Ingredion Incorporated

CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2026

Word version

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

09/16/2026, 05:39 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

Headquartered in Westchester, IL, Ingredion Incorporated is a Fortune 500 global ingredient solutions company, that transforms corn, tapioca, potatoes, stevia, rice, grains, fruits, vegetables and other plant-based materials into value-added ingredient solutions for the food, beverage, animal nutrition, brewing and industrial markets. Our product lines, which are primarily derived from the processing of corn and other starch-based materials, include starches and sweeteners, animal feed products and edible corn oil. As of 2025, our net sales were $7.2 billion USD and we employed approximately 11,200 people across a global network of 46 manufacturing facilities, 30 R&D centers (Ingredion Idea Labs®) and multiple sales offices. We report in business segments which aligns our production assets and commercial efforts: Texture & Healthful Solutions ("T&HS"), which focuses on providing its solutions to the global market; Food & Industrial Ingredients—Latin America ("F&II—LATAM"), and Food & Industrial Ingredients—U.S./Canada ("F&II—U.S./Canada"), each of which focuses on providing its products to local markets. In addition, we group operating segments that are not individually or collectively classified as a reportable segment as "All Other." Most of our manufacturing processes are based on a capital-intensive, two-step process that involves the wet-milling and processing of starch-based materials, primarily corn. During the front-end process, we steep starch-based materials in a water-based solution and separate them into a starch slurry, protein, fiber, or germ used to produce corn oil. We will then further process the starch slurry to produce starches, sweeteners and other ingredients for various industries. Our global operations' emission sources primarily come from on-site combustion of fuels, purchased electricity and steam, indirect emissions from our purchased goods and services, upstream and

downstream transport and distribution, and processing of our sold products. In 2025, Ingredion published its 15th annual sustainability report, which highlights 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.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

7219000000

(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:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

INGR

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
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Thailand
☑ United Kingdom
☑ United States of America
☑ Mexico
☑ Germany
☑ Colombia
☑ 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:	

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	☑ 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

Ban Kao Dihn

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 10

(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 11

(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 12

(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 13

(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 14

(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 15

(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 16

(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 17

(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 18

(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 19

(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 20

(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 21

(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 22

(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 23

(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 24

(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 25

(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 26

(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 27

(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 28

(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 29

(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 30

(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 31

(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 32

(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 33

(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 34

(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 35

(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 36

(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 37

(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 38

(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 39

(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 40

(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 41

(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 42

(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 43

(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 44

(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 45

(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 46

(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 47

(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. Ingredion 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:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Distribution

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

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

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ 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)

575858

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.10) Original unit

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Gigajoules (GJ)

(1.22.11) 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 2025 was 2,281,249 GJ (lhv).

(1.22.12) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Sawn timber, veneer, chips

(1.22.13) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.14) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.20) Please explain

In 2025, we had 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 <1.2% of Ingredion's overall procurement spend. Revenue generated by these facilities is <5%.
[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

Farmed seafood / Aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:
☑ 91-99%

(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 92% of our crop usage globally, while cassava makes up an additional 1%. The remaining 7% 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

Wild-capture seafood

(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:
☑ 1-10%

(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 1% of our crop usage globally while corn is the majority at 92%. The remaining 7% is comprised of multiple crops such as potatoes, 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 Research and Development 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* ☑ Direct operations ☑ Upstream value 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:

☑ 100%

(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: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ 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:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ SEDEX

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Drought
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
☑ Heat wave
☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Chronic physical
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Water stress

Technology
☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities
☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

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. 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 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(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:

☑ As important matters arise

(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

Other
☑ External consultants
☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Other, please specify :WWF Biodiversity Risk Factor

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Drought
☑ Wildfires

Chronic physical
☑ Change in land/freshwater/ocean use
☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
☑ Water stress

Policy
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation

Reputation
☑ Stigmatization of sector

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Customers
☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

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 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 3

(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

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Heat wave

☑ 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

☑ Changing customer behavior

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

Reputation

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

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to sanctions and litigation

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

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 the highest risks identified 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 Risk Prioritization Number (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 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land/freshwater/ocean use

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

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Local communities

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.2.2.18) 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. In 2023, we used the World Wildlife Fund Biodiversity Risk Filter to evaluate the geographies around the world in which we operate. In 2024, our focus was on enhancing the information we have about those geographies to better understand how our operations are, or can, impact the local ecosystem in a positive way. These enhancements fall into three major categories: sustainable and regenerative agriculture, water stewardship and stakeholder engagement. We also worked to map out this additional context alongside geographic biodiversity risk. This work has brought additional insight to priority areas of focus for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Going forward, our challenge will be finding a way to evaluate biodiversity value alongside other environmental factors, such as carbon emissions and water. We understand there can be trade-offs between these factors. One approach we are evaluating is to quantify the economic value of natural capital within a geographic ecosystem to better be able to evaluate interventions and other projects. As an example, the economic value of water in a high-stress geography could be much higher than the economic value of water in a low-stress geography. Estimating this economic value of biodiversity, carbon and water could provide us with a more robust mechanism for evaluating intervention approaches, understanding how to prioritize trade-offs and better represent the ecosystem needs in decision making. This approach could also suggest KPIs that help us better understand how we are driving progress. Ingredion continues to evaluate partners and opportunities to pilot this economic valuation approach in our supply areas, as we feel it could further strengthen our approach around biodiversity, as well as help inform our sustainable and regenerative agriculture strategy. In 2025, we began the process of quantifying the value of natural capital (i.e. biodiversity, carbon, and water) in a few geographies to pilot this process and better understand the interrelation of these so we can determine the best approach to driving meaningful positive impact. We also continue to have conversations with customers around the topic of biodiversity.
[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 inclusion and belonging. 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. 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. 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 a 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:

☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

10000000

(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

Climate-related risks and opportunities are identified, assessed, and managed through the Company's Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process, which is aligned with the COSO framework. Risks are evaluated using a standardized methodology that considers both the likelihood of occurrence and the potential financial impact to the business. Likelihood is assessed using a five-level scale ranging from approximately 10% to 90% probability of occurrence, while impact is assessed using a five-level scale based on potential Gross Profit (GP) exposure, ranging from less than $5 million to greater than $25 million. Likelihood and impact scores are combined to determine the overall risk rating and prioritization. Risks that exceed established corporate risk tolerance thresholds are considered substantive and require documented mitigation plans, management oversight, and allocation of appropriate resources to reduce exposure and strengthen resilience. Climate-related risks are evaluated alongside other strategic, operational, regulatory, and supply chain risks. Potential impacts include disruptions resulting from water scarcity, extreme weather events, energy supply interruptions, transportation challenges, and reduced availability of agricultural raw materials. The Company also monitors external developments that may influence climate-related risk exposure, including emerging laws, regulations, policies, directives, and market expectations. Changes are tracked through regulatory monitoring services, industry associations, legal counsel, consultants, and other external sources to support compliance and proactive risk management. The Operations Leadership Team (OLT) regularly reviews key operational risks, business continuity capabilities, and organizational resilience. Climate-related risks are assessed through established management systems, including the Business Continuity Program (BCP), sustainability management processes, and the ERM framework. The OLT also reviews sustainability strategy, performance metrics, targets, and action plans across global operations. An example of a substantive risk would be a manufacturing facility may be required to curtail production because of insufficient water availability, or agricultural raw materials may become constrained due to changing climate conditions. Such events could disrupt operations, increase costs, reduce Gross Profit, and affect the Company's ability to meet customer commitments.

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:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

10000000

(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. 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 also reviews the sustainability strategy, metrics, and action plans for the company's global operation. 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, Quality, Supply Chain, Engineering, Finance, Legal, Innovation, and Procurement. An example of a substantive opportunity is the decision to invest $100 Million to install an energy cogeneration system at our Indianapolis facility. This project will expand Ingredion's capabilities for delivering texture innovations to growing end markets while bolstering the economic viability and sustainability of the Indianapolis plant. The project will improve operational efficiency and reliability while reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

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

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 functionally to segment level EHS&S leaders. At a global level, our Global Water/Wastewater Engineering 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 team. The Global Process Engineering 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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with discharge permits / regulatory limits

(2.5.1.6) 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

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

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

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with discharge permits / regulatory limits

☑ Reduction in pollutant concentration or load against a baseline

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

As part of our regenerative agriculture program, Ingredion works with growers, customers, and industry partners to promote practices that strengthen farm resilience and build a more sustainable agricultural supply chain. As a founding member of the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI) Platform's regenerative agriculture program, we continue to collaborate across the food and beverage industry to help shape and advance regenerative agriculture standards, recognizing that alignment is essential to driving meaningful progress. A strong example is our cassava sourcing program in Thailand, where farmers have adopted soil health improvements through organic matter application and fertilizer management aligned with the 4R Nutrient Stewardship principles—applying the right fertilizer source, at the right rate, at the right time, and in the right place. These practices help optimize nutrient use efficiency, reduce environmental impacts associated with fertilizer application, improve soil health, and support higher agricultural productivity while strengthening the long-term resilience of our farming communities and supply chain
[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

Ingredion conducted a 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. While no risks were met the threshold for substantive, this assessment allowed Ingredion to develop strategic activities around certain risks. An example of a risk identified was deforestation in Brazil. An action taken was the requirement for FSC Certification of our tier 1 wood suppliers.

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, and peas. 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. Our manufacturing operations also could be adversely affected by reduced water availability resulting from droughts or other interruptions from acute and chronic physical climate events due to climate change, including droughts, heat waves, freezing temperatures, changing precipitation patterns and heat stress.

(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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs for responding to the issue are being developed and will be presented in future. Ingredion spends a portion of money each year on regenerative agriculture to increase the robustness of our supply chain.

(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:

☑ Risk2

(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

Three manufacturing facilities have been identified through the Company's 2025 water risk assessment as operating in areas with elevated water-related risk. Of these facilities, one is classified as High risk and two are classified as Medium risk. Increased water stress at these locations could lead to higher operating costs through increased water sourcing, treatment, conservation, or infrastructure investments. Water-related risks may also affect operational efficiency if water availability becomes constrained. However, based on current risk assessments and mitigation measures, these impacts are not expected to have a substantive financial effect on the Company as a whole. The Company continues to monitor water-related risks at all sites and incorporates the results into its enterprise risk management and business continuity planning processes. Ongoing water stewardship initiatives, efficiency projects, and contingency planning are intended to reduce exposure and strengthen operational resilience at facilities located in water-stressed regions.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Constraint to growth

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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 water stress were to significantly reduce the availability of water at the facility, and operational needs could not be met through existing on-site wells or alternative supply sources, production could be curtailed or temporarily suspended. This could result in increased operating costs, reduced production output, lower profitability at the site, and additional capital expenditures to secure alternative water sources or implement water conservation and efficiency projects. Extended disruptions could also affect customer supply commitments and revenue generation. While such impacts could affect facility-level financial performance and cash flows, the Company does not currently expect the risk to have a material impact on its overall financial position, financial performance, or cash flows due to existing mitigation measures and operational flexibility within its broader manufacturing network.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(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 cost of response 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 continues implementation of its 2030 Sustainability target to reduce our water use intensity by 30% in all high-stress geographies where we manufacture, and 20% in medium stress geographies, 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.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(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:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ All river basins within selected countries/areas

(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:

☑ Disruption in upstream value chain

(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 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, and peas. 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. Our manufacturing operations also could be adversely affected by reduced water availability resulting from droughts or other interruptions from acute and chronic physical climate events due to climate change, including droughts, heat waves, freezing temperatures, changing precipitation patterns and heat stress.

(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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs for responding to the issue are being developed and will be presented in future. Ingredion spends a portion of money each year on regenerative agriculture to increase the robustness of our supply chain.

(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.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ India

☑ Brazil

☑ Canada

☑ Mexico

☑ Colombia

☑ Thailand

☑ United States of America

☑ Germany

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

There is a global concern that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere may have an adverse effect on global temperatures, weather patterns and the frequency and severity of natural disasters. The increasing concern over climate change could result in new domestic or international legal requirements for us to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental impacts of our operations, improve our energy efficiency, or undertake sustainability measures that exceed those we currently pursue. Furthermore, such measures may result in the taxation of greenhouse gas emissions. Any such regulatory requirements could cause disruptions in the manufacture of our products and result in increased capital, procurement, manufacturing and distribution costs.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased compliance 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

Our reputation could be harmed if we fail, or are seen as having failed, to respond responsibly and effectively to changes in legal and regulatory measures adopted to address climate change. The occurrence of any of the foregoing matters could adversely affect our operating results, financial condition, cash flows and prospects and could require us to devote significant resources to rebuild our reputation.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater due diligence

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Costs for responding to the issue are being developed and will be presented in future.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We are or will be obligated to comply with new sustainability and climate-related reporting requirements under California climate-related reporting statutes, laws of member states of the European Union implementing the EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive, and other laws and regulations that continue to evolve. These sustainability reporting requirements, under evolving sustainability reporting frameworks, will require us to provide, at least annually, detailed public disclosures about the greenhouse gas emissions and other climate-related effects our activities produce, the climate-related operating and financial risks we face, and the strategies we pursue to reduce and adapt to the impacts of climate change. We expect to incur substantial costs to prepare these disclosures and implement internal controls for sustainability reporting. Changes in the scope, timing, or interpretation of these requirements, and any divergence among reporting regimes across jurisdictions, could increase our compliance costs, create disclosure and control challenges, and expose us to enforcement actions, litigation, or reputational harm. If we fail to compile, assess and report the required operating and accounting information in a timely manner and in accordance with mandatory reporting standards or if public statements regarding sustainability-related matters are alleged to be misleading, we could be exposed to fines and other sanctions and sustain harm to our reputation.
[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:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The facility represents approximately 14% of our global production.
[Add row]

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

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply
☑ Fines, but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

Ingredion facilities reported one fine in 2025 primarily related to wastewater permit exceedances of fats, oils and greases (FOG) on effluent discharges to third party treatment facilities.
[Fixed row]

(3.3.1) Provide the total number and financial value of all water-related fines.

(3.3.1.1) Total number of fines

1

(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines

2500

(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated

2

(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(3.3.1.5) Comment

All fines are reported in our EHS&S management system and followed up by plant and senior leadership, including a full investigation into root causes. Ingredion had one minor fine for water related instances in 2025 related to wastewater effluent discharges from our manufacturing facilities that exceeded a specific performance limit (FOG) required by third party waste treatment facilities that received the waste. No fines were related to discharges to natural environment. In 2024, we reported 3 water-related fines.
[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

☑ Queretaro carbon tax

(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

12

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ No compliance obligation for scope 2 emissions

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

0

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

214392

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

2963

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

217356

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

Ingredion has two facilities that are exposed to the Canada ETS program. Scope 2 emissions are not taxed in this program. The emissions in this program represent 12% of Ingredion's Scope 1 global emissions.

EU ETS

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

1

(3.5.2.2) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ No compliance obligation for scope 2 emissions

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

0

(3.5.2.4) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.2.5) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.2.6) Allowances allocated

15015

(3.5.2.7) Allowances purchased

3355

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

18370

(3.5.2.9) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.11) Comment

Ingredion has two facilities that are exposed to the EUTS Carbon Tax Scheme; one in the UK, and one in Germany. Scope 2 emissions are not taxed in this program. The emissions in this program represent 1% of Ingredion's Scope 1 global emissions. Note, the facility in the UK was closed in 2025.
[Fixed row]

(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

Queretaro carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

13

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

21200

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Ingredion has one facility that is exposed to this Carbon tax. Costs shown are USD.
[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?

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

Forests

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☑ Opportunities exist, but none anticipated to have a substantive effect on organization

(3.6.3) Please explain

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 four 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. We continue to explore if there will be opportunities for having a substantive effect.

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

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

☑ Peru
☑ China
☑ India
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ United States of America
☑ Germany
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Thailand

(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 one of many critical drivers 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)

4360000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The figure presented ($4,360,000 USD) is the approximate cost savings realized from energy reduction/ continuous improvement initiatives resulting in 1% energy savings. The number was calculated by multiplying the energy savings by the 2025 cost for energy. Additional cost reductions can be anticipated in the future with installation of more energy efficient equipment.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

8720000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Ingredion has consistently achieved energy reductions primarily related to continuous improvement efficiency initiatives which require low to medium 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. the figure was calculated as 4,360,000 X 2 = 8,720,000

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our global engineering and Ingredion Performance System (IPS) 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.

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

☑ Peru

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Brazil

☑ Canada

☑ Mexico

☑ Germany

☑ Colombia

☑ 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 $1,070,000 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)

5378951

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Each 1% reduction in process water use intensity results in savings up to approximately $1,070,000 annually when considering purchase, pumping, preparation, and subsequent wastewater treatment costs. The figure of $5,380,000 represent the potential cumulative savings for a 1% reduction over the next 5 years ($1,070,000 X 5).

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

10757900

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Our financial costs were calculated assuming an average payback period of two years. Two years was chosen to account for both zero/low capital projects, as well as capital investments for larger projects. the figure was calculated as $5,378,950 X 2 = $10,757,900

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our local team of engineers, and technical professionals collaborate and innovate through a global Engineering 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]

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 2026 proxy (page 17-18) explains Ingredion's approach to Board diversity. 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 illustrates the diversity of experiences, qualifications, and backgrounds of our board nominees. The current directors and nominees for re-election include five women directors, one male director of Hispanic ethnicity, one African-American male director, and two directors who lives outside the United States.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

Q4.1 2026 INGR Proxy vFinal.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

Forests

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

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

(4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

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. However, Corn, Cassava, Stevia, Pulses and Potatoes are not high-risk forest commodities and are thus not disclosed in the survey. For the purposes of this

disclosure, fuel wood is the only commodity that is high-risk. Forestry-related issues relating to fuel wood are not part of our agenda as the use of fuel wood is not material to our organization. Fuel Wood represents <1.2% of our procurement spend, compared to the 28% for Tier 1 crops.

Water

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

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 the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement

☑ 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 at 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.

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

☑ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement
☑ 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 at least quarterly with scheduled topics covered at each meeting. 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 Vice President Global EHS & Sustainability 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

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

☑ 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

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

☑ 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

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

☑ 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

☑ 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, and Global Operations Leadership Team. 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, SVP and Chief Innovation Officer, SVP and Chief Legal Officer, Corporate Secretary, and Chief Compliance Officer, Vice President Global EHS & Sustainability, Vice President Corporate Controller, 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 Environmental, Health, Safety, and 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

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Chief Supply Chain Officer

(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

(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:

☑ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Given the low materiality of the topic (i.e. the consumption of fuel wood comprises only <1.2% of Ingredion's overall procurement spend and occurs at only four manufacturing facilities globally) sustainability related issues related to fuel wood are managed within the Global Operations Team headed by the Senior Vice President Global Operations and Chief Supply Chain Officer. In addition, fuel wood matters, as applicable, may be addressed at meetings of the Ingredion Sustainability Council and Operations Leadership Team (OLT). The OLT Chair (COO) bring issues or concerns, including those related to fuel wood, to the Executive Team (i.e., C-Suite) and the Board of Directors, as applicable.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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 board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The 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

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

0

(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 target and annual global absolute greenhouse gas emissions. Note: Due to confidentiality reasons Ingredion does not disclose the % of monetary incentives. A zero was shown for completeness purposes.

Forests

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

C-suite executives have annual goals related to attaining regenerative agriculture targets however there are no incentives for reaching targets around fuel wood. 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 <1.2% of our procurement spend, compared to 28% for Tier 1 crops.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(4.5.3) Please explain

C-suite executives have annual goals related to attaining regenerative agriculture targets. Monetary incentive is linked to reaching the annual goal target. An example of a regenerative agriculture KPI would be achieving the targeted annual progress towards our sustainable sourcing of Tier 1 crops. Note: Due to confidentiality reasons Ingredion does not disclose the % of monetary incentives. A zero was shown for completeness purposes.
[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 :Define strategy options 1.5C

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Other strategy and financial planning-related metrics, please specify :Define strategy options 1.5C

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. For example, the Chief Operating Officer (COO) has a goal related to Scope 1 and 2 absolute greenhouse gas reductions and Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) has a goal related to sustainably sourcing Tier 1 crops.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(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

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 includes 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 comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to no-conversion of natural ecosystems by target date

☑ Commitment to no-deforestation by target date

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights
☑ Commitment to secure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous people and local communities

Additional references/Descriptions
☑ 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

Statement-on-Deforestation-2026.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

*Ingredion's business relies on access to water in the areas we operate. We use freshwater, groundwater, and municipal water resources; and, a portion of our facilities source water from water-stressed areas. Water is essential not only for our direct operations, but across our entire value chain, including: Water used by farmers to grow our agricultural raw materials, Water needed in our manufacturing processes, The critically important fresh water necessary to meet the highest standards for food safety and quality, and *Water used by our direct customers and their consumers We recognize the rights of all people to clean water and sanitation; and, we support initiatives that minimize our impact on climate, biodiversity and water resources. We understand that climate change impacts both water availability and quality. We take a precautionary approach, using climate scenario analyses to assess and manage risks and opportunities across our value chain. As a result, Ingredion is committed to water stewardship through discrete measures outlined in the policy statement attached.*

(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

Q4.6.1 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 biodiversity policy; however, biodiversity materiality considerations are interwoven throughout our All Life sustainability strategy. As an example, our Agriculture Statement covers our commitment to the efficient use of natural resources, reduction of pesticides, and ensuring social responsibility is a key factor in sourced products. This statement supports our All Life goal to achieve 100% sustainably sourced Tier 1 crops by 2025 using the SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment, which includes evaluation of on-farm biodiversity among other criteria. As biodiversity expectations and disclosure requirements continue to evolve, Ingredion has expanded its understanding of biodiversity-related risks and opportunities. In 2023, we utilized the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Biodiversity Risk Filter to assess biodiversity risks across the geographies in which we operate. Since then, we have enhanced our analysis by integrating additional information related to sustainable and regenerative agriculture, water stewardship, and stakeholder engagement to better understand how our operations and supply chains may impact local ecosystems. These enhancements fall into three major categories: sustainable and regenerative agriculture, water, and engagement. We also mapped this additional context against geographic biodiversity risk. This work has provided greater insight into priority areas of focus for biodiversity and ecosystem services.

(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

Q4.6.1 agricultural-sustainability-statement.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.

(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

Q4.6.1 climate-policy.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

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI)

☑ UN Global Compact

☑ Other, please specify :Field to Market, National Grain and feed Association

(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. Ingredion serves on the board of directors for the National Grain and feed Association as well as the Sustainability Committee. As an active member in Field to Market, Ingredion works 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. Ingredion has had our Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 GHG reduction goals validated by the SBTi in 2022. In 2026, Ingredion joined a new collaboration with The Nature Conservancy in Brazil is targeting sustainable and regenerative practices in the Cerrado, one of the world's most biodiverse savannas.
[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

No

☑ No, we have assessed our activities, and none could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

Q4.11 climate-policy engagement.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ It is not possible or relevant for my organization or the intermediary organization to be registered

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

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/climate management and a trade association we were working with, we would engage further with that party to understand their position.

(4.11.9) Primary reason for not engaging in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(4.11.10) Explain why your organization does not engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Ingredion does not directly engage in lobbying activities or independently advocate for specific environmental policies, laws, or regulations. Due to the scale of our resources and organizational structure, we generally rely on reputable third-party organizations, industry groups, and trade associations to monitor, evaluate, and engage on regulatory and policy matters relevant to our business and the broader food and agricultural sectors. Through these organizations, Ingredion stays informed about emerging environmental legislation and regulatory developments while benefiting from collective industry expertise and representation. Our participation in these groups is intended to support awareness and understanding of policy developments rather than to directly influence legislative or regulatory outcomes. As a result, Ingredion does not maintain dedicated internal resources for direct policy advocacy and does not independently engage policymakers on environmental matters. Instead, any engagement on such issues is conducted indirectly through industry associations and external representatives that advocate on behalf of their broader memberships.
[Fixed 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 communications

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Biodiversity indicators

☑ Climate-related targets

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Water pollution indicators

☑ Greenhouse gas emissions figures

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

Page 33 of our Sustainability Report lists our environmental performance data related to climate, water, waste, and COD. Page 41 discusses our biodiversity strategy and relevant actions. Page 45 provides overview of regenerative agriculture engagements. Page 63 is the GRI index.

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

Q4.12 Sustainability report.pdf

(4.12.1.9) Comment

At Ingredion, we believe the most meaningful progress happens when purpose and performance move forward together. Our purpose—to bring the potential of people, nature and technology together to make life better—guides how we grow, innovate and operate every day. In 2025, we saw firsthand The Power of Us: how progress accelerates when our people work across functions, regions and disciplines with a shared commitment to our sustainability ambitions. Collaboration is not simply how we work; it is how we win. This year, we built strong momentum across the three pillars of our All Life strategy: Everyday Life, Planet Life and Connected Life. From our manufacturing floors to our agricultural supply chains, our teams demonstrated what is possible when we pair clear goals with disciplined execution and shared accountability. One of our most significant achievements this year was reaching over 96% sustainably sourced Tier 1 priority crops globally. Just five years ago, we were at 25%. This progress reflects the strength of our grower partnerships and our belief that sustainable sourcing at scale is both achievable and essential in collaborating with growers around the world to build a resilient food system. Across our operations, we took practical steps to reduce our environmental footprint. These steps included converting our Winston-Salem, North Carolina, facility from coal to natural gas, marking a complete exit of coal across all Ingredion operations in the Americas.

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

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

Select from:

☑ No

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Risks & Opportunities

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

Page 14 of our annual 10-k discloses specific business risks related to climate change and water availability.

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

Q4.12 Ingredion 10k.pdf

(4.12.1.9) Comment

The report summarizes our 2025 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:

☑ Every three years or less frequently

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
☑ Bespoke climate transition scenario

(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. Second, 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

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

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

2025

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 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. Second, 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) 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. Second, 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

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 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
☑ 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 influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

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 influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

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 influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

The water scenario analysis includes a detailed assessment of our global manufacturing operations and the baseline water risk, water quality, water withdrawals, and future water stress. 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. With this information we were able to set All-Life basin level water targets of 10%, 20% and 30% depending on the severity of the water risk. This is then further integrated into our strategy and financial planning by allowing us to prioritize resources on facilities where water stress is the greatest. As an example, in our scenario analysis we identified extremely high water-stress as a material concern for our facilities in Mexico. This has influenced our strategy and financial planning by prioritizing projects relating to water reuse/recycling. In the previous decade, our Mexico team has already executed on the easier opportunities to reduce water use intensity.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes, 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.

(5.2.10) 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

(5.2.13) 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.

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

Optimizing Energy Consumption: Ingredion continues to deploy its Ingredion Performance System (IPS) across manufacturing sites as the standard operating framework for driving operational excellence, resource efficiency, and environmental performance. Capital investments remain a key lever for reducing energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and water use through equipment upgrades and process improvements. Network optimization efforts continue to align production across Ingredion's global manufacturing footprint to improve efficiency while maintaining a high level of customer service. Substituting Energy Sources: Ingredion achieved a significant decarbonization milestone in 2025 by completing the conversion of its Winston-Salem, North Carolina facility from coal to natural gas, eliminating coal use across all Americas operations. This transition is expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 5,500 metric tons of CO_2e annually and marks the completion of a multi-year coal phase-out strategy in the region. Ingredion continues to leverage renewable biomass energy at multiple facilities in Brazil and is expanding renewable electricity sourcing as a key decarbonization pathway. In 2025, 31% of purchased electricity globally was sourced from renewable resources. The company also continues to evaluate and deploy on-site renewable energy projects, including solar installations in locations such as Thailand, Colombia, and Pakistan, where favorable economics and generation capacity support further emissions reductions. Additionally, Ingredion continues to utilize biogas generated at its facilities as a lower-carbon energy source and is evaluating opportunities for process electrification and emerging low-carbon technologies as equipment is replaced or expanded. Collectively, these initiatives contributed to a 15% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions compared with the 2019 baseline

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

Q5.2 Sustainability report - Transition plan.pdf,Q5.2 Sustainability report - Transition plan.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other environmental issue considered

(5.2.18) Adaptation-specific objectives included within your climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

(5.2.21) 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

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

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. Across this year we have seen that reformulating for sustainability is a growing focus for our customers. The sustainability value is often bundled in with other benefits, like affordability. For example, Ingredion makes a functional starch that helps our paper customers use higher percentages of recycled content in their end product. This not only helps them reduce costs by reducing virgin content in their product, but it also helps reduce their product water and carbon footprint. Our innovation expertise, along with tools such as the HowGood product sustainability platform and our proprietary ATLAS consumer insights database, make us a valuable resource for customers looking to change product formulations or create entirely new products for launch. With over 11 years of consumer research and insight, ATLAS provides us with a unique market view to better support our customers.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

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 2025, 96.3% 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 high water stressed sourcing geographies by the end of 2025; and reducing our water use intensity by 30% in all high-stress geographies where we manufacture products by 2030.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

We know that innovation holds tremendous potential to help Ingredion, our customers and our other supply chain partners reach their sustainability goals. It's not just product innovation but examining every angle of our operation to increase sustainability. This could be new ways of approaching project financing, like co-sharing costs with our partners on regenerative agriculture initiatives or digging into the details at a micro level. For example, a technology like mobile phone apps is not cutting-edge, but has enabled us to work more closely with small holder farmers in geographies like Thailand. In 2025, we undertook a study with an outside consultant to evaluate our work in sustainable innovation. The study highlighted a few key findings. It confirmed that sustainability is increasing as a driver for growth in the food and beverage industry, showed us where the best business case for sustainable innovation lies, identified our current strengths and explored additional opportunities for our consideration. This report laid the foundation for additional work being done to redefine our sustainable innovation strategy. For example, consider a starch that could have a slightly higher carbon footprint to manufacture, but enables our customers to replace up to 50% of egg whites in their formulations,

which dramatically lowers the carbon footprint of the end consumer good. This thinking is critical for our development, as processing of goods sold represents the highest percentage of Ingredion's Scope 3 emissions, and, therefore, the biggest opportunity for us to drive improvement as a leader in plant-based ingredients.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

The greatest potential climate-related risks to Ingredion's operations remain the availability of water and agricultural raw materials, which are discussed above. In addition, Ingredion continues to implement initiatives that reduce the environmental impacts of its operations while increasing long-term resilience to climate-related risks, including changing temperature and precipitation patterns identified through climate scenario analysis. To support these efforts, Ingredion has established goals to achieve a 28% reduction in absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, source 50% of purchased electricity from renewable sources by 2030, and reduce water-use intensity by 30% at manufacturing facilities located in high-water-stress regions by 2030. In 2025, Ingredion achieved a significant decarbonization milestone by completing the conversion of its Winston-Salem, North Carolina facility from coal to natural gas, eliminating coal use across all Americas operations and reducing annual greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 5,500 metric tons of CO_2e. The company also increased renewable electricity procurement, with 31% of purchased electricity sourced from renewable resources globally, and continued evaluating and deploying on-site renewable energy solutions, including solar installations in Thailand, Colombia, and Pakistan. These actions, combined with ongoing energy-efficiency improvements through the Ingredion Performance System (IPS) and capital investment projects, contributed to progress against Ingredion's climate goals while helping reduce operational exposure to future energy and climate-related risks.
[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

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

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 2025 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 2025. 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 2025 was higher than 2024, 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?

Carbon

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

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

(5.10.2) Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Our organization does not currently apply an internal price to water beyond the direct costs associated with water supply, treatment, distribution, wastewater management, and related operational expenses. At present, establishing an internal water price is not a strategic priority. The organization is managing multiple business and cost pressures and has chosen to focus its environmental pricing efforts on areas that are most closely aligned with our current climate strategy and decarbonization objectives. As a result, we have implemented an internal carbon price to support investment decisions and assess climate-related risks, but we have not adopted a comparable pricing mechanism for water-related environmental externalities. While water is a material operating cost for our business, water stewardship considerations are integrated into our existing decision-making processes through direct cost management, operational efficiency initiatives, and capital investment evaluations. Water reduction and optimization opportunities are routinely assessed as part of business cases for capital projects, with expected savings from reduced water consumption, treatment, and disposal costs incorporated into project payback calculations. We continue to monitor water-related risks, costs, and stakeholder expectations and may reassess the need for an internal price in the future as our sustainability strategy evolves and as water-related risks become more financially material to the business.

Other

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

(5.10.1) 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, and we do not 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 <1.2% of our global spend in 2025. However, Ingredion engages with smallholders in our agricultural supply chain and 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.

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

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

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 2025 we continued the screening process of our non-agricultural suppliers to identify our largest CO2 emitters so we can develop an engagement strategy. Our farm suppliers equate to approximately 80% of our total suppliers.

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

25000

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:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Biomass for timber fuels is used at four facilities globally. We have engaged with our tier 1 suppliers who provide fuel wood/biomass energy in South America and are working to ensure their biomass sources are managed to ensure a robust and sustainable supply. We are in the process of securing FSC certification for our Tier 1 biomass suppliers.

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

40

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape/marine ecosystem condition

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on water availability

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

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. 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. Our farm suppliers equate to approximately 80% of our total suppliers.

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

25000
[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

As timber fuel wood is a small portion of our supply chain, we currently engage with suppliers at a facility level. In South America, we source steam from biomass boilers and have recently begun engaging with the vendor to provide feedback on their third-party sustainability audits.

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 2025, 96.3% 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:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

We have recently requested Tier 1 suppliers of biomass in our Brazil facilities to have FSC certification of their biomass. Currently 75% of vendors are certified, with the balance occurring in 2026. 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.

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 2025, 96.3% 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:

☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, 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:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 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

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. In 2025, we continued to see progress on our sustainable sourcing program, increasing to 96.3% sustainably sourced across our globally sourced Tier 1 crops. Our Tier 1 crops — corn, tapioca, potato, stevia and peas/pulses — comprise approximately 99% of our global agricultural sourcing by volume. Notable increases in sustainable volumes in 2025 were seen in Thailand, driving much of our progress. 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. S3.C1 emissions from Tier 1 crops are calculated to be 8,107,000 MT. Total S3 emissions for Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 is 11,104,180. The requirement covers 8,107,000/11,104,180 = 73% of the Scope 3 emissions. At the end of 2025, 96.3% of our Tier 1 suppliers have met the requirement, therefore the % of supplier Scope 3 Emissions in compliance is approximately 96.3%.

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :FSSC

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(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:
☑ Less than 1%

(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:
☑ None

(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

We have recently requested Tier 1 suppliers of biomass in our Brazil facilities to have FSC certification of their biomass. Currently 75% of all vendors are certified, which represents 70% of total costs. We are looking to increase these percentages in 2025. Tier 1 biomass spend in our Brazil facilities is <1% of overall global spend.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, 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:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(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:

☑ 51-75%

(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:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 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

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. In 2025, we continued to see progress on our sustainable sourcing program, increasing to 96.3% sustainably sourced across our globally sourced Tier 1 crops. Our Tier 1 crops — corn, tapioca, potato, stevia and peas/pulses — comprise approximately 99% of our global agricultural sourcing by volume. Notable increases in sustainable volumes in 2025 were seen in Thailand, driving much of our progress. 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. Our engagement metrics reported were calculated by dividing the total number of farmers in our Tier 1 Crop program by the total number of suppliers that sold products to Ingredion in 2025. At the end of 2025, 96.3% of our Tier 1 suppliers have met the requirement, therefore the % of suppliers in compliance is approximately 96.3%
[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

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

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 from agricultural production represent a significant portion of Ingredion's Scope 3 greenhouse gas footprint and create opportunities to reduce emissions through closer engagement with growers and the adoption of sustainable and regenerative agriculture practices. Through our sustainable agriculture programs, we work directly with farmers to implement practices that improve soil health, increase resource efficiency, strengthen climate resilience, and reduce environmental impacts. Ingredion collects farm-level data through tools such as Field to Market's Fieldprint® Platform in North America and the Cool Farm Tool in Asia Pacific, enabling growers to measure and benchmark environmental performance, including greenhouse gas emissions, water use, and soil health indicators. This data-driven approach helps identify opportunities for continuous improvement and supports collaboration on projects that deliver measurable environmental outcomes. In Thailand, for example, farmers participating in our sustainable cassava program have implemented soil health improvements through organic matter application and fertilizer management aligned with 4R Nutrient Stewardship principles, helping optimize nutrient use efficiency while reducing environmental impacts. These efforts contributed to significant business and sustainability outcomes, including improved yields, enhanced starch content, expanded irrigated acreage, and increased supply resilience. By leveraging transparent farm-level data and strong partnerships with growers, Ingredion can quantify the impact of sustainable agriculture practices, recognize grower leadership, and strategically advance initiatives that reduce greenhouse gas emissions while supporting profitable and resilient agricultural production. In 2025, we partnered with a third party to execute regen ag in Thailand. We self-funded a regen agricultural pilot in China which is now earning customer investment/partnership. In Mexico we continue to partner with CIMMYT on a regen ag project for domestic corn growers focused on input optimization and regen practice implementation. We also assessed two regen ag projects versus the SAI Platform's Regenerating Together 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:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain transparency and human rights

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

We have worked with our third party steam supplier in Brazil to provide feedback on the robustness of their third party biomass verification program. The vendor manages multiple wood/biomass contracts and is developing a third party audit program that began in 2024. The 2024 program focused on regulatory audit and ESG transparency. Our engagement in 2025 was to review the status of the program and provide feedback on material topics related to deforestation, certification, and traceability.

(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:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

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. In 2024, we expanded the use of the Cool Farm Tool in the Asia Pacific Region to collect data and then work with them to implement practices to reduce their GHG emissions and improve their soil health. In 2025, we awarded two growers with Sustainable Agriculture awards to recognize their progress.

(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:
☑ Yes
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing
☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Align your organization’s goals to support customers’ targets and ambitions
☑ 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

Given the scale of Ingredion's global agricultural supply chains and our sustainability commitments, including advancing sustainable and regenerative agriculture practices, engaging customers is critical to achieving meaningful environmental outcomes. Many of the environmental impacts associated with our products occur upstream in agricultural production, and progress requires alignment across the value chain. Ingredion works with customers, growers, suppliers, cooperatives, processors, and other value chain partners to support the adoption of sustainable and regenerative agriculture practices that can improve soil health, enhance water stewardship, increase climate resilience, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Customer engagement helps create consistent market signals that encourage growers to adopt and maintain these practices over the long term. Collaboration with customers also enables the development and scaling of projects that would be difficult for any single organization to implement independently. By aligning sustainability objectives, sharing resources, and coordinating investment, supply chain partners can reduce the burden on individual participants while maintaining the environmental outcomes sought by the program. This collaborative approach supports broader adoption of regenerative agriculture practices across key sourcing regions and helps generate measurable environmental and business benefits. In addition, many customers have established their own climate, sustainable sourcing, and Scope 3 emissions reduction commitments. Through ongoing engagement, Ingredion works with customers to identify opportunities to advance shared sustainability objectives, improve supply chain transparency, and support progress toward mutual environmental goals. Demonstrating alignment across the value chain reinforces the importance and durability of these initiatives for growers and strengthens the connection between agricultural production and the consumer products that ultimately depend on these raw materials. Finally, in 2025 we continued to work with our customers to allocate renewable electricity and regenerative agriculture. These projects have benefits of reducing our direct footprint, and our customer's scope 3.

(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 2025 we have 90 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

Given the scale of Ingredion's global agricultural supply chains and our sustainability commitments, including advancing sustainable and regenerative agriculture practices, engaging customers is critical to achieving meaningful environmental outcomes. Many of the environmental impacts associated with our products occur upstream in agricultural production, and progress requires alignment across the value chain. Ingredion works with customers, growers, suppliers, cooperatives, processors, and other value chain partners to support the adoption of sustainable and regenerative agriculture practices that can improve soil health, enhance water stewardship, increase climate resilience, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Customer engagement helps create consistent market signals that encourage growers to adopt and maintain these practices over the long term. Collaboration with customers also enables the development and scaling of projects that would be difficult for any single organization to implement independently. By aligning sustainability objectives, sharing resources, and coordinating investment, supply chain partners can reduce the burden on individual participants while maintaining the environmental outcomes sought by the program. This collaborative approach supports broader adoption of regenerative agriculture practices across key sourcing regions and helps generate measurable environmental and business benefits. In addition, many customers have established their own climate, sustainable sourcing, and Scope 3 emissions reduction commitments. Through ongoing engagement, Ingredion works with customers to identify opportunities to advance shared sustainability objectives, improve supply chain transparency, and support progress toward mutual environmental goals. Demonstrating alignment across the value chain reinforces the importance and durability of these initiatives for growers and strengthens the connection between agricultural production and the consumer products that ultimately depend on these raw materials.

(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 2025 we have 90 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.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

Ingredion began the process of moving from a traditional sustainability materiality assessment to a double materiality assessment that is in line with the requirements of the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) double materiality assessment. The CSRDs double materiality assessment requires companies to consider both the financial impact of sustainability issues on their business (financial materiality) and the impact of their activities on people and the planet (impact materiality).

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Beginning in 2024, and continuing in 2025, we conducted evaluations with internal and external stakeholders, reviewed inputs and outputs with our executive team and engaged consultants to help us navigate the complexity of EU CSRD requirements. Our stakeholder groups include customers, industry non-government organizations (NGOs), investors and suppliers. Additionally, we continue to conduct gap assessments against standards such as the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), CDP, EcoVadis and Sustainalytics, to name a few. Our double materiality work continued into 2025 as we prepare for anticipated reporting under CSRD in 2028 for 2027 data. We have engaged with a third party to assist us in this process. We will identify reporting needs and deploy digital solutions in support of enhanced data governance. We also expect to gain further insight on best practices as some companies begin to report on CSRD requirements. It should be noted that we report on many topics in this report. While some of them do not rise to the level of materiality to our business, they are there to help address the information needs of our stakeholders.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :NGO's

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

Ingredion began the process of moving from a traditional sustainability materiality assessment to a double materiality assessment that is in line with the requirements of the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) double materiality assessment. The CSRDs double materiality assessment requires companies to consider both the financial impact of sustainability issues on their business (financial materiality) and the impact of their activities on people and the planet (impact materiality).

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Beginning in 2024, and continuing in 2025,, we conducted evaluations with internal and external stakeholders, reviewed inputs and outputs with our executive team and engaged consultants to help us navigate the complexity of EU CSRD requirements. Our stakeholder groups include customers, industry non-government organizations (NGOs), investors and suppliers. Additionally, we continue to conduct gap assessments against standards such as the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), CDP, EcoVadis and Sustainalytics, to name a few. Our double materiality work continued into 2025 as we prepare for anticipated reporting under CSRD in 2028 for 2027 data. We have engaged Deloitte to assist us in this process. We will identify reporting needs and deploy digital solutions in support of enhanced data governance. We also expect to gain further insight on best practices as some companies begin to report on CSRD requirements. It should be noted that we report on many topics in this report. While some of them do not rise to the level of materiality to our business, they are there to help address the information needs of our stakeholders.
[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?

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a change in methodology

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

In 2025, Ingredion transitioned Scope 3 GHG accounting from manual spreadsheets to the Watershed carbon accounting platform. This methodology change affects how emissions are calculated across reported categories but does not change the boundary — the same categories (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 15) are reported as in prior years. No change in reporting year definition was made. Previously, emission factors were manually applied via spreadsheets. Watershed's platform uses a systematic, auditable calculation engine drawing on recognized emission factor databases, improving consistency, granularity, and traceability. Key changes by category: Category 1: Agricultural raw material factors now sourced from HowGood (product-specific LCA); remaining spend uses the Watershed CEDA-FLAG hybrid model integrating EEIO data with FLAG factors. Category 2: Spend-based factors now use the CEDA-FLAG hybrid model. Category 3: Factors systematically applied from DEFRA 2025, IEA 2025, and regional residual mix sources. Categories 4 & 9: Ingredion continues to supply shipment-level mode and distance data; the change is limited to emission factors, now sourced from Ecoinvent 3.11. Category 5: Factors now from EPA 2025 and DEFRA 2025. Categories 6 & 7: Factors now from CEDA-FLAG (Cat. 6) and EPA/DEFRA 2025 (Cat. 7). Category 10: No methodology change — custom lifecycle-based factors from product-specific LCA studies remain consistent with prior years. Category 12: Factors now from EPA 2025 and DEFRA 2025. Category 15: Factors now from CEDA 2025. The change in emission factor sources may affect year-over-year comparability. To ensure consistency, Ingredion recalculated its 2019 base year Scope 3 emissions using Watershed and equivalent methodology, enabling like-for-like comparison.
[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) Scopes recalculated

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2, location-based
☑ Scope 2, market-based
☑ Scope 3

(7.1.3.3) Scope 3 categories recalculated

Select all that apply

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

(7.1.3.4) 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.

(7.1.3.5) 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

☑ 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: 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 market-based 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 excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Company Owned Vehicles

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 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 (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.

(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

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 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]

[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)

2562226

(7.5.3) 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.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

778552

(7.5.3) 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. 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 Factors are as follows: Oxnard and Guadalajara use supplier specific factors, Belcamp, North Charlston and Winson use factors published by Edison Electric. Our facilities in the US (excluding those stated) use Green-E residual mix factors, our facilities in Europe use residual mix factors published by the Association of Issuing Bodies, and our facilities in South America and Asia use average grid factors provided by the International Energy Agency (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.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

793297

(7.5.3) 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.

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)

11155274

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ingredion uses a hybrid approach to estimate Scope 3 Category 1 emissions, combining spend-based and commodity-specific methodologies to improve accuracy across our diverse procurement portfolio. Spend-based method: For most purchased goods and services estimates, we calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier and procurement spend data. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend with select vendors are mapped to those vendors' unique revenue intensity estimates when complete and reported to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Total spend is multiplied by the EF for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis (e.g. electricity from facilities). For cloud computing emissions, we use either cloud usage data or spend data to estimate electricity consumed and calculate electricity emissions by applying regional EFs. We also use spend data to estimate the indirect emissions associated with the cloud vendor. Commodity-specific method (agricultural-based commodities): For most agricultural-based commodities, we apply custom emission factors sourced from HowGood, a sustainability data provider specializing in food and agricultural supply chains. Total mass is multiplied by the applicable emission factor(s) for that commodity to calculate CO2e emissions.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

44969

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ingredion calculates emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier & procurement spend data. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. Spend with select vendors is mapped to those vendors' unique revenue intensity estimates when they have submitted complete reports to complete and reported to the CDP. Total spend is multiplied by the Emissions Factor for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis.

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)

523813

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ingredion estimates fuel and energy related activities emissions for three categories: 1) Transmission and Distribution (T&D) - We estimate electricity lost to transmission and distribution. We apply regional grid loss rates from eGRID and Ecoinvent to estimate electricity lost in transmission and distribution, and apply the correct electricity emissions factor to estimate emissions. 2) Natural Gas Leakage - We use fugitive emissions data from chapter 4.2 of the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas inventories. A tier 1 approach was taken to evaluate fugitive emissions from exploration, production, processing, and transmission & storage of natural gas. Tier 1 was chosen as specific supply chain data was unavailable, and fugitive natural gas emissions are typically not significant for Watershed customers. 3) Upstream (well-to-tank or WTT) emissions- We calculate WTT emissions for stationary and mobile combustion, as well as

WTT emissions for electricity production and electricity T&D loss. We use DEFRA EFs for WTT emissions. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based emissions in Scope 2 will also affect this category because electricity WTT and T&D loss emissions differ between the two methods. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

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)

1112270

(7.5.3) Methodological details

To estimate upstream transportation and distribution emissions, Ingredion collects shipment-level data, including the weight of goods transported (in metric tons), the distance traveled, and the mode of transport (e.g., road, rail, sea, air). For each shipment, the weight is multiplied by the distance traveled to calculate tonne-kilometers (tonne-km). The calculated tonne-km quantity is then multiplied by the appropriate tonne-km emission factor for the relevant mode of transport, sourced from EPA and DEFRA, to calculate CO2e emissions. For warehousing and storage activities, where activity-level data such as energy consumption is not available, Ingredion calculates emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emission factors applied to annual warehousing spend data. Spend is aggregated by category and mapped to the most accurate EEIO sector. We account for inflation or deflation to convert the emission factors to the US dollar value for the year of the activity, using industry-level price index data published by the US Bureau of Economic Analysis to obtain sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Total spend is multiplied by the emission factor for that category to calculate CO2e emissions. Upstream logistics include the transportation and distribution of products purchased between Ingredion's tier 1 suppliers and its operations, as well as outbound transportation and distribution services paid for by Ingredion, in vehicles not owned or operated by Ingredion. To prevent double counting, any logistics spend captured in operating expenses that overlaps with the distance-based data is deduplicated so that emissions are only counted once in the final footprint.

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)

92779

(7.5.3) Methodological details

1) Ingredion estimate waste emissions by collecting information on tonnage of waste disposal by waste type and treatment methods at each facility within our boundary. We use emissions factors from DEFRA for landfill, composting, and recycling. We use emission factors from the USEPA EF Hub for landfill, composting, incineration, and digestion in the US. 2) Ingredion manually calculates wastewater treatment emissions outside of the Watershed platform and uploads the pre-calculated results to Watershed for inclusion in the footprint. This approach is used because wastewater is a material emissions source for Ingredion's food processing operations, and a manual calculation allows for the application of methodology and emission factors that are most representative of Ingredion's specific wastewater treatment processes.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1751

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For business travel (e.g. Uber, Trains), Ingredion calculates emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual spend data. Spend is aggregated by each travel category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. For all EEIO EFs, we account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16012

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ingredion estimates emissions in two categories. 1) Commute. We estimate the number of employees commuting in each location by aggregating employees by location. We exclude any remote employees. We use data published by governments to estimate average commute mix and distance for each location, and apply that to the total number of commuting employees in each location to determine miles traveled by car, public transit, walking and biking (Example sources: US Census Bureau for US states, Euro State for select EU cities). We multiply miles by the emissions factor for that commute-method category. For commute, we use EFs from EPA EF Hub for cars and public transit, while for walking and biking, we assume that EFs are 0. 2) Remote work. We estimate that the square footage occupied by a home office is 150 square feet. We use the Department of Energy's Building Performance Database to find benchmarks for electricity consumption per square foot of residential space and natural gas per square foot of residential space. We then multiply energy usage by the corresponding region's electricity and natural gas emissions factors. Since the DoE's data set does not assume homes are being used non-stop during working hours, we adjust these estimates up to correct for this.

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

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Upstream leased assets are not applicable to Ingredion.

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)

367521

(7.5.3) Methodological details

To estimate downstream transportation and distribution emissions, Ingredion collects shipment-level data, including the weight of goods transported (in metric tons), the distance traveled, and the mode of transport (e.g., road, rail, sea, air). For each shipment, the weight is multiplied by the distance traveled to calculate tonne-kilometers (tonne-km). The calculated tonne-km quantity is then multiplied by the appropriate tonne-km emission factor for the relevant mode of transport, sourced from EPA and DEFRA, to calculate CO2e emissions. Downstream logistics include emissions from the transportation and distribution of sold products after the point of sale, where Ingredion does not pay for the transportation — specifically, the movement of products between Ingredion's operations and the end consumer. To prevent double counting, any logistics spend captured in operating expenses that overlaps with the distance-based data is deduplicated so that emissions are only counted once in the final footprint.

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)

3098302

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ingredion collects the mass of sold products categorized by market segment. Market segments span food and beverage applications, animal nutrition, and industrial applications. For each market segment, Ingredion has developed custom manufacturing emission factors (expressed in kgCO2e per kilogram of product processed) based on life cycle assessment (LCA) research of products common to that market segment. The majority of these emission factors are sourced from HowGood, a sustainability data provider specializing in food and agricultural LCA data. For select market segments where HowGood data is not available, emission factors are sourced from other peer-reviewed or publicly available LCA research, including the Journal of Food Engineering, Carbon Cloud, NC State University Bioresources, and Vitro Glazings. Where emission factors could not be determined by LCA research, a weighted average emission factor is applied based on the balance of emissions attributable to product groups without specific LCA information. For each market segment, the total mass of sold product (kg) is multiplied by the corresponding custom manufacturing emission factor (kgCO2e/kg) to calculate CO2e emissions. Emissions are then summed across all market segments to determine total Category 10 emissions.

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)

6483

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ingredion estimates use of sold products emissions for the combustion of sold denatured ethanol, which is the only product sold by Ingredion that directly consumes fuel or emits greenhouse gases during its use phase. Ingredion collects data on the quantity of denatured ethanol sold during the reporting period, along with the fuel type, month, and location of sale. The quantity of fuel sold is multiplied by the corresponding combustion emission factor to calculate CO2e emissions. Emission factors for fuel combustion are sourced from the US EPA Emission Factor Hub and DEFRA, consistent with the stationary combustion methodology used for Scope 1 emissions. No other sold products require Category 11 reporting, as Ingredion's remaining product portfolio consists of intermediate food, beverage, and industrial ingredients that do not directly consume energy or emit greenhouse gases during their use phase. Downstream processing emissions associated with these intermediate products are captured under Scope 3 Category 10 (processing of sold products).

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)

2138600

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate emissions by collecting data on products sold and their total masses. To estimate the amount of each product that is disposed of, we apply product-type-specific waste rates: Food products: We use data from ReFED, a leading food waste research organization, to estimate the proportion of sold food that becomes waste at the consumer level. Non-food products and packaging: We use estimates published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on typical waste

disposal patterns to estimate amounts disposed. Each waste amount is then mapped to the most accurate waste type based on its composition and disposal characteristics. The total mass of each waste type is distributed across disposal pathways — including landfill, composting, incineration, anaerobic digestion, and recycling — using EPA data on waste disposal patterns. Monthly waste quantities are then multiplied by waste-type-specific emission factors for each disposal pathway to calculate total CO2e emissions. Emission factor sources include the US EPA Emission Factor Hub and UK DEFRA.

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

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Downstream leased assets are not applicable to Ingredion.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Franshises are not applicable to Ingredion.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

306219

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate the emissions from corporate investments, specifically equity and debt investments. To determine the EFs, we use the input data on the currency, country, industry, and the annual revenue of the asset for the specified measurement period. We also determine the attribution factor of the asset using the outstanding amount and the asset value. We use spend-based EFs from Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) or asset-specific EFs where available. For EEIO-based EFs, we account for inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values.

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

(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)

1750327

(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)

799252

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

751456

(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 Factors are as follows: Oxnard and Guadalajara use supplier specific factors, Belcamp, North Charlston and Winson use factors published by Edison Electric. Our facilities in the US (excluding those stated) use Green-E residual mix factors, our facilities in Europe use residual mix factors published by the Association of Issuing Bodies, and our facilities in South America and Asia use average grid factors provided by the International Energy Agency (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)

9272104.59

(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

(7.8.6) Please explain

Ingredion uses a hybrid approach to estimate Scope 3 Category 1 emissions, combining spend-based and commodity-specific methodologies to improve accuracy across our diverse procurement portfolio. Spend-based method: For most purchased goods and services estimates, we calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier and procurement spend data. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend with select vendors are mapped to those vendors' unique revenue intensity estimates when complete and reported to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Total spend is multiplied by the EF for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis (e.g. electricity from facilities). For cloud computing emissions, we use either cloud usage data or spend data to estimate electricity consumed and calculate electricity emissions by applying regional EFs. We also use spend data to estimate the indirect emissions associated with the cloud vendor. Commodity-specific method (agricultural-based commodities): For most agricultural-based commodities, we apply custom emission factors sourced from HowGood, a sustainability data provider specializing in food and agricultural supply chains. Total mass is multiplied by the applicable emission factor(s) for that commodity to calculate CO2e emissions.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

53062.16

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

We calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier & procurement spend data. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. Spend with select vendors is mapped to those vendors' unique revenue intensity estimates when they have submitted complete reports to complete and reported to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Total spend is multiplied by the Emissions Factor for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis.

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)

496863.25

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

We estimate fuel and energy related activities emissions for three categories: 1) Transmission and Distribution (T&D) - We estimate electricity lost to transmission and distribution. We apply regional grid loss rates from eGRID and Ecoinvent to estimate electricity lost in transmission and distribution, and apply the correct electricity emissions factor to estimate emissions. 2) Natural Gas Leakage - We use fugitive emissions data from chapter 4.2 of the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas inventories. A tier 1 approach was taken to evaluate fugitive emissions from exploration, production, processing, and transmission & storage of natural gas. Tier 1 was chosen as specific supply chain data was unavailable, and fugitive natural gas emissions are typically not significant for Watershed customers. 3) Upstream (well-to-tank or WTT) emissions- We calculate WTT emissions for stationary and mobile combustion, as well as WTT emissions for electricity production and electricity T&D loss. We use DEFRA EFs for WTT emissions. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based emissions in Scope 2 will also affect this category because electricity WTT and T&D loss emissions differ between the two methods. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1190779.68

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

To estimate upstream transportation and distribution emissions, Ingredion collects shipment-level data, including the weight of goods transported (in metric tons), the distance traveled, and the mode of transport (e.g., road, rail, sea, air). For each shipment, the weight is multiplied by the distance traveled to calculate tonne-kilometers (tonne-km). The calculated tonne-km quantity is then multiplied by the appropriate tonne-km emission factor for the relevant mode of transport, sourced from EPA and DEFRA, to calculate CO2e emissions. For warehousing and storage activities, where activity-level data such as energy consumption is not available, Ingredion calculates emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emission factors applied to annual warehousing spend data. Spend is aggregated by category and mapped to the most accurate EEIO sector. We account for inflation or deflation to convert the emission factors to the US dollar value for the year of the activity, using industry-level price index data published by the US Bureau of Economic Analysis to obtain sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Total spend is multiplied by the emission factor for that category to calculate CO2e emissions. Upstream logistics include the transportation and distribution of products purchased between Ingredion's tier 1 suppliers and its operations, as well as outbound transportation and distribution services paid for by Ingredion, in vehicles not owned or operated by Ingredion. To prevent double counting, any logistics spend captured in operating expenses that overlaps with the distance-based data is deduplicated so that emissions are only counted once in the final footprint.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

73331.14

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

1) We estimate waste emissions by collecting information on tonnage of waste disposal by waste type and treatment methods at each facility within our boundary. We use emissions factors from DEFRA for landfill, composting, and recycling. We use emission factors from the USEPA EF Hub for landfill, composting, incineration, and digestion in the US. 2) Ingredion manually calculates wastewater treatment emissions outside of the Watershed platform and uploads the pre-calculated results to Watershed for inclusion in the footprint. This approach is used because wastewater is a material emissions source for Ingredion's food processing operations, and a manual calculation allows for the application of methodology and emission factors that are most representative of Ingredion's specific wastewater treatment processes.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3403

(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

(7.8.6) Please explain

For business travel (e.g. Uber, Trains), we calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual spend data. Spend is aggregated by each travel category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. For all EEIO EFs, we account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

14636.44

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

We estimate emissions in two categories. 1) Commute. We estimate the number of employees commuting in each location by aggregating employees by location. We exclude any remote employees. We use data published by governments to estimate average commute mix and distance for each location, and apply that to the total number of commuting employees in each location to determine miles traveled by car, public transit, walking and biking (Example sources: US Census Bureau for US states, Euro State for select EU cities). We multiply miles by the emissions factor for that commute-method category. For commute, we use EFs from EPA EF Hub for cars and public transit, while for walking and biking, we assume that EFs are 0. 2) Remote work. We estimate that the square footage occupied by a home office is 150 square feet. We use the Department of Energy's Building Performance Database to find benchmarks for electricity consumption per square foot of residential

space and natural gas per square foot of residential space. We then multiply energy usage by the corresponding region's electricity and natural gas emissions factors. Since the DoE's data set does not assume homes are being used non-stop during working hours, we adjust these estimates up to correct for this.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Emissions covered under scope 1 or 2

(7.8.6) 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)

303988.57

(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

(7.8.6) Please explain

To estimate downstream transportation and distribution emissions, Ingredion collects shipment-level data, including the weight of goods transported (in metric tons), the distance traveled, and the mode of transport (e.g., road, rail, sea, air). For each shipment, the weight is multiplied by the distance traveled to calculate tonne-kilometers (tonne-km). The calculated tonne-km quantity is then multiplied by the appropriate tonne-km emission factor for the relevant mode of transport, sourced from EPA and DEFRA, to calculate CO2e emissions. Downstream logistics include emissions from the transportation and distribution of sold products after the point of sale, where Ingredion does not pay for the transportation — specifically, the movement of products between Ingredion's operations and the end consumer. To prevent double counting, any logistics spend captured in operating expenses that overlaps with the distance-based data is deduplicated so that emissions are only counted once in the final footprint.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2026322.61

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

Ingredion collects the mass of sold products categorized by market segment. Market segments span food and beverage applications, animal nutrition, and industrial applications. For each market segment, Ingredion has developed custom manufacturing emission factors (expressed in kgCO2e per kilogram of product processed) based on life cycle assessment (LCA) research of products common to that market segment. The majority of these emission factors are sourced from HowGood, a sustainability data provider specializing in food and agricultural LCA data. For select market segments where HowGood data is not available, emission factors are sourced from other peer-reviewed or publicly available LCA research, including the Journal of Food Engineering, Carbon Cloud, NC State University Bioresources, and Vitro Glazings. Where emission factors could not be determined by LCA research, a weighted average emission factor is applied based on the balance of emissions attributable to product groups without specific LCA information. For each market segment, the total mass of sold product (kg) is multiplied by the corresponding custom manufacturing emission factor (kgCO2e/kg) to calculate CO2e emissions. Emissions are then summed across all market segments to determine total Category 10 emissions.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization’s activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

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 and have no other products that would generate 'use' emissions.

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)

1204630.49

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

We calculate emissions by collecting data on products sold and their total masses. To estimate the amount of each product that is disposed of, we apply product-type-specific waste rates: Food products: We use data from ReFED, a leading food waste research organization, to estimate the proportion of sold food that becomes waste at the consumer level. Non-food products and packaging: We use estimates published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on typical waste disposal patterns to estimate amounts disposed. Each waste amount is then mapped to the most accurate waste type based on its composition and disposal characteristics. The total mass of each waste type is distributed across disposal pathways — including landfill, composting, incineration, anaerobic digestion, and recycling — using EPA data on waste disposal patterns. Monthly waste quantities are then multiplied by waste-type-specific emission factors for each disposal pathway to calculate total CO2e emissions. Emission factor sources include the US EPA Emission Factor Hub and UK DEFRA.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Emissions covered under scope 1 or 2

(7.8.6) Please explain

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) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:
☑ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) 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)

99895.53

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Average data method
☑ Investment-specific method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

We estimate the emissions from corporate investments, specifically equity and debt investments. To determine the EFs, we use the input data on the currency, country, industry, and the annual revenue of the asset for the specified measurement period. We also determine the attribution factor of the asset using the outstanding amount and the asset value. We use spend-based EFs from Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) or asset-specific EFs where available. For EEIO-based EFs, we account for inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

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) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:
☑ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) 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]

(7.9) 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 2025 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final With FLAG.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Page 1-3

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ 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 2025 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final With FLAG.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 1-3

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ 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 2025 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final With FLAG.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 1-3

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ 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: Use of sold products

☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

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

☑ Scope 3: Processing of sold products

☑ 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

(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 2025 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final With FLAG.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

Page 1-3

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 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)

11338

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.44

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

This figure was calculated by comparing changes from renewable energy sources from each site. Most of this sources were purchased renewable electricity, but biomass and on-site renewable electricity generation were also considered. Part of these changes include a 4,818 MT CO2e savings in our Hamburg facility due to switching to purchased renewable electricity sources. These changes represent a 0.44% decrease in our Scope 1 & 2 emissions.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

68170

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.62

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The value presented represents the impact of energy efficiency programs and other significant activities different from RE consumption. This figure was calculated by comparing the change in emissions intensity from each site in 2025 vs 2024 by the production from 2025 and substracting any changes attributed to renewable energy consumption. Capital projects implemented helped increase energy efficiency and reduce emissions at multiple facilities. Part of this projects include: 1) a decrease 7960 MT CO2e due to heat recovery projects; 2) an approximate decrease of 5,500 MT CO2e due to the coal to gas conversion from our Winston Salem facility; and 3) an around -8125 MT CO2e decrease due to installations and modifications to improve process efficiency. Additionally, our 2025 total energy used decreased 2% when compared to 2024, which caused a decrease in our overall facility emissions. These changes represent a 3.79% decrease in our Scope 1 & 2 emissions.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The value presented represents the impact from closing our facility in Goole, UK, in 2025 compared to 2024. The site was closed and dismantled, and it still remains as part of our base year emissions. This change represents a 0.04% decrease in our Scope 1 & 2 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

There were no acquisitions in 2025

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

There were no mergers in 2025.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23658

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.91

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The value presented represents the impact of a change in production. This figure was calculated by comparing the emission intensity from each site in 2024 by the change in global production from 2025 vs 2024. Although there was a slight decrease in global production in 2025 vs 2024, some manufacturing sites had a significant increase in output which caused an increase in emissions.. This change represents a 0.30% increase in emissions.

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 2025

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 2025

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 operating conditions in 2025

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 changes in 2025.

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable as all sources have been identified.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Land use change emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Scope 3 land use change emissions associated with agricultural commodities in our supply chain were calculated using emission factors sourced from HowGood, a food industry sustainability data platform that provides crop- and location-specific agricultural emission factors. These emissions are included in the Scope 3 Category 1 (Purchased goods and services) figures reported in 7.8. Scope 1 emissions for this category are not relevant as Ingredion does not own/operate agricultural land other than 2 leased farms (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.

Land management net biogenic CO2 emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Ingredion sources agricultural commodities which involve land management activities that may result in net biogenic CO_2 emissions from changes in soil and biomass carbon stocks. While we have begun quantifying land management CO_2 removals through our regenerative agriculture programs, we have not yet separately calculated net biogenic CO_2 emissions across our broader Scope 3 supply chain. We are evaluating methodologies and data sources to quantify this subcategory in future reporting periods. Scope 1 emissions for this category are not relevant as Ingredion does not own/operate agricultural land other than 2 leased farms (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.

Land management production emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Scope 3 land management production emissions — including emissions from fertilizer application, machinery use, and other on-farm production activities — were calculated using emission factors sourced from HowGood, a food industry sustainability data platform that provides crop- and location-specific agricultural emission factors. These emissions are included in the Scope 3 Category 1 (Purchased goods and services) figures reported in 7.8, rather than reported separately in this subcategory. Scope 1 emissions for this category are not relevant as Ingredion does not own/operate agricultural land other than 2 leased farms (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.

Biogenic product emissions

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.2) Scope 2

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) 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. We calculate Gross CO2 and CO2 removals from biogenic emissions. On site biofuels primarily include woody biomass and methane from on-site waste treatment operations.

Land management CO2 removals

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Scope 3 land management CO_2 removals were quantified through Ingredion's regenerative agriculture programs, managed in partnership with AgOutcomes and the Soil and Water Outcomes Fund. Removals were modeled by Eocene using the EcoPractices platform and COMET-Farm for sequestration and N_2O reductions, and USDA RUSLE2 with GREET emission factors for fuel and fertilizer emission reductions. Practices implemented by enrolled farmers included conservation/reduced tillage, no-till, and cover cropping. All field data was collected and verified by Soil and Water Outcomes Fund staff, with 100% of fields visited for compliance verification. Scope 1 emissions for this category are not relevant as Ingredion does not own/operate agricultural land other than 2 leased farms (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.

Land occupation

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Scope 1 emissions for this category are not relevant as Ingredion does not own/operate agricultural land other than 2 leased farms (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.

Land carbon leakage

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Scope 1 emissions for this category are not relevant as Ingredion does not own/operate agricultural land other than 2 leased farms (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.

Biogenic product CO2 emissions (as gross CO2 fluxes)

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.12.1.2) Scope 2

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Ingredion reports net biogenic emissions from the combustion of on-site and off-site biofuels. Currently, gross co2 fluxes from Biogenic product emissions are not calculated.

Reversals of land management CO2 removals

(7.12.1.1) Scope 1

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.3) Scope 3

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.12.1.4) Please explain

Ingredion's land management CO_2 removals are generated through regenerative agriculture programs managed in partnership with AgOutcomes and the Soil and Water Outcomes Fund. The risk of reversals is managed through a 10% buffer pool allocation applied to all Verified Emission Reductions. No reversals of previously reported removals have occurred to date, as the carbon pools associated with these programs remain within Ingredion's value chain. Should reversals occur in the future, they would be accounted for through the buffer pool mechanism. Scope 1 emissions for this category are not relevant as Ingredion does not own/operate agricultural land other than 2 leased farms (approximately 25 acres total) and one greenhouse (<0.5 acres). These properties are used for research and development, and breeding purposes. Calculated emissions from these leased properties are not significant when compared with our manufacturing operations.
[Fixed row]

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

CO2 emissions from land use management

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

CO2 emissions from land use management is not material for our organization.

CO2 removals from land use management

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

CO2 removals from land use management is not material for our organization.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

Sequestration during land use change is not material for our organization.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

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

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

29899

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

☑ Process-based models

(7.12.3.3) 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. For ADM products - 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. For 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)

(7.12.3.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.12.3.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.12.3.3) Please explain

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Maize/corn

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Unit of production

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.742

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

The emissions intensity value for Corn presented in 2025 is approximately 7.4% lower than the prior year. Since 2024, we updated our methods and have used the Latis database offered by HowGood to obtain emission factors for our agricultural materials. This new approach allows us to to apply multiple emission factors relative to the material based on the sourcing region where the agri-product is grown, thus improving the accuracy and relevance of our inventory. The figure above represents an average for all emission factors used for the same commodity based on the volumes sourced from each region. The same methodology has been applied between this year of reporting and the prior year.

Other commodity

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☑ Unit of production

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.447

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

The value presented is for Cassava Root in 2025, and is approximately 5.7% lower than the prior year. Since 2024, we updated our methods and have used the Latis database offered by HowGood to obtain emission factors for our agricultural materials. This new approach allows us to to apply multiple emission factors relative to the material based on the sourcing region where the agri-product is grown, thus improving the accuracy and relevance of our inventory. The figure above represents an average for all emission factors used for the same commodity based on the volumes sourced from each region. The same methodology has been applied between this year of reporting and the prior year.
[Fixed row]

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

(7.15.1) Emissions breakdown by greenhouse gas type

Select from:

☑ Yes, Scope 1 emissions only

[Fixed row]

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CO2

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

1714234

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

1714234

(7.15.1.8) 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 selected gas)

56

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

1577

(7.15.1.8) 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 selected gas)

96

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

25327

(7.15.1.8) 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 selected gas)

4.81

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

7666

(7.15.1.8) 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)

43200

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

144419

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

122787

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

221743

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

1125

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

1125

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8917

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

64050

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

33027

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

76111

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

3809

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

0

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20454.77

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

30524.32

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

32288.19

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

88

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

3043

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

3043

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7060

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

12511

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

11251

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

351308

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

129082

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

147001

Pakistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

232466

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

24762

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

24762

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11011

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

3188

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

0

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39950

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

38506

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

34565

United Kingdom

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

440

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

67

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

0

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

737576

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

344166

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

341605
[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*	*190071*
Row 2	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - LATAM*	*481631*
Row 3	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - U.S./Canada*	*816314*

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 4	*All Other*	*262271*

[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)

1750327

(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*	*287983*	*268555*
Row 2	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - LATAM*	*280498*	*269789*
Row 3	*Food & Industrial Ingredients - U.S./Canada*	*160723*	*150296*
Row 4	*All Other*	*70048*	*62817*

[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)

1750327

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

799252

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

751456

(7.22.4) Please explain

Ingredion reports 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 entitites.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary.

Row 1

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Ingredion Brasil Ingredientes

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Other food processing

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ Other unique identifier, please specify :NIRE (Número de Identificação do Registro de Empresas- Brasil)

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

35214297780

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

43200

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

144419

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

122787

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Operational boundaries for Ingredion Brasil Ingredientes Industriais Ltda. consist of four manufacturing sites in Brasil: Mogi Guaçu, Cabo, Balsa Nova & Alcantara.

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Rafhan Maize Products ltd

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Other food processing

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ ISIN code – bond

(7.23.1.4) ISIN code – bond

PK0032001015

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

232466

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

24761

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

24761

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Operational boundaries for Rafhan Maize Products Co. Ltd. consist of three manufacturing sites in Pakistan: Cornwala, Mehran & Rakh Canal.
[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). We have partnered with HowGood to be able to provide product level carbon emissions to customers. The HowGood methodology is designed to ISO 14067 and the GHG Protocol Product Life Cycle Accounting and Reporting Standard and has been certified by Carbon Trust. Ingredion is expanding this methodology to include site-level actual manufacturing emissions. We will continue to refine Scope 3 data inputs through supplier engagement activities to include more primary data.
[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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
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

752111

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

8188188

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

8940299.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

488892

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1086454

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

0

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1575346.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1145709

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

533979

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1679688.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

19400

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

19400.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

2406113

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

9808621

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

0

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

12214734.00
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ 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) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

273450

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

0

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

108794

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

164656

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Sustainable biomass includes the consumption of reclaimed biogas from onsite wastewater treatment facilities, as well as the consumption of purchased bio-diesel fuels. Biogas is traditionally used to offset fossil fuels in thermal drying equipment.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

478661

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

33135

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

0

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

445526

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Other biomass includes the consumption of woody biomass.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

There was no consumption of other renewable fuels during 2025

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

363124

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

59482

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

0

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

303643

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Two facilities had coal consumption in 2025.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

217596

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

15312

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

201910

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

373

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

This row accounts for substances derived from crude oil, such as Diesel, Gasoline, Propane, LPG, Kerosene, and Residual Fuel Oil.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

7607467

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

5998

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

5213979

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

424234

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

1963256

(7.30.7.7) Comment

This row accounts for natural gas consumption.

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

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

There was no consumption of other non-renewable fuels during 2025

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

8940299

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

113927

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

5524684

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

1338432

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

1963256

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Sum total of all fuels used by Ingredion operations in 2025
[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)

713353

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

712067

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

19400

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

19400

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

4861722

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

4861722

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

95739

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

95739

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

2307275

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

2307275

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

536960

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

536960

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Brazil

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

328379

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

0

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

1018559

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

366749

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

1713687.00

Canada

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

25009

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

189658

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

0

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

906035

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

1120702.00

China

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

52420

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

0

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

111670

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

43756

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

207846.00

Colombia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

18002

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

61894

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

0

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

313582

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

393478.00

Germany

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33874

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

0

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

42515

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

101110

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

177499.00

India

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4055

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

0

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

0

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

8911

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

12966.00

Malaysia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20261

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

0

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

0

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

34926

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

55187.00

Mexico

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

229327

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

157073

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

192129

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

1593794

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

2172323.00

Pakistan

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

71318

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

75257

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

0

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

735734

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

882309.00

Peru

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14360

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

0

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

0

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

53936

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

68296.00

Thailand

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

87914

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

16375

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

0

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

242930

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

347219.00

United Kingdom

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

402

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

0

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

0

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

2177

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

2579.00

United States of America

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

690025

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

213095

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

314815

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

3842706

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

5060641.00
[Fixed row]

(7.30.15) Provide details on the electricity purchases that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

23596

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ GEC [China]

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

Select from:

☑ China

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Our facilities in China have purchased different certificates from solar power. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025. Commissioning date is not available

Row 2

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

28820

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ GEC [China]

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

Select from:

☑ China

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Our facilities in China have purchased different certificates from wind power. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025. Commissioning date is not available

Row 3

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

18027

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Colombia

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

1977

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Our four Colombia plants purchase from the Chivor Power Plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 4

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2040

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from RE Gebeng Sdn. Bhd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 5

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

360

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2009

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the Kenering Dam Power Plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 6

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Mexico

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3800

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Mexico

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the Eoliatec del Pacifico Power Plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 7

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Peru

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

14219

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Peru

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

1971

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the Matucana Power Plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 8

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

893

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2013

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Bureerum 2) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 9

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

94

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2013

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from A J TECHNOLOGY Co.,Ltd. Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 10

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

708

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Khon Kaen 9) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 11

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

645.2

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2011

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Sakon Nakorn1) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 12

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

780.4

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ Thailand

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Loei 2) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 13

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

826.4

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Nakorn Phanom 3) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 14

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

469.6

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Udon Thani) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 15

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

669.04

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2011

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Nakorn Phanom 1) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 16

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

639.76

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ Thailand

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2011

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Loei 1) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 17

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

895.14

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2013

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Bureerum 1) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 18

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

745.52

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Nong Kai 1) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 19

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

709.88

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Surin 3) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 20

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Thailand

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

924.16

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Solar Power (Bureerum 3) Co., Ltd. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 21

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1504

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the PV Maßbach power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 22

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

450

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the PV Bocholt-Mussum power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 23

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

192

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:

☑ Germany

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2004

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the SP Pfersdorf power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 24

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

895

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2025

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the EPW – Areal 10 power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 25

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2601

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

1999

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the WP Kluis power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 26

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

75

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2003

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the WP Zossen power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 27

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

6970

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the UW Langenhorn power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 28

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1880

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Spain

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the PE El Balson power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 29

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

50

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ GO [Europe]

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

Select from:
☑ Norway

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2018

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the Svardøla (Luster) power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 30

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

23329

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the Milagres III power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 31

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

23394

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from the Milagres IV power plant. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 32

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

19059

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Companhia Energetica Sinop SA. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 33

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4446

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from PCH Pirapora. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 34

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

45460

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2017

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from EOL Delta 3 II. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 35

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

956

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2017

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from DELTA 3 VII ENERGIA S.A. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 36

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

203392

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Companhia Energetica Sinop SA. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 37

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

12518

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2014

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from CENTRAIS EOLICAS MORRAO S/A.

Row 38

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

51

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2015

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from CENTRAIS EOLICAS AMETISTA S.A

Row 39

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind (technology type unknown)

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4800

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :M-RETS

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Traverse Wind Energy 2. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 40

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

985

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :M-RETS

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Purchased from Blackbear Alabama Solar I. All certificates issued for this power qualify for an REC Vintage of 2025.

Row 41

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

43062

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :M-RETS

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Our facility in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, receives renewable energy as part of the default delivered package from the Utility (Alliant Energy). The utility purchases REC's 'on behalf of customers' to meet State RPS requirements. Alliant confirmed that 49.8% of retail load had been covered by REC's retired on behalf of customers.

Row 42

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

191

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Power Content Label

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Our facility in Oxnard California receives default delivered power from Southern California Edison Company. The specifications of the Renewable Energy is contained on the 2023 Power Content Label (https://www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/power-source-disclosure-program). 2023 was used for the disclosure because it was the most recent report when our Renewable Energy was third party assured.

Row 43

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

339

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Power Content Label

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Our facility in Plover, WI, receives default delivered power from Wisconsin Public Service Co. The specifications of the Renewable Energy is contained on the The Wisconsin Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) Annual Report (https://psc.wi.gov/Pages/ServiceType/Energy/Renewables/RpsCompliance.aspx).

Row 44

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :Wind & Solar

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1376

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Renewable Power Supply Certificate

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

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Our facility in Goole, UK, receives renewable electricity as part of a contract with the vendor, Total Energies. Power was generated from eight devices located in the UK. The commissioning date was not available in the Utility summary report.
[Add row]

(7.30.17) Provide details of your organization's low-carbon heat, steam, and cooling purchases in the reporting year by country/area.

Row 1

(7.30.17.1) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

(7.30.17.2) Country/area of consumption of low-carbon heat, steam or cooling

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.17.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Steam

(7.30.17.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Other biomass

(7.30.17.5) Low-carbon heat, steam, or cooling consumed (MWh)

1018559

(7.30.17.6) Comment

This includes supply of steam from third party biomass boilers in two of our facilities

Row 2

(7.30.17.1) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

(7.30.17.2) Country/area of consumption of low-carbon heat, steam or cooling

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.17.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Steam

(7.30.17.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Other biomass

(7.30.17.5) Low-carbon heat, steam, or cooling consumed (MWh)

35466

(7.30.17.6) Comment

This includes supply of steam from third party biomass boilers in two of our facilities

Row 3

(7.30.17.1) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

(7.30.17.2) Country/area of consumption of low-carbon heat, steam or cooling

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.17.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Steam

(7.30.17.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Solid waste incineration with energy recovery

(7.30.17.5) Low-carbon heat, steam, or cooling consumed (MWh)

91684

(7.30.17.6) Comment

This row represents a facility that purchases steam powered by incineration of solid waste with energy recovery. The biomass fraction is estimated as part of the solid waste used.
[Add row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0003465553

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

2501782.38

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

7219000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

1.2

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Ingredion's net sales decreased 3% in 2025 compared to the previous year. Likewise, production in our manufacturing facilities decreased compared to the previous reporting year; which, alongside our increase in renewable energy use and energy efficiency efforts have reduced our gross Scope 1 and 2 emissions combined.
[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

4.82

(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

3.2

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

As part of our All Life sustainability strategy, all of our sites have a water reduction goal that is reflective of the water stress for the basin where the facility operates. Facilities in high water stress areas have a 30% reduction by 2030, facilities in medium stress areas have a 20% reduction, and facilities in low water stress areas have a 10% reduction goal. The metric presented is a composite of the three goals. In 2025, we updated our water risk model. The resultant impact for this work to our water reduction target comes in Mexico, where our Tlalnepantla site remained high stress, but our Guadalajara and San Juan del Río sites were reclassified as medium stress. Our water intensity was slightly lower in 2025 (4.82) vs 2024 (4.99) due to continuous improvement initiatives and lower production rates. We continue to identify opportunities and make strategic investments which will help us attain our goal by 2030.
[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

Q7.53.1 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)

2562226

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

793297

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

0

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

3355523

(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)

2415976.56

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

1750327

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

751456

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

2501783

(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

90.87

(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. Our Scopes 1 and 2 GHG emissions from 2025 decreased 4% when compared to the prior year. This decrease was caused by multiple factors, including: 1) lower production at our manufacturing facilities, 2)more energy efficient processes, and 3) an increase in our purchased renewable electricity.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:
☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Q7.53.1 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 11 – Use of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 10 – Processing of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

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

(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)

10254681

(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)

523813

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

1112270

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

92779

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

648836

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6483

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

12638862

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

12638862

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

91.9

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.44) 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)

20.9

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

67

(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

(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)

10743032.7

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

8565356

(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)

496863

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

1190780

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

73331

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

424347

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

10750677

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

10750677

(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

99.60

(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. In 2025, we achieved approximately 96% of our Tier 1 crops (corn, tapioca, potato, stevia, pulses) as sustainably sourced. We also focused on improving the quality of our FLAG (forest, land and agriculture) Scope 3 calculations. We continue using HowGood emissions data for agriculture raw materials, such as corn, tapioca, and stevia, that comprehensively include farm-to-farm gate emissions, land use change and carbon removals estimates. We advanced load and routing optimization through improved planning tools and processes to enhance freight efficiency and reduce unnecessary transport emissions. We also began advancing structured engagement with select customers who share similar sustainability objectives, building on growing demand for product carbon footprint transparency and primary data exchange. From a supplier engagement perspective, we strengthened our engagement by implementing a digital platform to better manage emissions data and collaborate with suppliers. During the year,we began rolling out the system to improve data accuracy, simplify emissions calculations and enhance supplier outreach.

(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)

37977

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

2.3

(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

31

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

60.17

(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

Renewable electricity is a key lever in reducing our Scope 1 and 2 emissions. The cost and availability of renewable energy varies by market, influenced by local infrastructure, supply dynamics and regulatory conditions. In 2025, we expanded renewable electricity purchases where commercially viable, while evaluating long-term agreements and onsite generation opportunities to balance emissions reductions with cost competitiveness. As a result 31% of our total purchased electricity was sourced from renewable energy. Ingredion will continue assessing opportunities to increase renewable electricity adoption across our network as market conditions and technologies evolve.
[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

	Emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*116*	
To be implemented	*12*	*64835*
Implementation commenced	*23*	*67852*
Implemented	*23*	*34230*
Not to be implemented	*0*	

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Solar PV

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

8229

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1183935

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3350536

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Ingredion installed PV solar cells at two facilities. The project will reduce the amount of power purchased from 3rd party, as well as reduce the power required to be generated on site by fossil fuels. CO2 savings and paybacks are calculated according to expected project benefits. It is estimated to save approximately 8,229 MT per year.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Waste heat recovery

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

7926

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

652650

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1648855

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Ingredion installed seven capital projects that optimized steam usage or the steam recovery system in our manufacturing facilities. The CO2 and cost figures reported represent the total of all seven projects.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

8125

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

5319991

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

14869544

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Implementation of 12 projects that improved energy efficiency. Investments included upgrading process equipment, optimizing process systems, and improving process insulation. The CO2 and cost figures reported are estimated based on engineering calculations which represent the total of all 12 projects.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Electrification

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

4550

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

694346

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1965000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Ingredion installed a new Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR) evaporator at one of our facilities. An MVR replaces a thermal load (which requires fossil fuel) with an electric motor, and are significantly more efficient than traditional steam evaporators. The CO2 savings are a result of improvements in efficiency.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Fuel switch

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

5400

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

706942

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2059985

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

COAL CONVERSION: We completed the conversion of our Winston-Salem, North Carolina, facility from coal to natural gas, marking the exit of coal use across all Ingredion operations in the Americas. This milestone represents a meaningful step forward in reducing the carbon intensity of our manufacturing footprint. The transition to natural gas is expected to reduce GHG emissions by approximately 5,400 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) annually – equivalent to approximately 7.9% of the plant's total emissions. Beyond carbon reduction, the conversion delivers additional environmental and operational benefits, including: Improved air quality profile through elimination of sulfur- and chlorine containing coal inputs. Enhanced byproduct utilization, as wood ash generated from biomass can be beneficially applied to agricultural land to support soil health. Reduced on-site truck traffic, as coal deliveries are no longer required.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal finance mechanisms

(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 2

(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 3

(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 4

(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 while still considering financial considerations.

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our CEO awards program, now in its thirteenth 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 6

(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 has used an internal carbon price since 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.
[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 2

(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 3

(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 4

(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 5

(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 6

(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 7

(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 8

(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 9

(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 2

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ 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 3

(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 4

(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 We selected 0% for revenue generated from low carbon products as the information required cannot be disclosed.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits retired by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Soil carbon sequestration

(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 June 2024 and May 2025.

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

17715

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2024

(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 :Soil and Water Outcome Fund

(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 2024 crop year C02e reductions and removals produced on farms have been modeled by Eocene 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 and checked by Soil and Water Outcomes Fund staff. 100% of 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 34,717 VER's to Ingredion, however only 17,715 VER's were applied to our Scope 3 as they applied to Corn.
[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	*395150*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*395150*

[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)

194436

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Single contracted producer

(8.5.7) Please explain

Two facilities utilize steam in third party owned/operated boilers. Biomass sourcing is managed by a single third-party vendor. Volume is calculated from reported energy values from 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)

148625

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biomass sourcing is managed by the facility and is sourced by multiple local vendors. Volume is calculated from reported energy values. Volume includes total sourced timber for the operation of one on-site boiler.

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)

52088

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biomass is used to supply an on-site boiler. Biomass is sourced by Ingredion through local vendors. Volume is calculated from reported energy values.
[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

No, but we plan to

☑ No, but we plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

(8.7.2) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.3) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Ingredion has a no-deforestation target as it relates to the sourcing of our Tier 1 crops (Corn, Cassava, Potatoes, Pulses, Peas). Timber, used as fuel wood, in four of our facilities, represents <0.5% of our global energy spend and is not an immediate strategic priority. In recent years we have worked with our vendors to assess risk in our supply chain. Ingredion continues to use the SAI Platform FSA as our primary mechanism for evaluating deforestation in our agricultural supply chain. Our organization's definition of "no-deforestation" is consistent with industry and regulatory definitions of deforestation.

(8.7.4) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

(8.7.5) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.6) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year

Ingredion has a no-deforestation target as it relates to the sourcing of our Tier 1 crops (Corn, Cassava, Potatoes, Pulses, Peas). Timber, used as fuel wood, in four of our facilities, represents <1.2% of our global procurement spend and is not an immediate strategic priority. In recent years we have worked with our vendors to assess risk in our supply chain. Ingredion continues to use the SAI Platform FSA as our primary mechanism for evaluating deforestation in our agricultural supply chain. Our organization's definition of "no-deforestation" is consistent with industry and regulatory definitions of deforestation.
[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

☑ Chain-of-custody certification

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

At the end of 2025, approximately 80% of the wood sourced at our Cabo facility is from vendors certified by FSC. As of 2026, 100% of the wood sourced has been certified by the FSC. The vendor provided the FSC certificates as well as the required sourcing documents. The figure of 11% was calculated by dividing the volume of wood sourced by vendors who have FSC certificates (41,671) by the total volume of wood sourced globally for our operations (395,150). 41,671/395,150 = 11%. [Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

11

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

0

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

89

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

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00
[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes, deforestation-free (DF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

11

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

11

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

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

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ FSC Forest Management certification

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

11

(8.9.1.3) Comment

Currently, approximately 80% of the wood sourced at our Cabo facility is from vendors certified by FSC. As of 2026, 100% of our Cabo wood vendors are certified by FSC. The disclosure volume of 11% was calculated by dividing the volume of wood sourced by vendors who have FSC certificates (41,670 MT) by the total volume of wood sourced globally for our operations (395,150MT). 41,670/395,150 = 11%. Attached is an example certificate of a vendor in the program.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

FSC_GLOBAL.pdf
[Add 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 Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) as our primary mechanism for evaluating deforestation risk in our agricultural supply chain. Because the absence of deforestation is an essential requirement within the FSA, our goal of sustainably sourcing 100% of Tier 1 priority crops is closely aligned with our commitment to achieve zero deforestation. We have assessed and validated approximately two-thirds of our Tier 1 crop suppliers as sustainably sourced under the FSA and continue to work with additional growers that have completed assessments but do not yet meet sustainable sourcing criteria. Of the geographies currently assessed, we have identified only two areas where we are seeking a greater understanding of potential deforestation impacts. While the FSA has not identified significant deforestation concerns, Brazil remains a geography with elevated deforestation risk, and we are undertaking additional due diligence to verify that no issues exist within our supply chain. In Ontario, Canada, a small number of growers have reported clearing trees within the past 10 years to expand farmland under government-approved land management programs. We are working to better understand how these activities align with evolving industry and regulatory definitions of deforestation. Ingredion's Brazil operations have also launched initiatives to increase supply chain transparency and enhance our understanding of environmental and social impacts at the farm level. These efforts include evaluating land-use practices, biodiversity considerations and potential deforestation risks across our sourcing regions. To further strengthen our biodiversity and zero-deforestation commitments, Ingredion began collaborating with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in Brazil in 2025. Through this partnership, we support sustainable and regenerative agriculture in the Cerrado, one of the world's most biodiverse savanna ecosystems. The initiative focuses on improving soil health, protecting watersheds, restoring degraded land and promoting agricultural productivity without additional land conversion. Insights from this work will help strengthen our understanding of biodiversity and land-use risks while supporting resilient agricultural landscapes. Ingredion's commitment to sustainable sourcing, biodiversity protection, regenerative agriculture and collaboration with organizations such as The Nature Conservancy continues to support our deforestation goals.
[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:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Increasing supplier control systems

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

65

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Greater stakeholder engagement and collaboration

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

This volume of wood is managed by our third-party steam vendor. We have been engaging with the vendor as they build a robust third-party audit program to ensure traceability in their supply chain.

Timber products

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Increasing physical certification

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

3

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

It is expected that our remaining suppliers at our Cabo facility will be certified with FSC by 2026. We continue to engage with our suppliers.
[Add row]

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

	Third-party certification scheme adopted	Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ We do not supply requesting members with goods and services containing this commodity

[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 <1.2% of our total procurement spend. Ingredion has a strategy around biodiversity and reforestation in the areas where we operate or source crops from biodiversity hotspots. We currently operate in six biodiversity hotspot areas, and have engaged in tree planting,

reforestation, or habitat protection in all six areas. Within our supply chain, SAI's Farm Sustainability Assessment 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. No sites were disqualified in 2024 for deforestation. The FSA is a critical tool to allow Ingredion to collaborate within our supply chain, identify if and where deforestation considerations occur, and address it where we find it. Ingredion is planning on aligning reporting of FLAG emissions in alignment with pending changes proposed by the GHG Protocol FLAG guidance, which is due to be released in late 2025.
[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:
☑ Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply
☑ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting
☑ Labor rights

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply
☑ Third party audits

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

Select from:
☑ No, but we plan to collect data on this indicator 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. In 2024, our third-party steam supplier which sources biomass for fuel wood, engaged with a third-party audit firm who audited their fuel wood supply chain, which included a regulatory and labor rights topics. The vendor presented the results of the audit to Ingredion, highlighting that the third party vendor audited 30 suppliers representing approximately 90% of the biomass supplied to make Ingredion steam. They continue the audit on an annual basis.
[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 28% of our procurement spend. Spend relating to timber products used for fuel wood constitutes <1.2% of our global procurement spend. Based on this materiality assessment, we focus our efforts on forest-related matters pertaining to deforestation in our agriproducts supply chain and implement projects as required that promote sustainable agriculture practices. Our leadership work with the SAI, coupled with our target to sustainably source 100% of our Tier 1 crops by 2025 supports our forest-related commitment. Within our supply chain, SAI's Farm Sustainability Assessment 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. Thus, the FSA is a critical tool to allow Ingredion to collaborate within our supply chain, identify if and where deforestation considerations occur, and address it where we find it.
[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, but we 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:
☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:
☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:
☑ Soil carbon sequestration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Expected benefits of project
☑ Carbon credits gained
☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity
☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss
☑ Securing continued supply of agricultural commodities

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Incentivizing growers in our supply chain to adopt regenerative agriculture practices.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2021

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2029

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

30000

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

400000

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

39.70556

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-90.254857

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:
☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

900000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon credits gained

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Ingredion has engaged with the Soil and Water Outomes Fund to implement regenerative agriculture projects in our supply shed located in Illinois, United States. The project incentivizes growers to adapt sustainable management practices on their crop fields that are related to reduced till, the implementation of cover crops, and no-till farming. The crops grown in the project include primarily corn and soy. Environmental outcomes were modelled for reduction in emissions due to nitrous oxide reductions/sequestration, upstream fuel emission reductions, and upstream fertilizer emission reductions. The farm fields were audited annually and VER's are delivered in the summer months.
[Add row]

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:
☑ Shared premises

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not collected and/or reported

Select from:
☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(9.1.1.7) Country/area and river basin of exclusion

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :River basin data is not currently tracked for water withdrawals that have been assessed as non-material to our operations. Our water management and reporting processes prioritize sites and withdrawals with potentially significant water-related impacts, dependencies, or risks. As a result, detailed river basin identification has not been collected for these non-material withdrawals.

(9.1.1.8) Estimated volume of water the exclusion represents (megaliters)

902608

(9.1.1.9) Estimated % of total water

0.1

(9.1.1.10) 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. In offices, water is primarily used for bathroom/kitchen usage and no manufacturing is done at these sites. Using standard factors per worker, withdrawals from non-manufacturing locations are estimated to total <0.008% of Ingredion's total withdrawals in 2025. Total water estimated is 902,608 M3 divided by total Ingredion withdrawals (112,835,022) = 0.008%

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:

☑ Rainwater

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not collected and/or reported

Select from:
☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(9.1.1.7) Country/area and river basin of exclusion

Uzbekistan
☑ Unknown

(9.1.1.8) Estimated volume of water the exclusion represents (megaliters)

1

(9.1.1.9) Estimated % of total water

0.1

(9.1.1.10) 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 <0.0002% of Ingredion's total water withdrawals.
[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:

☑ At least once a month

(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 global 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:

☑ At least once a month

(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 global 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:

☑ At least once a month

(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:

☑ At least once a month

(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 global 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:

☑ At least once a month

(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 global 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, the potential impact of emerging regulations, and for the quantification of downstream Scope 3 emissions.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

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 global 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:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each manufacturing site enters monthly data into a global 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:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(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:

☑ At least once a month

(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:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Each of our manufacturing sites enters this data into a global 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:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We tracked water recycling/reuse at approximately 82% of our sites in 2025. 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:

☑ At least once a year

(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)

112835

(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 efficiency

(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 2024, our 2025 total withdrawals were approximately 5% lower. We consider a +/-10 % variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The small decrease in overall water withdrawal was driven by a decrease of production and water withdrawals from plants in North America. 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)

97173

(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 efficiency

(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 2024, our 2025 total discharges were approximately 7% lower. We consider a +/-10 % variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The small decrease in overall water discharges was driven by a decrease of production and water discharging from plants in North America. 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)

15662

(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 efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

"In comparison to 2024, our 2025 total consumption was approximately 10% higher. We consider a +/-10 % variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The increase in overall water consumption was driven by a larger decrease in water discharges against our water withdrawals. The numbers for withdrawal, discharges and consumption balance. As we become more efficient at water use, we expect our water consumption to stay the same 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)

12113

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ 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

10.74

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Identification tool used

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

identify sites located in areas with water stress using the Water Availability Indicator from the WWF Water Risk Filter. In 2025, 9 of our manufacturing facilities were located in areas with a 'High water stress' (Water Availability score >3.4).In addition, 8 of our manufacturing facilities were located in areas with a 'Medium water stress' (Water Availability score: 2.6-3.4). The volume of water withdrawn from areas with water stress, includes withdrawals from sites with high and medium water stress scores. In comparison to the previous reporting year, our 2025 total withdrawals from areas with water stress were approximately 3% 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 the sites vs 2024. 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.
[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) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.6.4) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

(9.2.6.5) Please explain

We assessed our sourced agricultural commodities by entering our sourcing origin locations and using the water availability indicator from the WWF Water Risk Filter. The amount of corn sourced from areas with water stress was calculated using the total annual weight (MT) of the commodity shipped by each supplier. It was identified that around 7.7% of our corn in 2025 was sourced from areas with a 'High Risk' category (Water Availability score >3.4). These sourcing areas were mostly located in Pakistan (7.2%) and China (0.5%). In addition, around 4.8% of our corn was sourced from areas under the "Medium Risk" (Water Availability score: 2.6-3.4) category. The sourcing areas for this category were located in Canada,,Mexico, China, United States, Brazil and Pakistan. In June 2026, Ingredion completed the sale of 51% of its interest in the Pakistan business. We anticipate a decrease of these amounts for future years as most of our high risk sourcing is used by our operations in Pakistan, and as we continue to progress in our sustainable sourcing targets and improve our tracking and traceability practices for our raw materials supply chain.

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:

☑ 11-25

(9.2.6.3) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.6.4) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Inform strategies for managing and mitigating water stress

(9.2.6.5) Please explain

For reporting purposes, only Tapioca/Cassava was considered for the other commodity classification, as the rest of the commodities (such as potatoes, stevia and peas) compose less than 2% of our total agricultural sourcing and thus are not considered material. We assessed our sourced agricultural commodities by entering our sourcing origin locations and using the water availability indicator from the WWF Water Risk Filter. The amount of Tapioca sourced from areas with water stress was calculated using the total annual weight (MT) of the commodity shipped by each supplier. In 2025, all of our Tapioca was sourced from Thailand. It was identified that around 18.1% of our Tapioca in 2025 was sourced from areas with a 'High Risk' category (Water Availability score >3.4). In addition, around 74.6% of our Tapioca was sourced from areas under the "Medium Risk" (Water Availability score: 2.6-3.4) category. We anticipate a decrease of these amounts for future years as we continue to progress in our sustainable sourcing targets and improve our tracking and traceability practices for our raw materials supply chain.
[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)

73761

(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 2024, our total 2025 withdrawal of fresh water was approximately 5% lower. We consider +/-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The slight decrease was due to a decrease in our production volumes in most of our facilities, which resulted in a reduction of water withdrawal. 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)

16889

(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 2024, our total 2025 withdrawal of renewable groundwater was approximately 7% lower. We consider +/-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The slight decrease was due to a decrease in our production volumes in most of our facilities, which resulted in a reduction of water withdrawal. 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 <1.5% of the water intake and is not considered relevant when considering other water intake sources.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

22185

(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 2024, our total 2025 withdrawal of water from third parties was 2% lower. We consider +/-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. The slight decrease was due to a decrease in our production volumes in most of our facilities, which resulted in a reduction of water withdrawal. 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)

72025

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

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 2025, discharges to fresh surface water were 7% lower compared to 2024. We consider +/-10% variance to be about the same

when making year over year comparisons. This slight decrease was mostly due to more efficient processes and a decreasing production rate. We anticipate that the discharge surface water will remain about the same in future years as efficiencies in water use and discharge progress.

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)

844

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Change of discharge destination

(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 2024, our 2025 groundwater discharges were approximately 56% lower. This decrease was mostly due to a facility in the US and two facilities in Thailand significantly reducing their groundwater discharges in favor of surface water and third party destinations. Overall, irrigation is a small percentage of our water discharge volume. We anticipate that the discharge volume to groundwater will remain about the same in future years.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

24304

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Third party water source volumes, generally municipal water suppliers, are measured at all applicable sites. In comparison to 2024, our 2025 water from third party sources was 5% lower. We consider +/-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. This slight decrease was mostly due to a

decreasing production rate. We anticipate that the discharge to third parties will remain about the same in future years as efficiencies in water use and discharge progress.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Indicate the highest level to which your wastewater is treated (either by your organization or a third party) before being discharged to the environment.

Quaternary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We do not use quaternary treatment for our process wastewater.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

1105

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 91-99

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ No other factors considered

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge of water treated by tertiary treatment raised by approximately 7% between 2025 and 2024. 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. As the available treatment level categories in this question were modified for this reporting cycle; our 2024 volumes for discharge by treatment category had to be recalculated to allocate discharges sent to third parties for treatment to their type of treatment. 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. For discharge treated in compliance with local regulations, the 91-99% range was estimated based on a low frequency of incidents—or volume of water—where levels exceeded the limits permitted by local regulations.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

32899

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:
☑ 91-99

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply
☑ No other factors considered

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge of water treated by secondary treatment decreased by 7% in 2025 vs 2024. Secondary treatment includes aerobic or anaerobic digestion facilities, or a combination of both. All of our wastewater discharges to third parties are included within this category. As the available treatment level categories in this question were modified for this reporting cycle; our 2024 volumes for discharge by treatment category had to be recalculated to allocate discharges sent to third parties for treatment to their type of treatment. Ingredion considers changes with /- 10% to be about the same. It is expected that the number may decrease 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. For discharge treated in compliance with local regulations, the 91-99% range was estimated based on a low frequency of incidents—or volume of water—where levels exceeded the limits permitted by local regulations.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

63169

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 91-99

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ No other factors considered

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge of water treated by primary treatment decreased by 8% in 2025 vs 2024. Primary treatment includes pH adjustment and removable of settle-able solids. We use primary treatment for non-contact cooling water that is returned to the same water source. 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. As the available treatment level categories in this question were modified for this reporting cycle; our 2024 volumes for discharge by treatment category had to be recalculated to allocate discharges sent to third parties for treatment to their type of treatment. For discharge treated in compliance with local regulations, the 91-99% range was estimated based on a low frequency of incidents—or volume of water—where levels exceeded the limits permitted by local regulations.

No treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We do not discharge process wastewater to the environment without treatment.

Unknown

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We do not discharge process wastewater to unknown destinations.
[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 substantive 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:

☑ No, we have assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(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)

Tlalnepantla

(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

19.54756

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-99.203423

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1085

(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

1084

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

1

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

521

(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

521

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

564

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is different from the one reported a year prior. In 2025, we reviewed our water risk assessment and we updated our water risk model. As a result, one manufacturing facility in Mexico has been identified through the Company's 2025 water risk assessment as operating in an area with a water-related high risk. This facility is different from the reported a year prior; however, previous year numbers were still available to compare with the 2025 performance. The water presented in the column "Total Water Withdrawals at this facility" is equal to the sum of "Withdrawals from groundwater", and "withdrawals from 3rd party sources". We do not withdraw fresh surface water, brackish surface water, or non-renewable groundwater. Moisture content of our agricultural raw materials represents <1.5% of the water intake and is not considered relevant when considering other water intake sources. Reported volumes are direct measurements that are reported into a corporate database. Compared to last year, none of the water withdrawals, discharges and consumption volumes was above a +/-10% variance. We consider +/-10% variance to be about the same when making year over year comparisons. We continue to research water efficiency and recycling initiatives applicable to this site. The facility is included in our water stewardship target and has a goal to reduce water use by 30% vs 2019 base year.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ ISAE 3000

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ ISAE 3000

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

Select all that apply

☑ ISAE 3000

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ ISAE 3000

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply

☑ ISAE 3000

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply
☑ ISAE 3000

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply
☑ ISAE 3000
[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	7219000000	*63978.38*	*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)

0.55

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Bushels of Corn

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.9.6) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.9.7) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Reference for future water targets and business planning

(9.9.8) 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 cubic meters per corn bushel grown (0.55 m3/bushel). Of the total acres in the data collection program, ~7.2% were irrigated. The average volume of water/acre was about the same compared to 2024 (0.53 m3/bushel) likely due to similar weather 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) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.9.7) Use of the metric within the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Reference for future water targets and business planning

(9.9.8) 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.
[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 (m3/denominator)

4.8244

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Water Use

(9.12.4) Denominator

Metric tons of finished product

(9.12.5) Comment

Water use 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:

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

(9.14.6) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(9.14.7) Please explain

Our protein fortification business 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. The product uses considerable less lifecycle water use than a meat based protein. As a demonstration of the value plant proteins can bring to our customers, Ingredion culinologists created an alternative formulation for a cheese cracker snack. By replacing whey protein with our VITESSENCE® Pulse 1853 Pea Protein Isolate, we were able to create a snack alternative that reduced blue water usage by 6%, reduced our carbon footprint by 47% and increased consumer preference for the product by 5% at an equivalent price point. While there appears to be clear water benefits, more work needs to be understood to classify as having low water impact.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category	Science-based target set in this target category according to SBTN guidance
Water pollution	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years
Water withdrawals	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	
Other	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	

[Fixed row]

(9.15.1) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Water target 2

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Basin level

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per unit of production

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

2.1

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

1.47

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

2.11

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-2

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

As part of our All Life sustainability strategy, all of our sites have a water reduction goal that is reflective of the water stress for the basin where the facility operates. Facilities in high water stress areas have a 30% reduction goal by 2030. In 2025, we updated our water risk model. The resultant impact for this work to our water reduction target comes in Mexico, where our Tlalnepantla site remained high stress, but our Guadalajara and San Juan del Río sites were reclassified as medium stress. The numerator of the target is the sum of all water withdrawals from the facility less single pass cooling water that is returned to the same source. The denominator is the total production manufactured. All manufacturing facilities in our operational boundary are included in this target with no exclusions.

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

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 2025, our operation in Tlalnepantla experienced flat progress (0%) in water use intensity compared to our 2019 baseline. The site experienced a decrease of 10% in its water withdrawals and production during the reporting year.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The target is set based on a calendar year (January - December).

Row 2

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 5

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Reduction in concentration of pollutants

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

18.43

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

16.59

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

18.84

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-22

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) 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).. Our goal is to reduce our COD intensity by 10% by 2030 compared to our 2019 baseline. All manufacturing facilities in our operational boundary are included in this target with no exclusions.

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

In waste reduction, we measure the COD (Chemical Oxygen Demand) intensity associated with operational streams going to wastewater. Our goal is to reduce our COD intensity by 10% by 2030 compared to our 2019 baseline, so we create more products and less waste from the agriculture crops we consume. In 2025, we experienced a 2% increase in COD intensity versus our 2019 baseline, which was flat compared to 2024 performance. Some of our facilities were impacted by unexpected operational upsets, which adversely impacted the global COD intensity. Several of our plant operations teams have formed small working teams to improve this sustainability metric.

(9.15.1.16) Is this a science-based target according to SBTN?

Select from:

☑ No

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The target is set based on a calendar year (January - December).

Row 3

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 4

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Procurement/production of sustainable raw materials

☑ Increase in procurement/production of crops using sustainable agriculture practices

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

96.3

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

96

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) 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.

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

We continued to see progress on our sustainable sourcing program, increasing to 85% sustainably sourced across our globally sourced Tier 1 crops. Our Tier 1 crops — corn, tapioca, potato, stevia and peas/pulses — comprise approximately 99% of our global sourcing by volume. Notable increases in sustainable volumes in 2025 were seen in cassava sourcing in Thailand, driving much of our progress. As we move into 2026, we will continue to press on toward 100% sustainable sourcing of our Tier 1 priority crops.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The target is set based on a calendar year (January - December).

Row 4

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 6

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Increase in the proportion of employees using safely managed drinking water services

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

96.3

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

96

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) 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.

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

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. As we move into 2026, we will continue to press on toward 100% sustainable sourcing of our Tier 1 priority crops. We know that there will be challenges in reaching this target – geopolitical pressures, growing small holders in our supply chain, rising program costs – but we are dedicated to driving progress.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The target is set based on a calendar year (January - December).

Row 5

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 1

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Basin level

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per unit of production

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

2.05

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

1.64

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

2.04

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

2

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

As part of our All Life sustainability strategy, all of our sites have a water reduction goal that is reflective of the water stress for the basin where the facility operates. Facilities in medium stress areas have a 20% reduction goal. In 2025, we updated our water risk model. The resultant impact for this work to our water reduction target comes in Mexico, where our Tlalnepantla site remained high stress, but our Guadalajara and San Juan del Río sites were reclassified as medium stress. The numerator of the target is the sum of all water withdrawals from the facilities less single pass cooling water that is returned to the same source. The denominator is the total production manufactured. All manufacturing facilities in our operational boundary are included in this target with no exclusions.

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

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 2025, our operation in Tlalnepantla experienced flat progress (0%) in water use intensity compared to our 2019 baseline.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The target is set based on a calendar year (January - December).
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets?

	Targets in place
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(10.1.1) Provide details of your plastics-related targets.

(10.1.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Plastics target 1

(10.1.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including entire value chain)

(10.1.1.3) Category of target & quantitative metric

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Complete three projects per country where we have manufacturing operations to drive increased plastics circular economy by the end of 2025

(10.1.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2019

(10.1.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(10.1.1.6) Base year figure

0

(10.1.1.7) End date of target

12/31/2025

(10.1.1.8) Target year figure

36

(10.1.1.9) Reporting year figure

47

(10.1.1.10) Target status in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Achieved

(10.1.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

130.55555555555557

(10.1.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Global environmental treaty/initiative/framework

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 12

(10.1.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Most of Ingredion's plastic use is tied to packaging and shipping finished products. Smaller amounts are used within our operations for quality testing and temporary storage. According to a previous assessment, there are approximately 11,300 metric tons (MT) of packaging material containing at least 50% plastic (by total weight) across our global operations.

(10.1.1.16) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

Last year, we made progress toward our goal of completing three plastics circular economy projects in each country where we operate manufacturing facilities. Globally, we have completed 47 projects to date, including five new projects in 2025. Efforts focused primarily on packaging optimization, material reduction and process improvements that reduce plastic intensity while maintaining product integrity and operational efficiency: In Brazil, we eliminated plastic film from products packaged in large bags, reducing approximately 25,000 kilograms (kg) of low-density Polyethylene annually. In Colombia, we introduced bulk bags containing 20–25% postconsumer recycled (PCR) resin, reducing virgin plastic use by 8,000 kg annually. In Pakistan, transitioning from polypropylene-woven grain bags to loose grain handling eliminated an estimated 240,000 kg annually

(10.1.1.17) Further details of target

While we've already implemented many of the most readily achievable improvements, we plan to advance plastics reduction through broader packaging innovation and procurement initiatives. Plastics optimization is embedded in our operational excellence and circular economy efforts, supporting our broader waste avoidance goals.
[Add row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.3) Please explain

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

(10.2.3) Please explain

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

(10.2.3) Please explain

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.3) Please explain

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Usage of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Usage of plastic packaging

Select all that apply
☑ Production/commercialization of goods or products packaged in plastics

(10.2.3) Please explain

Ingredion uses plastic packaging to package and ship its finished products. Packaging formats include plastic-lined paper bags, plastic bulk bags (flexible intermediate bulk containers, or FIBCs), intermediate bulk containers (IBC totes), and plastic drums. These serve as primary and secondary packaging across Ingredion's global operations.

Provision of waste management

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.3) Please explain

Ingredion does not engage in this activity.

Other plastics-related activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.3) Please explain

Ingredion uses plastic dunnage — protective materials such as plastic airbags, foam, or sheeting — during the shipment of finished products. These single-use plastic materials serve a protective function during transit and are not classified as product packaging.
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

11300

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Percentage not available

☑ None

(10.5.12) Please explain

Ingredion estimates approximately 11,300 metric tons of plastic content in finished goods packaging containing at least 50% plastic (by total weight) across our global operations during the reporting year. This figure was estimated based on weighted averages across packaging types. We are currently unable to report the breakdown of raw material content (i.e., % virgin fossil-based, % virgin renewable, % pre-consumer recycled, or % post-consumer recycled). Our packaging is sourced from multiple suppliers across diverse geographies, and supplier-level material composition data is not systematically collected at this time.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Specify the packaging formats across your organization's packaging portfolio and their proportions.

(10.5.1.1) Packaging formats in packaging portfolio

Select from:

☑ Other flexibles (incl. multimaterial), please specify :Stretch wrap, plastic-lined paper bags, and bulk bags. Stretch wrap is used to secure palletized shipments. Plastic-lined paper bags are multimaterial packaging consisting of a paper outer layer with an interior plastic liner. Bulk bags are large flexible tote bags. Both formats serve as primary packaging for Ingredion's finished products.

(10.5.1.2) Proportion of packaging portfolio

68

Row 2

(10.5.1.1) Packaging formats in packaging portfolio

Select from:

☑ Other rigids (incl. multimaterial), please specify :Intermediate bulk containers (IBC totes) and plastic drums. IBC totes are rigid, reusable containers typically made of plastic (often HDPE) within a metal cage, used for bulk liquid and semi-liquid ingredient shipments. Plastic drums are rigid single-material containers used for smaller-volume product shipments. Both formats serve as primary packaging for Ingredion's finished products.

(10.5.1.2) Proportion of packaging portfolio

32
[Add row]

(10.5.2) Is any of your packaging designed in compliance with design for recycling and/or composting guidelines?

(10.5.2.1) Is any of your packaging designed in compliance with design for recycling and/or composting guidelines?

Select from:

☑ Yes, recycling

(10.5.2.2) Select the design guidelines you are in compliance with

Design for recycling guidelines

☑ Regional design for recycling guidelines

(10.5.2.5) % of packaging that is designed for recycling

85

(10.5.2.8) Please explain

Ingredion's packaging portfolio includes multiwall valve bags (90% designed for recycling), multiwall pinch bags (70%), big bags made of polypropylene (90%), and plastic drums (90%). All packaging materials used by Ingredion are technically recyclable. However, in certain markets, recycling companies have indicated that the recovery process for some packaging formats is not cost-effective due to higher energy requirements and costs associated with sorting and preliminary cleaning. Ingredion continues to work with regional recycling partners to improve the practical recyclability of its packaging and is evaluating design improvements to increase the recycled content recovery rate, particularly for multiwall pinch bags where the current designed-for-recycling rate is lowest.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.3) Indicate the reusability and recyclability of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

(10.5.3.1) Percentages available to report

Percentage not available

☑ None

(10.5.3.5) Please explain

Ingredion procures plastic packaging from third-party suppliers for use in our finished goods. We do not currently have the data systems in place to calculate the percentage of our plastic packaging that is reusable or recyclable in practice and at scale. As a buyer rather than a manufacturer of packaging, we rely on supplier-provided specifications, and to date we have not aggregated this information across our global packaging portfolio in a way that would allow us to report reliable reusability or recyclability percentages.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.4) Provide the proportion of product delivered through reuse models.

(10.5.4.1) % total product delivered through reuse systems

Select from:

☑ None

[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:* ☑ Yes	*We reviewed CEPF biodiversity hot spots.*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Important, but not an immediate priority*

[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Cerrado.

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Data not available

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Sourcing of agricultural crops from the area.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Operational controls

☑ Other, please specify

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

In 2025, Ingredion began a collaboration with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in Brazil to advance sustainable and regenerative agricultural practices in the Cerrado—one of the world’s most biodiverse savannas and a critical source of Brazil’s major river systems. For more than three decades, TNC has worked across Brazil’s Cerrado, Amazon and Atlantic Forest biomes to develop science-based solutions that align conservation with economic development. In the Cerrado, nearly half of the native vegetation has been converted for agricultural use. While the region is critical for global food production, this expansion has also made it one of Brazil’s most environmentally vulnerable ecosystems. Through this partnership, Ingredion is supporting TNC’s efforts to demonstrate that agricultural productivity and biodiversity protection can be advanced. The initiative will help to: Expand regenerative food production systems that improve soil health and productivity without further land conversion. Strengthen watershed protection and water stewardship, recognizing agriculture as a primary water user in the region. Advance land restoration efforts on degraded areas to enhance biodiversity and climate resilience. Support Indigenous Peoples and local communities through improved land management practices and engagement in conservation policy discussions. This collaboration provides Ingredion with valuable, field-level insight into biodiversity risks and regenerative practices within a key sourcing geography. The insights from this work will inform and strengthen our broader biodiversity strategy and sustainable sourcing efforts across other regions of our agricultural supply chain.
[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Progress against targets

☑ Other data point in module 7, please specify :7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.13.1

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General 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. As part of the independent assurance the work included: 1. Assessing the appropriateness of the Reporting Criteria for the Subject Matter; 2. Conducting interviews with relevant personnel of Ingredion; 3. Reviewing the data collection and consolidation processes used to compile Subject Matter, including assessing assumptions made, and the data scope and reporting boundaries; 4. Reviewing documentary evidence provided by Ingredion; 5. Agreeing a selection of the Subject Matter to the corresponding source documentation; 6. Reviewing Ingredion's systems for quantitative data aggregation and analysis; and 7. Assessing the disclosure and presentation of the Subject Matter to ensure consistency with assured information. 8. Carrying out two in-person visits (Indianapolis, Indiana and Winston Salem, North Carolina) selected on a risk-based basis. Conducting an in-person review with Ingredion's headquarters personnel in Westchester, Illinois

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

Ingredion 2025 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Final With FLAG.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Base year emissions

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General 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. As part of the independent assurance the work included: 1. Assessing the appropriateness of the Reporting Criteria for the Subject Matter; 2. Conducting interviews with relevant personnel of Ingredion; 3. Reviewing the data collection and consolidation processes used to compile Subject Matter, including assessing assumptions made, and the data scope and reporting boundaries; 4. Reviewing documentary evidence provided by Ingredion; 5. Agreeing a selection of the Subject Matter to the corresponding source documentation; 6. Reviewing Ingredion's systems for quantitative data aggregation and analysis; and 7. Assessing the disclosure and presentation of the Subject Matter to ensure consistency with assured information. 8. Carrying out two in-person visits (Indianapolis, Indiana and Winston Salem, North Carolina) selected on a risk-based basis. Conducting an in-person review with Ingredion's headquarters personnel in Westchester, Illinois

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

Ingredion 2019 CDP Verification Statement GHG_Restatement_5-2026_Final with FLAG.pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ Water consumption– total volume

☑ Water discharges– total volumes

☑ Water withdrawals– total volumes

☑ Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

☑ Water withdrawals – volumes by source
☑ Water discharges – volumes by destination

(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, we undertake limited assurance verification of our water and waste performance. As part of the independent assurance the work included: 1. Assessing the appropriateness of the Reporting Criteria for the Subject Matter; 2. Conducting interviews with relevant personnel of Ingredion; 3. Reviewing the data collection and consolidation processes used to compile Subject Matter, including assessing assumptions made, and the data scope and reporting boundaries; 4. Reviewing documentary evidence provided by Ingredion; 5. Agreeing a selection of the Subject Matter to the corresponding source documentation; 6. Reviewing Ingredion's systems for quantitative data aggregation and analysis; and 7. Assessing the disclosure and presentation of the Subject Matter to ensure consistency with assured information. 8. Carrying out two in-person visits (Indianapolis, Indiana and Winston Salem, North Carolina) selected on a risk-based basis. Conducting an in-person review with Ingredion's headquarters personnel in Westchester, Illinois

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

Ingredion Corporate 2025 CDP Verification Statement Water ISAE 3000_Final.pdf

Row 4

(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

☑ Other data point in module 9, please specify :9.15 target 1 and target 2

(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, we undertake limited assurance verification of our water performance to target. As part of the independent assurance the work included: 1. Assessing the appropriateness of the Reporting Criteria for the Subject Matter; 2. Conducting interviews with relevant personnel of Ingredion; 3. Reviewing the data collection and consolidation processes used to compile Subject Matter, including assessing assumptions made, and the data scope and reporting boundaries; 4. Reviewing documentary evidence provided by Ingredion; 5. Agreeing a selection of the Subject Matter to the corresponding source documentation; 6. Reviewing Ingredion's systems for quantitative data aggregation and analysis; and 7. Assessing the disclosure and presentation of the Subject Matter to ensure consistency with assured information. Conducting an in-person review with Ingredion's headquarters personnel in Westchester, Illinois

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

Ingredion Corporate 2025 Verification Statement Water and Waste Performance_Final Rev 1 Format.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 to facilitate collective action in priority basins.

Select from:
☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute