), and identify opportunities for engagement that will deliver quantifiable reductions.*

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

(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

01/01/2020

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:
☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

1365224

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

2.8

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

50

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

25

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

47.03

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

The procurement of renewable energy has been identified as one element of an overarching strategy to achieve our Scope 1 and 2 GHG reduction goals.

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target covers purchased electricity from our global operations as defined by our operational boundary.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Renewable Electricity provides a substantial lever to decarbonize our global carbon footprint. The procurement of renewable electricity supported by certificates directly lowers the emissions of our purchased electricity (quantified as Scope 2 Market emissions). This supports our overall target to reduce our emissions by 28% by 2030 vs a 2019 base year.

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

The economic cost of renewable electricity varies by market based on local supply and demand. In some markets, there is relative cost parity, and we have prioritized renewable electricity purchases from the grid. In 2023, we participated in a project to explore a US virtual power purchasing agreement (VPPA) with an external consultant and other supply chain partners. Upon analysis, we concluded that the current US VPPA agreement structures would increase Ingredion's earnings volatility and add incremental energy cost. Currently, it is extremely difficult to pass on this incremental cost to our customers, who are looking for cost-effective solutions in their formulations. As a result, we decided not to pursue the VPPA agreement and continue to monitor the market for more economic opportunities in the future. We continue to evaluate solar power solutions at our manufacturing sites. These solutions provide renewable green power. Given the physical on-site surfaces

available (e.g., available land, rooftops, etc.), the solution can often be a small percentage of the site's overall electricity consumption. We have conducted on-site solar installations in Colombia, Thailand and Pakistan, which have had attractive capacity generation and financial returns.
[Add row]

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 2

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:
☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy productivity
☑ Other, energy productivity, please specify **:**Percentage of Waxy Corn Sustainably Sourced

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

40.0

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

No

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The overarching goal is to “Make life better for growers, mitigate supply chain risks and help drive food security by sustainably sourcing 100% of primary crops”.

Row 3

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 2

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy productivity

☑ Other, energy productivity, please specify :Sustainably sourcing 100% of primary crop

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

10.0

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

No

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The overarching goal is to "Make life better for growers, mitigate supply chain risks and help drive food security by sustainably sourcing 100% of primary crops".

[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*136*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*44*	*105854*
Implementation commenced	*31*	*308749*
Implemented	*15*	*16980*
Not to be implemented	*2*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Waste heat recovery

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

3408

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

140000

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

700000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Investment at our Guadalajara plant to recover heat from the boiler stack and use it as heat in our boiler preheater and dryers. This enabled the plant to reduce an estimated 3400 MT of CO2.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Solar PV

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

185

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

60800

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

730000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Installation of an on-site solar (Photovoltaic) system that reduces the consumption of 3rd party generated electricity.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Biogas

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

3791

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

199000

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

995000

(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

Implementation of a system to capture biogas from on-site wastewater treatment and use it as a source of heating fuel for our co-product dryer.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Process optimization

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

9596

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

750000

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

3001000

(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

Our global facilities implemented numerous process optimization projects in our starch operations which required capital upgrades to existing equipment and controls systems. Combined, these initiatives have an estimated savings of 9596 MT of CO2.
[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:
☑ Other :Project Prioritization Score

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We use a project prioritization scoring system to define and identify opportunities with a substantive impact. The scoring system includes metrics on business performance, customer initiatives, EHS performance, sustainability (including achieving company goals), and employee development/engagement.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Review of changing regulations, including emissions trading programs and carbon taxes, and how they potentially impact operations are factored into investment decisions.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Multiple analytics are drawn around all projects to determine how to optimize organizational costs. The calculations most commonly include ROI: Return on Investment and discounted cash flow analysis including net present value with a set internal hurdle rate and an independently calculated internal rate of return.

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Lower return on investment (ROI) specification

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The capital categorization for Environmental Projects has a standalone category which do require a ROI to be calculated allowing the sustainability investments to be made based on the merits of the sustainability initiative without financial calculations.

Row 6

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our CEO awards program, now in its eleventh year, is an example of a global recognition program recognizing the great work of many hundreds of employees. The finalists are drawn from all the company's regions and represent excellence in eleven categories: Be Preferred, Care first: Quality, Care First: Sustainability, Innovate Boldy, Everyone Belongs, Owners Mindset, AI Excellence Early Adopter, Digital Excellence, Professional Excellence, Leadership Excellence, and Business Excellence.

Row 7

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In an effort to raise awareness of climate change and influence decision makers to embed our climate commitments in our approval process, Ingredion implemented an internal carbon price in 2022. The inclusion of a shadow price introduces a formal mechanism to screen all capital investments against a shadow carbon cost, which incentivizes the development of projects that delivered CO2 reductions, while penalizing projects that increase our GHG footprint. While it is still early to judge the effectiveness of the program, initial observations made indicate an increase in frequency of projects with CO2 savings, including renewable energy.
[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:

☑ Crop diversity

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Diversification of crops grown in fields increases agronomic value of farming and disrupts insect and weed cycles.

(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

Communication with growers on crop diversity benefits.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 3

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP7

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Low tillage and residue management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Rely less on annual deep tillage and more on low/no till options.Recognize the benefits of residue on fields year-round for increased organic matter, decreased run off, and improved water holding capacity.

(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

Communication with growers on this topic at meetings.Collect information on practices through Sustainable Sourcing platforms.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fossil fuel (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 4

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Equipment maintenance and calibration

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Reduces GHG emissions and carbon footprint of farming activities.Allows for more accurate precision agriculture data collection.

(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

Communicate with growers on the importance of equipment maintenance. Poll growers on whether maintenance practices are being employed (via SAI FSA).

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 5

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Crop rotation

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Rotate between crops grown in a field rather than the same crop in a continuous fashion helps to break insect and weed cycles.

(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

Review benefits of crop rotation when communicating with growers.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 6

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Fertilizer management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Ensure proper amounts and timing of fertilizer applications to ensure efficiency and decrease run off and waste.

(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

Discuss with growers at meetings.Highlight environmental and economic benefits of proper fertilizer management.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 7

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Integrated pest management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Utilize scouting for pests to identify chemical and physical solutions to pest issues targeted at a farm level.

(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

Review IPM strategies with growers in direct communications.Specific example is a predator wasp release to reduce mealy bug issue in Thailand.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 8

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP9

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Pest, disease and weed management practices

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Utilize crop scouting, integrated pest management strategies, and appropriate chemical controls to increase agronomic viability of a farm in a responsible fashion.

(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

Communication with growers.Examples include herbicide tolerance studies on specialty corn in the US and the model farmer program in Thailand. We are seeing continued success from a program in previous year where we worked with farmers and local officials to mitigate mealy bug infestation in the Thailand Cassava crop.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 9

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP8

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Nitrogen-fixing plants as cover crop

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Where applicable and able to be managed, plant cover crops to fix available N to the soil for use with later crops.

(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

Discuss cover cropping in communications with growers. Highlight possible benefits of cover cropping.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

N/A

Row 10

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Proactively communicate with growers on new strategies, seeds, technologies, etc. that may improve agronomic, economic, or other conditions at the farm level

(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

Local grower meetings to facilitate best practice sharing between growers. (Model farmer program in Thailand; development of hybridized seed in Pakistan) and to bring in experts to discuss agriculture with growers.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

Local grower meetings to facilitate best practice sharing between growers. (Model farmer program in Thailand; development of hybridized seed in Pakistan) and to bring in experts to discuss Ag with growers (example the NA grower meetings).
[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP4

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Water

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Ensuring proper amounts and timing of fertilizer applications decrease run off and impacts to surface water.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Fertilizer management practices reduce the amount of fertilizer applied in the field and ensure the proper availability to maximize plant growth.

Row 3

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Rotating crops breaks insect and weed cycles and reduces the potential for soil nutrient depletion

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Growers are implementing crop rotation practices

Row 4

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP7

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Rely less on annual deep tillage and more on low/no-till options. This increases organic matter in the soil, decreases runoff and loss of topsoil and improves the water holding capacity of soils

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Growers are implementing low/no-till practices

Row 5

(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
☑ Soil

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Diversification of crops grown in fields increases the agronomic value of farming and disrupts insect and weed cycles

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Growers are beginning to practice crop diversity as well as crop rotation
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:
☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:
☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:
☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other
☑ Other, please specify :Bio-Converted RebM Sweetner

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

Ingredion produces four variations of stevia sugar substitutes—Leaf-extracted Reb A, Leaf-extracted Reb M, Bio-converted Reb M, and Fermented Sugarcane Reb M. Stevia is a category of sweeteners made of Steviol glycosides that derive from the leaves of the plant species Stevia Rebaudiana. Steviol glycosides are about 100 to 300 times sweeter than conventional white sugar, without carbohydrates, calories, or artificial ingredients. Stevia is a low-carbon alternative to other sweeteners like high fructose corn syrup (HFCS), white sugar from sugarcane, and white sugar from sugar beet. Ingredion commissioned Anthesis LLC to conduct a comparative life cycle assessment (LCA) of the four stevia products against the three traditional sweeteners which found that the stevia products had lower *environmental impact scores overall than the traditional sweeteners. Using the category of global warming as our primary focus, all four stevia products have lower global warming impacts than white sugar from sugarcane. This leads Ingredion to believe that the four stevia sweetener products we produce are low-carbon products when compared to the reference product of white sugar from sugar cane, and even other available traditional sweetener alternatives. We chose to specifically focus on bio-fermented Reb M as it is a more differentiated product within the stevia sector from Ingredion's portfolio.*

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Estimating and Reporting the Comparative Emissions Impacts of Products (WRI)

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

The functional unit for this study is defined as: "The sweetening equivalency of 1 kg of white sugar for use in the beverage industry." The function of the product systems is to provide sweetening to the beverage industry to make a variety of products. Sweeteners can be compared based on their relative sweetness, in relation to sucrose (white sugar) by weight. In this study, the relative sweetness is used as a proxy for the quantity of sweeteners needed to obtain a given sweet taste."

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Sweeteners produced from white-sugar from sugar cane.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

610

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

The third party study identified the GWP of bio-converted Reb M as 556 MT of CO2/KG of white sugar, and the GWP of sugarcane as 1170 MT of CO2/KG. As defined in the WRI attributional approach, avoided emissions are calculated by subtracting life cycle emissions of the reference product by life cycle emissions of the assessed product. (1170MT - 556MT) 610. We chose an attributional approach because the LCA analysis by Anthesis LLC compares sweetener products to each other. We chose to only calculate for global warming potential, though the Anthesis study has calculations for other environmental, but non-carbon related, categories. We use the ISO 14040/44 procedure for allocation of material and energy flows and environmental emissions. Assumptions were made for the stevia by-products, as economic allocation procedure for ISO was not possible, so a mass-based allocation that uses the production volumes of the different steviol glycosides was performed. Ingredion also does not have information on electricity or natural gas inputs for stevia separately, since stevia is manufactured with other products in the China and Malaysia facilities, so facility-level data was used. ReCiPe 1.06 Global Warming environmental impact indicator is used based on AR4 IPCC Global Warming Potential Factors. Omitted from the study were emissions from: · Human energy inputs to processes · Production and disposal of the infrastructure (machines, transport vehicles, roads, etc.) and their maintenance · Environmental impacts related to storage phases · Losses of product during the distribution to customers · Handling and potential storage of the product at the customer's facility. To prevent the sweeteners from absorbing moisture, they should be stored in a cool and dry place and kept well ventilated. This is true for the seven sweeteners under study · Electricity, steam and fossil fuels required for office energy needs, such as heating, cooling, and lighting · Transport of employees to and from their normal place of work and business travel · Environmental impacts associated with support functions (e.g., R&D, marketing, finance, management etc.) · Potential differences in product uses

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits canceled by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Agriculture

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

The project is administered by the Soil and Water Outcomes Fund (SWOF). The program seeks to incentivize growers to adopt regenerative agricultural practices such as no-till, extended crop rotations, and winter cover crop practices. Ingredion purchased VER's as part of a voluntary in- setting strategy from the SWOF from farms in our supply shed. The project period was from March 2022 and May 2023.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

4596

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2022

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Issued

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ Other private carbon crediting program, please specify

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Standardized Approaches

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The 2022 CO2e produced on farms have been modeled by Sustainable Environmental Consultants using the EcoPractices platform and COMET-Farm for sequestration and nitrous oxide (N2O) reductions and USDA RUSLE2 with Greet Emission factors for direct fuel usage reductions, upstream fuel emission reductions, and upstream fertilizer emission reductions. All data required to run the models was collected by SWOF and all fields have been visited to verify compliance with contract terms.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

The SWOF maintains a buffer pool to mitigate against reversals. A full verification report and data is submitted to Ingredion as part of our contract with SWOF. The project delivered 11,730 VER's to Ingredion, however only 4956 VER's were applied to our Scope 3 as they applied to Corn. VER's applied to Soy fields were not included in our retirement.

[Add row]

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

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

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Timber products	*232606*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*232606*

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Unknown

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

112127

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

Volume is calculated from reported energy values. Volume includes total sourced timber for the operation of one on-site boiler, and two third party steam boilers.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Unknown

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

120479

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

Volume is calculated from reported energy values. Volume includes total sourced timber for the operation of one on-site boiler.
[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?

Timber products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

Ingredion continues to use the SAI Platform FSA as our primary mechanism for evaluating deforestation in our supply chain. Our organization's definition of "no-deforestation" is consistent with industry and regulatory definitions of deforestation.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2019

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ In line with organizational commitments, but sector- or region-wide cutoff date is available

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2026-2030

[Add row]

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

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

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

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Other resource use and efficiency target metric, please specify :Sustainably sourcing 100% of tier 1 crops

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2023

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

10

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

66.8

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

63.11

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ None, no alignment after assessment

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Tier 1 Priority Crops include corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia and peas/pulses. There are no exclusions in our Tier 1 Priority Crops from this goal.

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

In 2023, we achieved 66.8% progress toward our goal of having 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops (i.e. corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia and peas/pulses) sustainably sourced by 2025. Additionally, we have achieved our goal of having 100% of global waxy corn sustainably sourced as part of that broader effort. We are at various stages of implementing sustainable agriculture, as indicated on the following map. Of the 66.8% of crops that were sustainably sourced globally, we are pleased to share that 14.6% of growers achieved SAI Platform's FSA Gold level by demonstrating the highest levels of sustainable agriculture. Various challenges have impacted our progress toward our goals in different geographies. For example, in the United States where we source the majority of our corn from grain elevators from grain elevators that may, in turn, source from varying draw areas, connecting with farmers can pose a challenge. In Thailand, where we were the first company to sustainably source waxy tapioca, our biggest challenge was educating growers about sustainable sourcing and spreading that knowledge to the thousands of smallholder farmers in our supply chain.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Sustainable and regenerative agriculture continue to be among the most common topics of discussion in sustainability engagements with our customers and other stakeholders. We continue to see many consumer-facing companies put an emphasis on sustainably sourced ingredients, leveraging continued consumer demand for sustainable products. At Ingredion, our work in this area is not only about helping our customers meet their sustainability aspirations, but also about working with our growers to support a more climate-resilient supply chain. We understand that we have an obligation to work with our grower partners across the world to support sustainable and regenerative farming.
[Add row]

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

Timber products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

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

(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

From a threshold materiality perspective, our focus on forest-related issues is targeted around sustainable sourcing of our tier 1 crops (Corn, Cassava, Pulses, Stevia and Potatoes) as they represent 31% of our procurement spend. Spend relating to timber products used for fuel wood constitutes
[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

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

Select from:
☑ No

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

In 2023, Ingredion began a forest risk assessment that involved reaching out to suppliers to better understand our supply chain risk. This process is continuing in 2024 with the intention to understand and report DF/DCF status.
[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

(8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

Ingredion continues to use the SAI Platform FSA as our primary mechanism for evaluating deforestation in our supply chain. As the lack of deforestation activity is considered an "Essential" question, and therefore required for a farm to be considered sustainable, our goal of having 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops sustainably sourced by 2025 is well aligned with our goal of having zero deforestation in our supply chain. We have currently assessed and validated approximately two-thirds of our Tier 1 crop suppliers as being sustainably sourced under the FSA, and we are working with even more growers who have been assessed but do not quite meet the sustainable sourcing criteria. Of the geographies currently assessed under the FSA, we have identified only two areas where we are seeking a greater understanding of possible deforestation impacts in our agricultural supply chain. While we have not identified significant deforestation risk through the FSA, Brazil has been identified as a geography where significant deforestation risk exists. For that reason, we would like to further validate that no issues exist in our supply chain. Some corn growers in Ontario have identified that they have cleared trees in the past 10 years as part of government-sanctioned deforestation to expand farmland. We are working to better understand how this may, or may not, meet industry standards of deforestation, as it has been done in a licensed and controlled way. In 2023, Ingredion's Brazil operations began work on a multi-year project to increase transparency into our supply chain. While part of the focus on this project is to gain a better understanding of social aspects of our agricultural suppliers, there will also be an environmental focus that will look at deforestation and other topics. For our Canada suppliers, we clearly understand the relatively small percentage of our grower suppliers who have cleared trees for farmland. We are now working to gain a better understanding of whether or not activity done under the sustainable management of a government or other entity meets industry and regulatory definitions of deforestation. Ingredion's dedication to protecting biodiversity and promotion of regenerative agricultural practices is driving our goal of achieving zero deforestation. Within the next year this practice of monitoring will be implemented, but it was not set forth as the highest priority for Ingredion.
[Fixed row]

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

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years

(8.12.5) Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.12.6) Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted

Biomass is not a material part of our fuel supply and represents

[Fixed row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

Timber products

(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated

Select from:

☑ No, but plan to do so in the next two years

(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Biomass is not a material part of our fuel supply and represents
[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

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

(8.14.5) Please explain

In 2023, Ingredion conducted a preliminary forest risk assessment for our timber biofuel products. The process involved reviewing historic supplier data (actual and proxy) for the regions where we source timber and conducting a risk profile. This assessment will guide future strategic activities related to land use and land change impacts.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

(8.15.1) Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ No, we do not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives, but we plan to in the next two years

(8.15.2) Primary reason for not engaging in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.15.3) Explain why your organization does not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

From a threshold materiality perspective, our focus on forest-related issues is targeted around the sustainable sourcing of our tier 1 crops (Corn, Cassava, Pulses, Stevia and Potatoes) as they represent 31% of our procurement spend. Spend relating to timber products used for fuel wood constitutes
[Fixed row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:

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

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

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

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Row 1

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Non-manufacturing facilities not co-located at manufacturing sites

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Water use is not significant.

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

Water use is not significant at these sites compared to manufacturing locations. In most cases, water is provided through the lease and managed in multi-tenant buildings by a landlord or property manager. Using standard factors per worker, withdrawals from non-manufacturing locations are estimated to total

Row 2

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Business activities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

A leased, 25-acre farm used primarily for research and development

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Water use is not significant.

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

Water use is not significant compared to manufacturing locations. The farm is not irrigated and relies on rainwater. Water use is estimated to be
[Add row]

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Total water withdrawals are measured using various methods depending on the site, including direct measurement (e.g., flow meters) or mass balances. Each of our manufacturing sites enters this data into a corporate database on a monthly schedule. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal rates are important to our operational stability, cost structure and sustainability goals. This will continue to be relevant into the future. Tracking and reducing water withdrawal is one of our company sustainability goals.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals by source are measured using various methods depending on the site, including direct measurement (e.g., flow meters) or mass balances. Each of our manufacturing sites enters this data into a corporate database on a monthly schedule. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal volumes by source, including municipal, groundwater and surface water, are important to understand due to potential impacts to the local environment, as well as potential risk from drought or changing regulations. This will continue to be a relevant aspect into the future.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water quality testing for potable water parameters occurs a minimum of annually. Measurement and analysis are in accordance with standard methods as specified in site permits and often in accordance with the World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines. WHO includes recommended limits on a variety of parameters including metals (e.g., arsenic, barium, chromium), organics (e.g., benzene, toluene, xylene) and other parameters.

(9.2.4) Please explain

As a food ingredients solutions provider, understanding the quality of our process water is critical to Good Manufacturing Processes (GMP). This will continue to be a relevant and important aspect into the future. In addition, sites measure water volumes being withdrawn by measures including flow meters or pump discharge rates. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge total volumes are measured using various methods depending on the site and may include direct measurement or mass balance. Each of our manufacturing sites enters this data into a corporate database on a monthly schedule. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Monitoring discharges by volume and source is important to understanding risks and vulnerabilities, as well as cost control. This will continue to be a relevant aspect into the future.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge total volumes are measured using various methods depending on the site and may include direct measurement or mass balance. Each of our manufacturing sites enters this data into a corporate database on a monthly schedule. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Monitoring discharges by destination and volume is important to understanding potential impact to the environment as well as the potential impact of emerging regulations.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge volumes by treatment method are measured using various methods depending on the site and may include direct measurement or mass balance. Each of our manufacturing sites enters this data into a corporate database on a monthly schedule. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Monitoring water discharge volume by treatment method along with treatment efficiency is necessary to make Scope 1 CO2 emission estimates, and to understand potential offsite impacts as well as potential impact of emerging regulations. This will continue to be relevant into the future.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each manufacturing site enters monthly data into a corporate database. Water effluent discharge parameters are measured in accordance with site-specific regulations and follow standard lab testing procedures. Most permits require monitoring of wastewater discharge flow rates, and effluent quality for biological oxygen demand, total solids, pH and other parameters.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We monitor and track standard effluent parameters as a measure of plant efficiency; for regulatory compliance; and, in addition to discharge volume and destination, to understand potential impacts to the local environment. This will continue to be a relevant aspect into the future. In addition, we have set a target to reduce Chemical Oxygen Demand 10% from our wastewater discharges by the end of 2030.

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

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Priority substances are measured in accordance with site-specific permit requirements at each site. Limits in site permits for direct discharge are set based on regulatory (e.g., NPDES permit) requirements and to not significantly change quality objectives of the receiving stream. Permit limits for discharge to sewer systems for additional treatment are set by the sewer authority. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our sites track and monitor the concentration of priority substances at a facility level. We currently do not report a corporate inventory for priority substances. This will continue to be a relevant aspect into the future.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Temperature is measured in accordance with site-specific permit requirements at each site. Temperature limits in site permits for direct discharge are set based on regulatory (e.g., NPDES permit) requirements to not significantly change the ambient temperature of the receiving stream (limits may be seasonal). Permit limits for discharge to sewer systems for additional treatment are set by the sewer authority and are generally in the 35 to 40 C range. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track and monitor the discharge temperature of non-contact cooling water and other wastewater, as required by regulatory permit, on monthly basis. This will continue to be a relevant aspect into the future.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each of our manufacturing sites enters this data into a corporate database on a monthly schedule. Water consumption is measured through various methods including direct readings (e.g., flow meters) and mass balances. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Tracking the volume of water consumed is important to understanding our water balance and tracking progress on our company sustainability goals. This will continue to be relevant into the future.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We tracked water recycling/reuse at approximately 82% of our sites in 2023. We currently measure recycling in a variety of ways on a monthly schedule, including direct measurement (e.g. flow meters) or mass balance calculations.

(9.2.4) Please explain

There has been little guidance on what should be considered water recycling/reuse in our industry because reuse of water in operations is integral in the way corn wet mills operate. For example, water from our starch washing process is reused in multiple processing steps. However, our definition and tracking categories emphasize water recycled and reused that is not part of our traditional design. This creates more value to us through easier identification of opportunities and best practices. Tracking new water recycling/reuse, beyond that integral to site operations will be a relevant aspect into the future.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The Sedex Members Ethical Trade Audit (SMETA) includes an evaluation of WASH services. 100% of sites have been audited to SMETA, and new acquisitions will continue to be folded into our existing program as they are integrated into the business. SMETA audits are conducted at least every three years for each of our manufacturing sites by an independent, third-party auditor using the criteria mandated by SEDEX. 100% of sites are monitored for this aspect.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We are dedicated to the welfare of our employees and business associates; and, therefore, this aspect will continue to be relevant.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

110069

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

In comparison to 2022, our 2023 total withdrawals were approximately 5% lower. We consider /-10 % variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The small decrease in overall volume of water withdrawn matches a corresponding drop in production seen in 2023 vs 2022. The numbers for withdrawal, discharges and consumption balance. Total water withdrawals are anticipated to decrease as we approach 2030 and our water reduction strategy is achieved.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

97859

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

In comparison to 2022, our 2023 total discharges were approximately 5% lower. We consider /-10 % variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The small decrease in overall volume of water withdrawn matches a corresponding drop in production seen in 2023 vs 2022. The numbers for withdrawal, discharges and consumption balance. Total water discharges are anticipated to decrease as we approach 2030 and our water reduction strategy is achieved.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

12209

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

In comparison to 2022, our 2023 total consumption was lower by 7%. We consider /-10 % variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The small decrease in the volume of water consumed corresponds to the lower production volume seen in 2023 vs 2022. The numbers for withdrawal, discharges and consumption balance. Total consumption is anticipated to decrease as we approach 2030 and our water reduction strategy is achieved.
[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)

12430

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

11.29

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

To determine if our manufacturing sites are located in water stressed areas, we calculate the basin level water stress at every global facility using a portfolio of tools including the WWF Water Risk Filter and WRI Aqueduct products.. The withdrawals shown represent facilities that are located in areas of high/extremely-high water risk. Approximately 8 percent of our total water intake as indicated by the WWF Water Risk Filter was identified from areas with either: 1) annual average monthly net water depletion equal to or greater than 75%, or 2) seasonal water depletion equal to or greater than 75% (one or more months). In comparison to 2022, our 2023 withdrawals were lower by approximately 13%. The reductions were due to a combination of production decreases, and the implementation of water efficiency projects. We expect this number to continue to lower (improve) as we continue to invest in water efficient processes/infrastructure to meet our 2030 All Life Water goals.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Maize/corn

(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:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

We assessed the locations of our corn suppliers using the WWF Water Risk Filter Map and identified that

Other commodity

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

We source cassava from various farms primarily in Thailand, but also smaller amounts from Colombia. Central Thailand experiences a typical tropical Savannah wet/dry seasonal climate. As such there are seasonal periods with little rain fall as well as periods with abundant rainfall. These periods generally fall in the same months each year and farmers compensate for these periods as part of their normal operations, mitigating risk to our business. We assessed the locations of our cassava suppliers using the WWF Water Risk Filter Map and identified that 51-75% of cassava was sourced from areas the WWF classifies as having seasonal water depletion (equal to or greater than 75% in one or months). We did not identify any Cassava sourced from areas having an annual average monthly net water depletion equal to or greater than 75%. As we continue to raise awareness around this metric, we anticipate maintaining or reducing this trend when we select areas to source cassava.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

71515

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Fresh surface water is measured at all our sites and is relevant to our operations because we use fresh water in our processes and for boiler feed water to make steam necessary for our manufacturing operations. In comparison to 2022, our total 2023 withdrawal of fresh water was approximately 5% lower. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We expect to see further reductions in water volume as we implement water recycling/reduction initiatives as part of our All Life sustainability goals.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Ingredion does not use brackish surface water/seawater and we do not expect this to change in the future. Brackish water is not an important aspect of our operations as it would only be used if no other water sources were available. Future use of this water source is also not expected to be important due to the difficulty to treat the water to an acceptable level for food quality.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

16937

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Groundwater withdrawal volumes are measured at all sites and we have verified approximately 90% of our total groundwater is renewable. We believe the remaining 10% is also renewable but are seeking an authoritative reference. In comparison to 2022, our total 2023 withdrawal of renewable groundwater was approximately 6% less. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We expect to see further reductions in water volume as we implement water recycling/reduction initiatives as part of our All Life sustainability goals

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Ingredion does not use Groundwater-non-renewable. Sites that use groundwater are located within renewable groundwater sources. We do not anticipate this to change in the future.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

The moisture content of our agricultural raw materials represents

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

21617

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Water supplied by third party sources is measured at all our sites (where present) and is relevant to our operations because we use fresh water in our processes and for boiler feed water to make steam necessary for our manufacturing operations. In comparison to 2022, our total 2023 withdrawal of water from third parties was 5% lower. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We expect to see further reductions in water volume as we implement water recycling/reduction initiatives as part of our All Life sustainability goals
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

71118

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to fresh surface water is relevant at our sites that treat wastewater for discharge in accordance with regulations. Stormwater runoff from many sites is also discharged to fresh surface water. In 2023, discharges to fresh surface water were 5% lower compared to 2022. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We anticipate that the discharge surface water will remain about the same in future years as efficiencies in water use may offset increased production rates.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to brackish surface water/seawater is not relevant because Ingredion does not discharge to brackish surface water/seawater. We do not anticipate this changing in the future.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2229

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We do not discharge water directly to groundwater through injection wells. The volume discharged to groundwater represents irrigation of land both onsite and offsite. In comparison to 2022, 2023 discharges were approximately 24% lower likely due to decreased production and greater water recycling at the facilities. Overall, irrigation is a small percentage of our water discharge volume. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We anticipate that the discharge volume to groundwater will remain about the same in future years as efficiencies in water use may offset increased production rates.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

24512

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Third party water source volumes, generally municipal water suppliers, are measured at all applicable sites. In comparison to 2022, our 2023 water from third party sources was 3% lower. We consider /-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We anticipate that the discharge volume to third parties will remain about the same in future years as efficiencies in water use may offset increased production rates.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2843

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge of water treated by tertiary treatment decreased by approximately 6% between 2023 and 2022. Tertiary treatment includes membranes for salt removal, Dissolved Air Floatation (DAF) units for precipitating Phosphorous, and additional chemical dosing to remove sulfates after anaerobic treatment. These facilities also have primary and secondary treatment systems. Ingredion considers changes with /- 10% to be about the same. It is expected that the number may increase as we pursue advancements in treatment technologies at some of our global facilities. This will be balanced by reductions from implementing water recycling/reduction initiatives as part of our All Life sustainability goals.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

13028.2

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 41-50

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge of water treated by secondary treatment decreased by 4% in 2023 vs 2022. Secondary treatment includes aerobic or anaerobic digestion facilities, or a combination of both. Ingredion considers changes with /- 10% to be about the same. It is expected that this volume will decrease due to reductions from implementing water recycling/reduction initiatives as part of our All Life sustainability goals, and from sites installing more advanced waste treatment infrastructure.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

18555.2

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge of water treated by primary treatment decreased by 3% in 2023 vs 2022. Primary treatment includes pH adjustment and removable of settle-able solids. Ingredion considers changes with /- 10% to be about the same. It is expected that this volume will decrease due to reductions from implementing water recycling/reduction initiatives as part of our All-Life sustainability goals, and from sites installing more advanced waste treatment infrastructure.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We do not discharge process wastewater to the environment without treatment.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

42.7

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge of untreated water to a third party treatment facility increased by 2% in 2023 vs 2022. Ingredion facilities that do not have on-site wastewater treatment will discharge process waste water to local municipalities for treatment. Our discharges conform to regulatory limits for pollutants set forth by the local jurisdiction. Ingredion considers changes with /- 10% to be about the same. It is expected that waste volumes will continue to improve as we make progress on reducing overall water consumption as part of our All Life Sustainability Goals and from sites installing more advanced waste treatment infrastructure.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

65301.1

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 11-20

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This represents non-contact single pass cooling water that is treated, as applicable, to meet local regulatory requirements. Discharge of non-contact single pass cooling water decreased by 4% in 2023 vs 2022. Ingredion considers changes with /- 10% to be about the same. We expect this number to stay consistent in the future.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☑ Nitrates

☑ Phosphates

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Ingredion monitors and track priority effluent parameters at a local facility level and we do not roll up this information into a corporate inventory at present.
[Fixed row]

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

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

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

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

One of our manufacturing sites meets the definition of having the potential to result in a substantive impact. This facility is located in an area defined as extreme high water stress using our ensemble risk tool.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

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

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

0

(9.3.4) Please explain

While we have evaluated risk and impacts within the supply chain; none currently meet the definition of substantive impact.
[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)

Facility 1

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Panuco

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.400967

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-99.989156

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2906

(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

2653

(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

253

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

1436

(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

1436

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

1470

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

We do not withdraw fresh surface water, brackish surface water, or non-renewable groundwater. Moisture content of our agricultural raw materials represents
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

The verifier performed their work in accordance with Apex's standard procedures and guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

The verifier performed their work in accordance with Apex's standard procedures and guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Water withdrawal quality was not verified.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

The verifier performed their work in accordance with Apex's standard procedures and guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

The verifier performed their work in accordance with Apex's standard procedures and guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

The verifier performed their work in accordance with Apex's standard procedures and guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

The verifier performed their work in accordance with Apex's standard procedures and guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

The verifier performed their work in accordance with Apex's standard procedures and guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.
[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	8160000000	*74135.32*	*It is expected that this number should improve as water efficiency projects are implemented at Ingredion.*

[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

Maize/corn

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

0.17

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Acre-inch

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Thousand Bushels of Corn

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.9.6) Please explain

Water Intensity is calculated from data collected by suppliers in the Field to Market program. Volume is calculated as the depth of irrigated water applied across the total irrigated field areas ratioed to the total field acreage in the program (irrigated and non- irrigated) expressed as acre-inch per thousand corn bushels grown (0.17 acre-inch/thousand bushels). Of the total acres in the data collection program, 3.6% were irrigated. The average volume of water/acre was higher compared to 2022 (0.11 acre-inch/thousand bushels) likely due to hot and dry conditions near the end of the growing season - a time which is critical for water demand to ensure good crop yields. We anticipate that water use for Field to Market suppliers will decrease over time as a result of customer collaboration and suppliers being able to measure and compare irrigation efficiencies. Further to this, our commitment to the AgWater challenge has set the stage for deeper collaboration within our agricultural supply chain, which includes utilizing the Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) to identify region and crop-specific practices such as those that promote soil health, improve nutrient management, and reduce irrigation.

Other commodity

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

399

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.9.6) Please explain

We do not have supplier specific quantitative information for this commodity. However, a literature review indicated that the average water intensity of cassava is approximately 399 m3/ton of cassava grown in Thailand. Thailand produces approximately 70% of the world market share of cassava. The majority (approximately 80%) of the water is from precipitation. While, we do not have supplier specific water intensity data, cassava growers are taught the importance of water management through the Model Farmer Program. We anticipate that water use will decrease over time as a result of education, awareness, and implementation of water management strategies. Further to this, our commitment to the AgWater challenge has set the stage for deeper collaboration within our agricultural supply chain, which includes utilizing the Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) to identify region and crop-specific practices such as those that promote soil health, improve nutrient management, and reduce irrigation. *(https://www.thaiscience.info/Journals/Article/CMJS/10990726.pdf)*

[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Average water intensity for all products across our operations (Cubic meters of water per Metric tons of finished product)

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

4.7

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water withdrawn

(9.12.4) Denominator

Metric tons of finished product

(9.12.5) Comment

Water withdrawn includes all water intake with the exception of single pass non-contact cooling water that is withdrawn and returned to the same source.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*Ingredion's product portfolio does not contain any hazardous substance compounds.*

[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:
☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

In 2022 we did a comparison of water intensity (Water use per MT of product produced) between wet and dry manufacturing processes for Pulse Proteins and calculated a 99.8% reduction in water, and 94.5% reduction in energy when comparing processing requirements of our Ultra Performance line vs traditional pulse protein production.

(9.14.4) Please explain

Our Plant-Based Protein growth platform is well aligned to play a part in the broader evolution of our food system. Growing consumer demand for plant based and hybrid products is expected to drive dramatic increases in sales of these products.In 2022, Ingredion was pleased to be announced as the World Plant-Based Awards winner for Best Plant-Based Sustainability for our Ultra Performance line of products. The Ultra Performance line allows for the creation of better-tasting plant-based food and beverages without typical challenges such as raw plant flavor or bitter taste commonly associated with dry milling of pulse products. Made at Ingredion's Vanscoy, Saskatchewan, Canada facility, the more sustainable Ultra Performance line of pulse protein concentrates does not generate anywastewater during processing. Our proprietary process does not incorporate chemicals or additives, and uses much less water and energy than traditional pulseprotein concentrate production.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category
Water pollution	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water withdrawals	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Other	*Select from:*

	Target set in this category
	☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Basin level

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Product water intensity

☑ Reduction per product

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

2.06

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

1.44

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

2.02

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

6

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

As part of our All Life sustainability strategy, all of Ingredion sites have a water reduction goal that is reflective of the water stress for the basin where the facility operates. Facilities in extreme high water stress areas have a 30% reduction by 2030, facilities in high stress areas have a 20% reduction, and facilities in low and medium water stress areas have a 10% reduction goal.

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

By the end of 2023 we have achieved 6% of our target. While we are slightly off target we continue to identify opportunities and make strategic investments which will help us attain our goal by 2030. The improvement over the prior year was underpinned by a portfolio of continuous improvement opportunities. We will continue to make progress towards our goal by remaining focused on Continuous improvement in our operational efficiency, and by investing in projects that promote the recycling/reuse of water. Our global operations network has a Manufacturing Excellence team that identifies best practices in our operational routines, equipment and technologies, and then share them across our global organization so they can be quickly adopted. In 2024, we will complete an anaerobic wastewater treatment project at our San Juan del Rio plant that will enable more water recovery for cooling. In 2024, we plan to initiate an additional investment project to reduce our Mexico water consumption.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

.

Row 4

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 5

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Reduction in concentration of pollutants

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

18.27

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

16.43

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

18.57

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-16

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

As part of our All Life Strategy, Ingredion implemented a goal to reduce the amount of organic material being sent to wastewater treatment from our manufacturing facilities. COD intensity, which measures the amount of organic material sent to wastewater treatment (either onsite or offsite wastewater treatment). All manufacturing facilities in our operational boundary are included in this target with no exclusions.

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

In 2023, we achieved a 1% increase in COD intensity vs. our 2019 baseline. Some of our facilities were impacted by unexpected operational upsets, which adversely impacted the COD intensity. While not an improvement vs. our base year, it reflects a 6% performance improvement vs. last year. Our teams will continue to focus on this metric in 2024.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

.

Row 5

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 4

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Procurement/production of sustainable raw materials

☑ Increase in procurement/production of crops using sustainable agriculture practices

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0.0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100.0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

66.8

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

67

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covers all tier 1 crops purchased by Ingredion. Tier 1 crops include corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia and peas/pulses.

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

In 2023, we achieved 66.8% progress toward our goal of having 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops (i.e. corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia and peas/pulses) sustainably sourced by 2025. Additionally, we have achieved our goal of having 100% of global waxy corn sustainably sourced as part of that broader effort. We are at various stages of implementing sustainable agriculture, as indicated on the following map. Of the 66.8% of crops that were sustainably sourced globally, we are pleased to share that 14.6% of growers achieved SAI Platform's FSA Gold level by demonstrating the highest levels of sustainable agriculture.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Various challenges have impacted our progress toward our goals in different geographies. For example, in the United States where we source the majority of our corn from grain elevators from grain elevators that may, in turn, source from varying draw areas, connecting with farmers can pose a challenge. In Thailand, where we were the first company to sustainably source waxy tapioca, our biggest challenge was educating growers about sustainable sourcing and spreading that knowledge to the thousands of smallholder farmers in our supply chain.

Row 7

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 6

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Increase in the proportion of employees using safely managed drinking water services

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0.0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100.0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

66.8

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

67

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covers the farms for all tier 1 crops purchased by Ingredion. Tier 1 crops include corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia and peas/pulses. WASH criteria have been taken into account in the assessment tool and require our supply farms to have access to WASH facilities for all permanent, temporary and seasonal workers and their families, visitors and subcontractors. This requirement is a mandatory element in order for the farm output to qualify as sustainably sourced.

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

We made notable progress this past year against our sustainable agriculture goal of sustainably sourcing 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops and now have 67% of those priority crops covered under our sustainable sourcing program.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

.

[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.1.2) Target type and metric

Plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale

End-of-life management

☑ Reduce the proportion of plastic waste which is sent to landfill and/or incinerated

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Increase plastics circular economy by the end of 2030

(10.1.3) Please explain

In 2023, Ingredion performed a preliminary mapping of where plastics are used within our operations. Primary use occurs in packaging and shipping/distribution of product to the customer. Smaller amounts of plastics are used in direct operations, but primarily are for quality control, testing of product and intermediate storage. Our estimates indicated that approximately 13,500 MT of plastic packaging material use containing 50% plastic (as a percentage of total weight) or greater was used in our global operation. We do not have complete data on the plastics packaging content associated with our raw material consumption at the present time. We aim to reduce plastic waste associated with our operation by completing three projects per country where we have manufacturing operations to drive increased circular plastics economy by the end of 2025. Through 2023, we have completed 22 projects. Our South America procurement and operations teams collaborated with suppliers to implement solutions that reduced plastic content in drums and stretch film used per pallet while still maintaining the product quality that our customers expect.

[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Some of Ingredion's product are packaged in packaging material containing varying levels of plastic contents depending on shipping/quality/customer requirements.

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

	Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)	Raw material content percentages available to report	Please explain
Plastic packaging used	*127.49*	*Select all that apply* ☑ None	*Overall Plastics Impact (kg/yr) is currently at 127,490.*

[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

Select all that apply

☑ None

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

Ingredion has yet to perform a circularity potential analysis of the plastics used in packaging of our products. In general, it is believed that a majority of the common plastic packaging materials used are available to be recycled, however this can very by country / region and localities.

[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

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ Pressure indicators

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Important, but not an immediate priority*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Important, but not an immediate priority*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Important, but not an immediate priority*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Important, but not an immediate priority*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Important, but not an immediate priority*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Important, but not an immediate priority*

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Progress against targets

☑ Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

☑ Other data point in module 7, please specify :7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.13.1

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards

☑ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

As part of our third-party verification process, we undertake limited assurance verification of our base year emissions (Scope 1, Scope 2, Biogenic), purchased renewable electricity consumption and progress to our SBTi goals.

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

Ingredion 2023 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final.pdf

Row 2

(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 consumption– total volume

☑ Water discharges– total volumes

☑ Water withdrawals– total volumes

☑ Water withdrawals – volumes by source

☑ Water discharges – volumes by destination

☑ 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

As part of our third-party verification process, Ingredion undertook limited assurance verification of our water intake and discharge volumes, as well as the progress to target for our water use intensity target (i.e. progress from 2019).

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

Ingredion Corporate 2023 Verification Statement Water and Waste Performance__Final.pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(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

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

We have third party verification of our Tier 1 crops that meet our requirements for sustainable sourced. In 2023, we achieved 66.8% progress toward our goal of having 100% of our Tier 1 priority crops (i.e. corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia and peas/pulses) sustainably sourced by 2025. Additionally, we have achieved our goal of having 100% of global waxy corn sustainably sourced as part of that broader effort. We are at various stages of implementing sustainable agriculture, as indicated on the following map. Of the 66.8% of crops that were sustainably sourced globally, we are pleased to share that 14.6% of growers achieved SAI Platform's FSA Gold level by demonstrating the highest levels of sustainable agriculture.

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

Ingredion SAI Assurance Statement 2023_Final (004).pdf
[Add row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Executive Officer for Ingredion

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:
☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute