Klockner Pentaplast Holding

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP

.

10/11/2024, 01:21 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:

☑ EUR

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Privately owned organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Klöckner Pentaplast (kp) has a broad product portfolio across a variety of polymers, and specialises in two core service lines: food packaging and pharma, health & protection, and durables.Kp is a plastics manufacturer that is purpose-driven to deliver the sustainable protection of everyday needs. Our experts create innovative films and trays such as blister packaging that provide product safety, help avoid food waste, safeguard medication and medical devices, and protect the integrity of countless durable products with our pharmaceutical packaging. We innovate, design and manufacture for sustainable solutions that our customers use to package and protect products in daily situations around the globe. And we understand our obligation and responsibility to champion a circular economy where plastics are a source of valuable raw material. In 2021, kp launched "Investing in Better", a broad and ambitious sustainability strategy with then time-bound and measurable long-term targets. The strategy is built around three main objectives: - Close the loop: we will reduce waste and do more with less. This objective commits us to using more recycled material, closing the packaging loop and taking every opportunity to make our packaging recyclable. - Work Smarter: we have a responsibility to use as few resources as possible, as efficiently as possible. That's why we are focused on using less energy, cutting carbon emissions and ending landfill. - Act Responsibly: Acting responsibly at all times is a cornerstone of our culture. And in the future, we will do an even better job of keeping our people engaged, while we continue to focus on safety, and becoming a more diverse company.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Not providing past emissions data for Scope 1

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

Select from:

☑ Not providing past emissions data for Scope 2

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

Select from:

☑ 1 year

[Fixed row]

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

1973208000

(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: ☑ Not applicable – we do not publicly disclose financial statements

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Switzerland
☑ France
☑ Poland
☑ Turkey
☑ Belarus
☑ Germany
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

We focus the majority of our procurement management resources on strategic, first-tier suppliers which account for 80% of our total spend, with additional focus on particular suppliers regarding Scope 3 GHG emissions. A vital part of best-practice procurement is due diligence, a management process that brings together risk assessment, engagement, improvement plans and regulatory compliance. Since 2023, we have used a cloud-based system to categorise and analyse risk exposure in our supply chain. We place specific focus on strategic and/or high-risk suppliers and we use data to screen them based on ISO and NACE1 codes that account for the following factors: • Country governance, track record, and infrastructure for monitoring and enforcement of human rights and labour laws. • Type of manufacturing process or operational activity and the related risks to worker health and safety. • Critical political, current affairs or business news screening. The evaluation of suppliers in scope is through self-assessment. If required, as governed by the risk analysis, an ESG audit will be conducted on the supplier's premises. Selected strategic or highrisk suppliers fulfil five ESG assessments in a more concrete manner via the cloud-based system on key areas: environmental protection; human rights and labour; anti-bribery and anti-corruption; health and safety and supply chain responsibility. An extra assessment about conflict minerals is assigned to those suppliers with specific risk in this area.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[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

When conducting our climate risk assessment to identify our short-term, medium-term and long-term physical and transitional risks and opportunities, to identify our financial resilience, we used this timeframe as a proxy to assess our 'short-term' physical and transition risks/opportunities.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

When conducting our climate risk assessment to identify our short-term, medium-term and long-term physical and transitional risks and opportunities, to identify our financial resilience, we used this timeframe as a proxy to assess our 'medium-term' physical and transition risks/opportunities.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

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

When conducting our climate risk assessment to identify our short-term, medium-term and long-term physical and transitional risks and opportunities, to identify our financial resilience, we used this timeframe as a proxy to assess our 'long-term' physical and transition risks/opportunities.
[Fixed row]

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

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from:	*Select from:*

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ 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

☑ 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:

☑ Every two years

(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

Other

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

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

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

Chronic physical

☑ Sea level rise

☑ Water stress

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Employees

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

To help us fully understand the impact of climate change on our business, we worked with independent sustainability consulting firm DNV to conduct an extensive climate risk assessment for the business, building on and including the climate scenario analysis on physical risks to our operating sites with SUST Global. DNV undertook surveys and interviews with internal and external stakeholders to provide an in-depth picture of our climate risk and opportunity landscape. Following the survey and interview process, a workshop was held with internal stakeholders, including members of the Executive Leadership Team and the Sustainability Committee, to validate the findings. These pieces of work are informing a roadmap to address our short-, medium-, and long-term climate-related risks and opportunities.

[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

Typically, kp factories draw municipal water and discharge very small volumes of wastewater to municipal systems. The quality of discharges is monitored to ensure compliance with all regional and/or local regulations. In 2023, we developed a roadmap for water management in our manufacturing plants. Examples of water efficiency projects include rainwater reuse, automatic washer overflow and effluent treatment. Furthermore, we work on water supply risk and share best practice in

process water systems, machine calibration and standard water efficiency metrics. At site level, we use external tools and internal designated experts to monitor water risks and manage plans to further minimise those risks. We adopt a precautionary approach to water risk management, and our Code of Conduct commits us to compliance with water stewardship regulations. A group-wide risk assessment is guided by a combined water stress index based on the Worldwide Fund for Nature's (WWF) Water Risk Filter and World Resources Institute's Aqueduct tool. For example, impacts relating to withdrawal, consumption and discharge are particularly important in water-stressed areas, so our regular assessment will identify sites exposed to the greatest risk. All sites have a water management plan in place, adapted to local conditions; all corporate water risks are managed and kp's governance and management are robust. We therefore believe that an overarching enterprise-wide water stewardship target is not required. When a territory withdraws 25% or more of its renewable freshwater resources, it is said to be 'water-stressed'. Of the 2.6m3 of water withdrawn by kp in 2023, 2% was within locations with high or extremely high baseline water stress. These are in South America, Asia and Europe, where five of our 30 sites are located: Changzhou and Suzhou, China; Cotia, Brazil; Gebze, Türkiye; and Bertinoro, Italy.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Where our direct operations take place, we undertake a check to see if we are operating in any locations that is considered a key biodiversity area (KBA).

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

Select from:

☑ No, we do not have a list/geospatial map of priority locations

[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

1000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

We define substantive financial / strategic impact as per the following definitions in our risk management framework, which has also been used when assessing climate risk in order to integrate that into our core business strategies: Marginal: Risk is easily mitigated by normal day to day processes. Impact of 0 to 0.1 million Euro. Moderate: Limited impact on future investment plans. Impact of 0.1 to 1 million Euro. Significant: Unlikely to compromise kp's 'licence to trade', but a short term impact on kp's ability to refinance at acceptable rates. Impacts future investment plans at strategic level. Impact of 1 to 5 million Euro. Critical: Approaching risks limit. Could compromise 'licence to trade'. Unable to secure sufficient funding. Permanent or serious damage to kp's future/operations. Impact of 5 to 15 million Euro. Catastrophic: Reached risk limit. Immediately compromises 'licence to trade'. Unable to secure funding. kp's future in doubt. Impact 50 million

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Capital expenditures

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

250000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

"For capex investment, kp's capital committee works with three main capex thresholds for all types of projects including, growth, cost reduction, sustainability, and maintenance. These thresholds are as follows: 1. Minor capital projects 10k but 250k Only capex projects 250k are required to follow a speciliased, detailed approval process. Any capex costs below this value are treated as part of day to day business costs, and managed from local site balance sheets and accounts payable. In the context of climate change mitigation only projects with capital investment costs above 250k are identified as being substantive. Furthermore, kp's capital allocation process, has a specific category for sustainability projects, which sites alongside cost reduction and growth. Climate change mitigation projects are marked in this category as part of the approval process.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy
☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Italy

☑ Spain

☑ France

☑ Poland

☑ Germany

☑ Portugal

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Fast evolving legislative requirements in the EU (namely the draft Packaging and Packaging Waste Regulation and regulation 2022/1616) and consumer behaviours, arempushing for recyclability and circularity. kp is at risk of having a product portfolio (and associated stock / assets) that does not meet circularity regulations and / or expectations. This poses a risk to kp's licence to operate in terms of potential fines for not complying with regulations and a potential loss of sales and market share as products that demonstrate circularity / recyclability become preferred.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

Changes to packaging due to regulation might allow new manufacturers enter our markets and/or produce alternative forms of packaging, including carton, glass and metal containers or packaging made from other materials, or are able to address certain demands more cheaply or cost-effectively than us, our business may be negatively affected. Any significant substitution away from plastic-based packaging products or our inability to respond to products and solutions introduced by our competitors would pose a material risk to our future performance and could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

100000

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

10000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

We worked with independent sustainability consulting firm DNV to conduct an extensive climate risk assessment for the business. Part of this work involved a survey sent to internal and external stakeholders. Market risk was majority scored as having a 'Moderate' impact over the long-term, which was defined as an impact of 0.1 to 1 million, according to our ERM scoring framework.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

60000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

One year of kp's CAPEX in order to further transition the business to more sustainable polymers and packaging.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our profitability depends upon, among others, on our ability to introduce new products that offer value for our customers. We need to continue to identify, develop and market innovative products on a timely basis to replace existing products in order to maintain our profit margins and our competitive position. However, we may face challenges due to the production complexity and logistics of developing and launching new products, given many of our products are developed to meet specifications provided by individual customers. Product development and engineering require significant investment.

Plastics

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Switzerland
☑ Russian Federation
☑ France
☑ Poland
☑ Turkey
☑ Belarus
☑ Germany
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Consumers are actively phasing out plastic from their purchasing decisions due to negative associations with environmental pollution and microplastic health concerns. As a plastics manufacturer, kp is at risk of decreasing demand/sale as alternatives to plastic such as paper or bio-plastics become increasingly popular. Talent attraction at kp may also suffer due to the perception that the industry is not sustainable.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(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

Decrease in sales associated with changing consumer demands has the potential to reduce our sales and revenue. In addition, consumer preference can be affected by environmental considerations, including whether packaging can be recycled or re-used or whether it contains recycled material. For example, customers in our Fruit & Produce and Food-to-Go product lines may prefer pulp and carton board products rather than plastic-based ones.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with customers

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our sales may be negatively affected by variations in customer preference driven by the sustainability, recyclability, ability to reuse and cost. In addition, government actions are introducing new environmental regulations and tax incentives are leading to heightened environmental awareness and inducing a change in consumer behaviors. We have developed plans to increase the use of recycled materials in manufacturing our products; however, we may be unable to realize these plans or to source sufficient recycled materials to meet our manufacturing needs. Furthermore, we may be unable to sufficiently expand capacity at our manufacturing plants to be able to increase usage of recycled materials due to unanticipated delays in developing our facilities or expenses for expanding capacity may be higher than we anticipated. In addition, there may be reputational risk associated with selling plastic products, and although we have programs to promote recycling and the value of plastic waste, such programs may not be sufficient to convince customers to continue buying our products if end-consumers choose to stop purchasing products with plastic packaging.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Reputation

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

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Switzerland
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United States of America
☑ Poland
☑ Turkey
☑ Belarus
☑ Germany
☑ Thailand
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

There is a risk that kp may not be able to deliver on its sustainability commitments or address all of its material sustainability / climate-related risks because kp's targets on recyclability and recycled content may be constrained by regulations set in the EU and associated supply and demand of recycled material. The impact of not being able to deliver on sustainability commitments could be reputational damage for not doing enough to meet the targets.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Increase fines reduces our cash flow. Also fall in demand due to reputational damage will reduce revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

5000000

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

15000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

We worked with independent sustainability consulting firm DNV to conduct an extensive climate risk assessment for the business. Part of this work involved a survey sent to internal and external stakeholders. Reputation risk was majority scored as having a 'Critical' impact over the long-term, which was defined as an impact of 5 to 15 million, according to our ERM scoring framework.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To mitigate this reputational risk, we are investing in innovation and we continue to develop new products that meet customer and regulatory requirements. Meeting our Circular Economy targets is an industry effort and as such we are part of multiskateholder initiatives so that we can drive the transition to a more circular economy.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

(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
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Switzerland
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United States of America
☑ Poland
☑ Turkey
☑ Belarus
☑ Germany
☑ Thailand
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Recycled materials are expected to increase in price and suppliers are expected to increase their costs as they invest in technological sustainability solutions.

(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

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

There is a risk that kp's customers may not be willing to pay higher premiums to cover the increased costs. The potential price 'premium' could negatively impact profit margins and business continuity.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1000000

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

5000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

We worked with independent sustainability consulting firm DNV to conduct an extensive climate risk assessment for the business. Part of this work involved a survey sent to internal and external stakeholders. Technology risk was majority scored as having a 'Significant' impact over the long-term, which was defined as an impact of 1 to 5 million, according to our ERM scoring framework.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Other infrastructure, technology and spending, please specify :Create a close loop for plastic packaging

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

PET plastic bottles are frequently recycled, but that tends not to be the case for the billions of plastic trays produced every year. kp Tray2Tray offers a solution by: • Creating a 'closed loop' of food packaging trays through managed recovery and reprocessing. • Working with municipalities; the collection, sorting and recycling industry; packers and retailers to secure a separate supply of rPET pots, tubs, and trays. Pioneering initiatives such as this support our customers' sustainability goals and differentiate kp in the market, steadily creating changes in consumer behaviour and altering perceptions of plastic packaging. kp has been instrumental in building up the tray recovery and reprocessing market in many countries. While most existing collection systems target PET bottles, only a small number of countries collect PET trays for recycling, and most that do capture relatively few. Consequently, the rate of trays sorted for recycling in the EU was just 25% in 2022. Today, kp Tray2Tray is a flagship programme that aims to turn the tide, steadily growing in volume, with the potential to bring more than 50,000 tonnes of rPET back into use and reducing the need for virgin material accordingly.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Other chronic physical risk, please specify :Supply chain disruptions due to physical climate risks affecting kp suppliers.

(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

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Physical climate risks pose a threat to kp's suppliers and dependencies on single source suppliers need to be carefully managed to address vulnerabilities within kp's supply chain.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Supply chain disruptions due to physical climate risks affecting kp suppliers.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

kp may be impacted by high volatility in raw material prices and supply chain disruptions could impact production output, leading to costly delays in delivering products to customers, or even loss of business.

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

Select from:

☑ No

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our Changzhou site was deemed at risk of flooding through our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Increase in disruption, could mean that there is a fall in production and therefore revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

610000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our lost production volume in million EUR figure was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. 0.61 million is the figure estimated for our Changzhou site.

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

102000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Our Rebuild Cost (Declared Insurance Exposure) figure for acute flooding risk at our Chanzou site was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Physical risks have the potential to impact manufacturing facilities and infrastructure, access to water and raw materials, and supply chain resilience. Direct financial consequences may include insurance and investment-related costs. At kp, our insurance policies offer cover for negative financial effects of changes in climate or weather variability. We operate facilities all over the world, some in regions that experience the impact of natural weather variability; we analyse the frequency and severity of weather events as part of our business continuity planning In order to further reduce business risks, business continuity could be maintained by transferring business to alternative kp sites.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our Changzhou and Suzhou sites were deemed at risk of cyclones through our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

This risk could impact kp's business in a number of ways, for instance: • Employee access to sites might be impacted. • Physical damage to assets and machinery. • Impact to production volumes due to downtime.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

11260000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our lost production volume in million EUR figure was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. This total figure of 11.26 million is made up of 0.61 million at our Changzou site and 10.65 million at our Suzhou site.

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

55700000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Our Rebuild Cost (Declared Insurance Exposure) figure for acute cyclone risk at our Changzou and Suzhou sites were calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. This total figure of 55.70 million is made up of 10.2 million EUR at our Changzou site and 45.50 million EUR at our Suzhou site.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Physical risks have the potential to impact manufacturing facilities and infrastructure, access to water and raw materials, and supply chain resilience. Direct financial consequences may include insurance and investment-related costs. At kp, our insurance policies offer cover for negative financial effects of changes in climate or weather variability. We operate facilities all over the world, some in regions that experience the impact of natural weather variability; we analyse the frequency and severity of weather events as part of our business

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk8

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Wildfires

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Brazil

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our Cotia site was deemed at risk of wildfires through our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

This risk could impact kp's business in a number of ways, for instance: • Employee access to sites might be impacted. • Physical damage to assets and machinery. • Impact to production volumes due to downtime.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

23730000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our lost production volume in million EUR figure was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. This total figure of 23.73 million is made up of 5.74 million EUR at our Totoral site and 17.99 million at our Cotia site.

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

102420000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Our Rebuild Cost (Declared Insurance Exposure) figure for acute wildfire risk at our Totoral and Cotia sites were calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. This total figure of 102.42 million is made up of 35.92 million EUR at our Totoral site and 66.50 million EUR at our Cotia site.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Physical risks have the potential to impact manufacturing facilities and infrastructure, access to water and raw materials, and supply chain resilience. Direct financial consequences may include insurance and investment-related costs. At kp, our insurance policies offer cover for negative financial effects of changes in climate or weather variability. We operate facilities all over the world, some in regions that experience the impact of natural weather variability; we analyse the frequency and severity of weather events as part of our business

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk9

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ France

☑ Germany

☑ Italy

☑ Spain

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our following sites: Cotia, Changzou, Suzhou, Gendorf, Verona, Berinoro Infia, Santo Tirso, Girona, Pontivy and Valencia Infia) are deemed at risk of heatwaves (as per a high emissions SSP5-RCP8.5 scenario) as identified through our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Increased frequency and magnitude of heatwaves may lead to staff discomfort and impact our operations. Investment in cooling systems may be required as climate adaptation measures, which could come at a cost, both financially and in carbon terms to kp.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

6400000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our lost production volume in million EUR figure was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. Below is breakdown of the figure per site: Cotia 0.5 million EUR Changzou 0.02 million EUR Suzhou 0.3 million EUR Pontivy 1.3 million EUR Gendorf 1.8 million EUR Verona 0.2 million EUR Berinoro Infia 1.1 million EUR Santo Tirso 0.8 million EUR Girona 0.3 million EUR Valencia Infia 0.1 million EUR

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1200000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Our Mitigation Capex figure for chronic risks was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. Below is a breakdown of the figure per site: Cotia 200,000 EUR Changzou 25,000 EUR Suzhou 50,000 EUR Pontivy 200,000 EUR Gendorf 150,000 EUR Verona 50,000 EUR Berinoro Infia 200,000 EUR Santo Tirso 150,000 EUR Girona 100,000 EUR Valencia Infia 100,000 EUR

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Physical risks have the potential to impact manufacturing facilities and infrastructure, access to water and raw materials, and supply chain resilience. Direct financial consequences may include insurance and investment-related costs. At kp, our insurance policies offer cover for negative financial effects of changes in climate or

weather variability. We operate facilities all over the world, some in regions that experience the impact of natural weather variability; we analyse the frequency and severity of weather events as part of our business

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk10

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ China

☑ Italy

☑ Spain

☑ Turkey

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our following sites: Totoral, Melbourne, Changzhou, Suzhou, Bertinoro Infia, Valencia Infia and Gebze) are deemed at risk of water stress (as per a high emissions SSP5-RCP8.5 scenario) as identified through our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Reduced ability to use water, therefore causing a fall in production.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

2500000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our lost production volume in million EUR figure was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. Below is breakdown of the figure per site: Totoral 0.2 million EUR Melbourne 0.4 million EUR Changzou 0.02 million EUR Suzhou 0.3 million EUR Bertinoro Infia 1.1 million EUR Valencia Infia 0.1 million EUR Gebze 0.5 million EUR

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

700000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Our Mitigation Capex figure for chronic risks was calculated as part of our physical climate risk analysis conducted by a third-party (Sust Global) in 2022. Each of the seven sites were estimated to have a potential financial impact figure of 100,000 EUR.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Physical risks have the potential to impact manufacturing facilities and infrastructure, access to water and raw materials, and supply chain resilience. Direct financial consequences may include insurance and investment-related costs. At kp, our insurance policies offer cover for negative financial effects of changes in climate or weather variability. We operate facilities all over the world, some in regions that experience the impact of natural weather variability; we analyse the frequency and severity of weather events as part of our business
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

9000000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

In 2022 we partnered with SUST Global to undertake a climate risk scenario assessment across all our operational sites globally, which are scattered across 5 continents and 18 countries, as well as key supply chain locations across the world. Both acute and chronic physical risks originating from climate change were considered. To enhance the scenario evaluations, we combined quantitative and qualitative analysis, alongside knowledge of our business and operating environment. The scope of the exercise focused on predicted risk over a period of 5, 10 and 30 years and took into account different scenarios. To help us fully understand the impact of climate change on our business, we worked with independent sustainability consulting firm DNV to conduct an extensive climate risk assessment for the business, building on and including the climate scenario analysis on physical risks to our operating sites with SUST Global data. As mentioned, environmental risks were identified and the the maximum risks identified in a year are less than 10% of financial earnings.
[Add row]

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of renewable energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Portugal

☑ Spain

☑ Thailand

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Investing in and transitioning to renewable energy presents a significant opportunity for kp to reduce its dependency on grid energy and mitigate risks associated with the volatility in grid energy prices. As such we have developed a renewable energy deployment roadmap to systematically assess the opportunity for renewable energy in our factories. During 2023, more than 70 energy projects were implemented within our Food Packaging division, all contributing to reducing CO2 emissions from our operations. No site was left untouched by our efficiency projects, with initiatives covering renewable energy, insulation, compressed air, line planning, cooling systems, motors, drives and pumps, automation, heating systems, material transportation, LED lighting and air conditioning, among others. Particularly notable are the solar energy installations at our Valencia and Pravia sites in Spain and our Santo Tirso site in Portugal.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

Ultimately, through renewable energy on site generation we saved 431k in 2023 through reducing our demand for energy by 2.753MWh.

(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)

400000

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

400000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Reduction in our energy cost bills from generating own electricity.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

165000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

kp pays 165k per year on 4 renewable on site generation projects under PPA structures where kp commits to buy the energy from the systems.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our 2023 internal Renewable Energy Technology Assessment identified solar energy as the best option for kp, from a range that included wind, hydrogen, biomass and battery storage. By the end of 2023, four factories (Rayong, Thailand; Valencia and Pravia, Spain; and Santo Tirso, Portugal) were operating on-site solar energy systems, and there are a further nine installations in the pipeline (five at food packaging sites and four at pharmaceutical packaging sites). We are also making use of renewables certificates (commodities bought on the open market representing renewable generation) and we are actively pursuing renewable power purchase agreements for large parts of our energy consumption. In summary, we are making progress by generating renewable energy on site and procuring renewable energy products from the market. By the end of 2023, 54% of our electricity was generated from renewable sources3 (2022: 52%). We have now increased the amount of renewable electricity used for four years in a row, with 17 sites using only renewable electricity.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Use of recycling

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ France

☑ Italy

☑ Portugal

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In 2023, our FP teams continued to deliver innovative products in line with our strategic 'roadmap'. Novel products such as our SmartCycle rigid films range contribute significantly towards our target to increase PCR content into our portfolio, along with other innovations, such as: 1. rXPS trays for fresh meat, which enable retailers to meet consumer expectations, particularly around food presentation, can include up to 50% recycled content while enabling retailers to meet consumer expectations. 2. kp FlexiLid EH 332, the thinnest laminated flexible film on the market, containing 30% PCR material. Produced at our Pontivy site in France, following sustainable production best practice, this product is already used on an industrial scale by UK meat packers. 3. Blending recycled content with polymers such as polypropylene (PP). This year, we conducted the first successful proof-of-concept trials of 'NEXTLOOPP'. However, despite recent supportive advances in US regulations, the use of mechanically post-consumer PP in food contact applications still faces challenges vis-à-vis current European legislation

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

kpEnhance RM1 is a blister film containing 30% PCR material, sourced from our partner, Prevented Ocean Plastic. This recycled material, helps to avoid paying certain tax in certain markets, thus helping financial performance.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We work closely with the recycling industry to ensure our products are recyclable at scale. In 2023, we focused on supporting recyclers and reprocessors, who can in turn support the collection industry to make more material available. We recognise that there has been growing investment in waste management and reprocessing

capacity in recent decades, but we also note that there remains insufficient capacity in the collection industry to supply the market, which is typically subject to seasonal fluctuations based on external factors. Closing the packaging loop also means working to influence policy and partners, and being prepared in advance of upcoming regulations. Upstream work involves third-party certification and developing audit schemes covering UK and EU material supply chains, and supporting suppliers to achieve controlled blending and chain of custody certification. Many types of single-use plastic, banned in Scotland since 2022, are now also prohibited in England and Wales. For many of our UK customers, the solution is kp Infinity, an Expanded Polypropylene (EPP) fully recyclable mono-material pack. kp Infinity is light, relatively little energy and water is used during its manufacture, and it is fully compatible with existing UK recycling infrastructure. Under testing, kp Infinity showed the lowest overall carbon footprint (kg CO2e) when recycling is factored in, outperforming both bagasse and board-based packaging.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Reduced water usage and consumption

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Portugal
☑ France
☑ Poland
☑ Turkey
☑ Belarus
☑ Germany
☑ Russian Federation

☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Switzerland
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In 2023, we developed a roadmap for water management in our manufacturing plants. Examples of water efficiency projects include rainwater reuse, automatic washer overflow and effluent treatment All sites have a water management plan in place, adapted to local conditions; all corporate water risks are managed and kp's governance and management are robust. We therefore believe that an overarching enterprise-wide water stewardship target is not required

(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:
☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ High

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

As our water consumption reduces, this results in a fall in the amount we are spending for it.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Typically, kp factories draw municipal water and discharge very small volumes of wastewater to municipal systems. The quality of discharges is monitored to ensure compliance with all regional and/or local regulations. In 2023, we developed a roadmap for water management in our manufacturing plants. Examples of water efficiency projects include rainwater reuse, automatic washer overflow and effluent treatment. Furthermore, we work on water supply risk and share best practice in process water systems, machine calibration and standard water efficiency metrics. At site level, we use external tools and internal designated experts to monitor water risks and manage plans to further minimise those risks. We adopt a precautionary approach to water risk management, and our Code of Conduct commits us to compliance with water stewardship regulations. A group-wide risk assessment is guided by a combined water stress index based on the Worldwide Fund for Nature's (WWF) Water Risk Filter and World Resources Institute's Aqueduct tool. For example, impacts relating to withdrawal, consumption and discharge are particularly important in water-stressed areas, so our regular assessment will identify sites exposed to the greatest risk. All sites have a water management plan in place, adapted to local conditions; all corporate water risks are managed and kp's governance and management are robust. We therefore believe that an overarching enterprise-wide water stewardship target is not required. When a territory withdraws 25% or more of its renewable freshwater resources, it is said to be 'water-stressed'. Of the 2.6m3 of water withdrawn by kp in 2023, 2% was within locations with high or extremely high baseline water stress. These are in South America, Asia and Europe, where five of our 30 sites are located: Changzhou and Suzhou, China; Cotia, Brazil; Gebze, Türkiye; and Bertinoro, Italy.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Switzerland
☑ France
☑ Poland
☑ Turkey
☑ Belarus
☑ Germany
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Within kp, energy is consumed during plastic processing whereby heat, cooling and compressed air are required in extrusion, calendering and thermoforming processes to convert raw materials to finished products. Our expert 'Energy Champions' implement many of the lessons learned from our 'lean, clean and green' programme, and in 2023, through the Energy Task Force, they delivered more than 100 projects globally. During the year, we invested 2m in sustainability related technology and equipment.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term
☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

Ultimately, we delivered annual energy cost savings of 2.9m (8,500 MWh), reducing operational carbon emissions by 12% versus 2022. This equates to 2,500 fewer tonnes of CO2 emitted versus 2022.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

2900000

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

2900000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Reduce in energy costs and running our lines more efficiently

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

2000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

During the year, we invested 2m in sustainability related technology and equipment for energy saving projects.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We apply state-of-the-art energy management, and our teams understand that the most sustainable energy is the energy you don't use in the first place. We will work hard to ensure kp's production is efficient and aligned with our GHG emissions reduction roadmap. We are also expanding the scope of our renewable energy roadmap, which itself includes efficiency measures
[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ OPEX

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

2000000

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

kp targets 2m savings on energy per year
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(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

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Through our governance structures, our leadership assesses risks related to sustainability, and specifically, climate. The Board and Executive Leadership team, led by the Chief Executive Officer, have ultimate responsibility for delivering sustainable value to our shareholders and other stakeholders. Responsibility for analysing climate-related risks sits with the Sustainability Committee with key risks and opportunities being promptly communicated to key decision makers. In addition, the Board and Executive Leadership Team receive updates on overall enterprise risks, via the Enterprise Risk Process, as part of the ongoing full and half-year reporting cycle. This provides an overview of our principal risks and includes details of new and emerging risks. Centralised and integrated policies, procedures and guidance ensure effective risk management and mitigation across our two divisions and at each of our sites and are under continuous review and updates

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(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

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

Select from:

☑ Sporadic – agenda item as important matters arise

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

Select all that apply

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

[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

[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
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

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ 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
☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues
☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

Other
☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:
☑ Reports to the 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 and Executive Leadership Team, led by the Chief Executive Officer, have ultimate responsibility for delivering sustainable value to our shareholders and other stakeholders. Responsibility for analysing climate-related risks (e.g. any negative impacts) sits with the Sustainability Director, following our Risk Process, which is overseen by our risk lead and Chief Operating Officer/Head of Corporate Sustainability. Climate risks are identified through trend analysis and stakeholder engagement; identified risks are presented to the Executive Leadership Team and Board and are incorporated into our risk framework to be managed by the appropriate business areas. The oversight and management of kp's global sustainability strategy – Investing in Better – is led by our Chief Operating Officer/Head of Corporate Sustainability, who reports to our Chief Executive Officer. Climate change (mitigation and adaptation) risks and opportunities are embedded in performance management processes across the business.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ 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

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

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

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the 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 and Executive Leadership Team, led by the Chief Executive Officer, have ultimate responsibility for delivering sustainable value to our shareholders and other stakeholders. Responsibility for analysing climate-related risks (e.g. any negative impacts) sits with the Sustainability Director, following our Risk Process, which is overseen by our risk lead and Chief Operating Officer/Head of Corporate Sustainability. Climate risks are identified through trend analysis and stakeholder engagement; identified risks are presented to the Executive Leadership Team and Board and are incorporated into our risk framework to be managed by the appropriate business areas. The oversight and management of kp's global sustainability strategy – Investing in Better – is led by our Chief Operating Officer/Head of Corporate Sustainability, who reports to our Chief Executive Officer. Climate change (mitigation and adaptation) risks and opportunities are embedded in performance management processes across the business.
[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:

☑ No, but we plan to introduce them in the next two years

(4.5.3) Please explain

The CEO's compensation is tied to the following success metrics in the short term (1) EBITDA and (2) Free Cash Flow. These financial indicators will benefit from the company achieving its GHG emissions Scope 1&2 reduction target, as the performance is directly tied to the interest rates for the Term Loan to the US Market. However, we are looking at expanding these and adding direct monetary incentives related to environmental issues.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

This policy applies to all kp employees, and to contractors, agents, consultants or any others working for or on behalf of kp. Where there are local legal or regulatory requirements, local requirements will take precedence. This policy will be monitored and reviewed regularly to ensure that it promotes best practice in the workplace -

Measure, monitor and continuously improve the environmental performance at sites - Implement new technologies and processes to reduce our GHG emissions, non-GHG air emissions, use of hazardous materials and water and energy use, whilst increasing our use of energy from renewable sources. - Adopt the waste hierarchy of waste prevention, reuse of materials, recycling, co-processing and energy recovery to minimise waste disposal, including hazardous waste and maximise material productivity. This includes setting reduction targets and taking necessary actions to achieve them - Optimize logistics, to improve fleet efficiency and minimize emissions from transport. - Minimize pollution (air, water, and soil) and help protect biodiversity and ecosystems.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

(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

kp_Group_Sustainability_Policy_2024.pdf
[Add row]

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

(4.10.1) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ UN Global Compact

☑ Plastic Pact Network

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ Ellen MacArthur Foundation Global Commitment

☑ Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

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

Since June 2022 kp is a United Nations Global Compact signatory. The goals of the UNGC align very well with the mission and purpose of our business and our commitment to sustainability at kp, and we look forward to working together to help solve many of the challenges that we face today. We are signatories of the Ellen MacArthur Foundation Global Commitment and the UK Plastic Pact since 2020. We support a sustainable and circular approach to plastic use and want to reshape the use of plastics. kp reports its sustainability report in accordance with the GRI Standards for the period January 1st to December 31st 2023 kp provide disclosures for financial and regulatory stakeholders relating to climate risk and opportunity in line with the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). Following KP's comprehensive GHG emissions analysis in 2020, we set targets in September 2021 which were validated by the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi).
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(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 external engagement seeks to increase and drive circular economy. The main reasoning behind is increasing the amount of recycled content available to use in the market as well as recyclability of our products.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**BPF, European Plastics Converters

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

BPF, European Plastics Converters all seek to drive circular economy. Both associations support the transition to a stronger and more circular economy where all resources are used in a sustainable way. This is fully aligned and consistent with our Investing in better strategy and our close the loop goal of reduce waste and do more with less. We will use more recycled material, close the packaging loop and take every opportunity to make our packaging recyclable.

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

15000

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

This funding refers to the membership costs of being member of BPF. We have not provided any further funding into the organisation.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Scope 3 Peer Group

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

The Group aims to support faster and more confident action in a noisy, rapidly-changing and confusing space. They do this by signposting relevant support and activity, and benchmarking and sharing best practice - wherever it may be. We engage with the materials provided through our consistent engagement with the group and engage with the research and best practice shared.

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Ellen Macarthur Foundation

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

The Ellen MacArthur Foundation works to accelerate the transition to a circular economy. We develop and promote the idea of a circular economy, and work with business, academia, policymakers, and institutions to mobilize systems solutions at scale, globally.

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Other, please specify **:Metrics**

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

All.

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Emissions targets and progress included in the 2023 report are based on the 2019 baseline and part of our investing in better strategy. Targets were approved by SBTi in September 2021, following a 1.5C pathway.
[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 two years
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios
☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:
☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Facility

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario covers the optimal sustainable path, also referred to as the Green Road. It encompasses socioeconomic and representative emissions pathways consistent with a gradual and pervasive global shift towards a more sustainable future.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

This scenario represents "Strong Mitigation".

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Facility

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario covers a middle path, with challenges to climate mitigation. In this scenario, environmental systems experience degradation, and climate change worsens through the end of the century. In this scenario, overall emissions continue to rise through mid-century before beginning to decline. This is a likely scenario if governments and policy reflect a strong sense of urgency towards climate adaptation.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

This scenario represents "Middle of the Road".

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Facility

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario covers a future where the world continues on its current trajectory, also referred to as Fossil-Fuelled Growth. Global markets are increasingly integrated and both total population and per-capita consumption increase.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

This scenario represents "High Emissions".
[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

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

kp understands that to demonstrate leadership on sustainability, it is critical to engage across a range of material issues. Increasingly, the interconnectivity of sustainability topics is becoming clearer, and climate-related issues often act as a connection that ties many of these issues together. The ability to talk about climate issues in an informed way, with a quantitative viewpoint, is essential to ensure the appropriate decisions are made for the business. We partnered with SUST Global to undertake a climate risk scenario assessment across all our operational sites globally, which are scattered across 5 continents and 18 countries, as well as key supply chain locations across the world. Both acute and chronic physical risks originating from climate change were considered. The scope of the exercise focused on predicted risk over a period of 5, 10 and 30 years. None of the physical or chronic hazards that were flagged indicated business-critical impacts, however flooding, cyclones and wildfires were flagged as an acute risk for 3 sites, and water stresses and heatwaves could pose chronic hazards at 15 sites under the high emissions (SSP5-RCP8.5) scenario.
[Fixed row]

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

	Transition plan	Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world	Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world
	Select from: ☑ No, but we are developing a climate transition plan within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*We have developed targets for 1.5'C, with the next step being to develop this plan soon.*

[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

☑ Investment in R&D

[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

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

We're transitioning our portfolio constantly to ensure all our products are fully recyclable, contain as much recycled content as possible and are part of the solution, not part of the problem. To ensure timely delivery of quality products to our customers, we put significant effort into consolidating our position to maximise business resilience and to deliver strategic transformations

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

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

After extensive research and development we launched our innovative kp Infinity packaging, a fully recyclable, extruded, polypropylene mono-material foam pack that can replace extruded polystyrene (XPS). Crucially, the UK government's single-use plastics ban (in force in England and Wales since 2023) does not apply to kp Infinity food containers and trays. kp Infinity therefore allows us to offer a suitable alternative in the UK; one which is durable, microwavable and light.
[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

☑ Direct costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Access to capital

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

To identify opportunities we: • Undertake transparent Life Cycle Analysis on relevant products. • Identify the appropriate markets and clients for more sustainable products. • Educate/raise awareness around the value and functionality of plastic. Provide information to allow customers to compare alternative products across life cycle. • Identify potential partners for industry/stakeholder collaboration To mitigate risk we: • Undertake a review of the product portfolio, to identify products that could potentially carry a reputational risk. • Address gaps in governance of climate-related risks and risk management framework. • Proactively prepare to build resilience for the sites most likely to be affected by acute risks e.g. flooding/drought and chronic risks e.g. heatwaves. • Diversification of raw materials-sourcing geographies where possible, especially single source materials
[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]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities	Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate priority for the business.*

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

We classify our suppliers by Scope 3 contribution with focus on category 1 – purchased goods and services, representing 74% of our total emissions. The suppliers who are responsible for 80% of those category 1 emissions are classified as our 'carbon-strategic' suppliers and they are requested to manage GHG emissions using targets, Life Cycle Analyses (LCA) and action programmes in the course of our supplier engagement programme.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

50
[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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

As part of our supplier engagement programme, we prioritise 50 suppliers (by Scope 3 category 1 – purchased goods and services, representing 74% of our total emissions) who are responsible for 80% of those category 1 emissions. They are classified as our 'carbon-strategic' suppliers and they are requested to manage GHG emissions using targets, Life Cycle Analyses (LCA) and action programmes in the course of our supplier engagement programme.
[Fixed row]

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

	Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process	Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance	Comment
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance	*- Nothing concrete - This is something that we are working towards implementing.*

[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:

☑ Disclosure of GHG emissions to your organization (Scope 1 and 2)

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ 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:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(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:

☑ 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:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

As part of our supplier engagement programme, we prioritise our top 50 suppliers (by Scope 3 category 1 – purchased goods and services, representing 74% of our total emissions), who are responsible for more than 50% of overall Scope 3 emissions. We request that these 'carbon-strategic' suppliers manage GHG emissions using targets, Life Cycle Analyses (LCA) and action programmes. Responsiveness and data from these suppliers continue to improve year on year. At the end of 2023, 16% of these suppliers set their own science-based targets, 76% have set in general GHG reduction targets. We send those prioritized suppliers annually a sustainability questionnaire. The results are published in a sustainability scorecard per supplier. The scorecards are shared and discussed with the suppliers and they have to show improvements and progress in next years Sustainability scorecard. kp has also included an ESG clause in direct supply contracts and Purchase Orders. Requires the supplier to acknowledge that it has familiarised itself with kp's Supplier Code of Conduct and Sustainable Procurement Policy. kp's Sustainable Procurement Policy expects suppliers to: • Undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility such as: • Responsible waste management and disposal • Reduction of greenhouse gas and other emissions harmful to the environment • Conservation of non-renewable natural resources

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Monitoring and reduction of Product Carbon Footprint (PCF)/ product life-cycle emissions

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ Second-party verification

☑ 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:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(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:

☑ 26-50%

(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:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

As part of our supplier engagement programme, we prioritise our top 50 suppliers (by Scope 3 category 1 – purchased goods and services, representing 74% of our total emissions), who are responsible for more than 50% of overall Scope 3 emissions. We request that these 'carbon-strategic' suppliers manage GHG emissions using targets, Life Cycle Analyses (LCA) and action programmes. Responsiveness and data from these suppliers continue to improve year on year. We send those prioritized suppliers annually a sustainability questionnaire. The results are published in a sustainability scorecard per supplier. The scorecards are shared and discussed with the suppliers and they have to show improvements in next years Sustainability scorecard. One part of the questionnaire is the request towards the supplier to share Product Carbon Footprint data with us. We have a KPI to show progress of this data collection process. At the end of 2023, we received primary data from more than 40% of the suppliers in scope. Supplier primary data is now included in our GHG inventory, and it improves year on year. Further, the improvements have been retro-applied to our baseline year to allow a clear comparison.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ 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:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(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:

☑ 1-25%

(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:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

As part of our supplier engagement programme, we prioritise our top 50 suppliers (by Scope 3 category 1 – purchased goods and services, representing 74% of our total emissions), who are responsible for more than 50% of overall Scope 3 emissions. We request that these 'carbon-strategic' suppliers manage GHG emissions using targets, Life Cycle Analyses (LCA) and action programmes. Responsiveness and data from these suppliers continue to improve year on year. We send those prioritized suppliers annually a sustainability questionnaire. The results are published in a sustainability scorecard per supplier. The scorecards are shared and discussed with the suppliers and they have to show improvements and progress in next years Sustainability scorecard. One part of the questionnaire is the request towards the supplier to set Science based targets. We have a KPI to show progress of this action. At the end of 2023, 16% of these suppliers set their own science-based targets.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

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

Financial incentives

☑ Include long-term contracts linked to environmental commitments

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

As part of our supplier engagement programme, we prioritise our top 50 suppliers (by Scope 3 category 1 – purchased goods and services, representing 74% of our total emissions), who are responsible for more than 50% of overall Scope 3 emissions. We request that these 'carbon-strategic' suppliers manage GHG emissions using targets, Life Cycle Analyses (LCA) and action programmes. Responsiveness and data from these suppliers continue to improve year on year. At the end of 2023, 16% of these suppliers set their own science-based targets, and we received primary data from more than 40%. Supplier primary data is now included in our GHG inventory, and it improves year on year. Further, the improvements have been retro-applied to our baseline year to allow a clear comparison. In general, we have set ambitious sustainability targets and measure target fulfilment. In detail, after this engagement program, we have now a maturity analysis of our top suppliers. This allows us to define specific actions depending on their maturity and work with them towards improvements in sustainability and GHG emission reduction. The impact of the engagement is perceived in the improved sustainability performance of the suppliers. We have KPIs that we track to monitor the success.The success is measured during the calculation of our Scope 3 emissions over the years and the number of collected PCF values from our suppliers and the updates of the other KPIs mentioned.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Engagement and training helps them to calculate their GHG Emissions and work on reductions.

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

Climate change

(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

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

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

Financial incentives

☑ Include long-term contracts linked to environmental commitments

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

A vital part of best-practice procurement is due diligence, a management process that brings together risk assessment, engagement, improvement plans and regulatory compliance. Since 2023, we have used a cloud-based system to categorise and analyse risk exposure in our supply chain. We place specific focus on strategic and/or high-risk suppliers and we use data to screen them based on ISO and NACE1 codes that account for the following factors: • Country governance, track record, and infrastructure for monitoring and enforcement of human rights and labour laws. • Type of manufacturing process or operational activity and the related risks to worker health and safety. • Critical political, current affairs or business news screening. The evaluation of suppliers in scope is through self-assessment. If required, as governed by the risk analysis, an ESG audit will be conducted on the supplier's premises. Selected strategic or highrisk suppliers fulfil five ESG assessments in a more concrete manner via the cloud-based system on key areas: environmental protection; human rights and labour; anti-bribery and anti-corruption; health and safety and supply chain responsibility. An extra assessment about conflict minerals is assigned to those suppliers with specific risk in this area. As an alternative to this evaluation approach, kp acknowledges suppliers who have already achieved an EcoVadis rating as evidence of an adequate due diligence programme. kp has also included an ESG clause in direct supply contracts and Purchase Orders. Requires the supplier to acknowledge that it has familiarised itself with kp's Supplier Code of Conduct and Sustainable Procurement Policy. kp's Sustainable Procurement Policy expects suppliers to: • Undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility such as: • Responsible waste management and disposal • Reduction of greenhouse gas and other emissions harmful to the environment • Conservation of non-renewable natural resources Human Rights and Conflict Minerals: • Act in accordance with the principles of the International Labour Organization, the UN Global Compact and the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights • Prohibit slavery and the use of forced, bonded, or child labour across the supply chain • Ensure that products do not contain metals derived from conflict minerals and actively assess and mitigate any risks in the supply chain concerning the sourcing of minerals from conflict areas

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Engagement and training helps them to calculate their GHG Emissions and work on reductions.

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

[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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

We engage with all our customers to make sure that they are aware of our sustainability strategy and more in detail with our climate action programme. We actively share or progress on our website and social media posts and provide ad hoc content when required. Impact of engagement, including measures of success In the last few years we have seen a growing number of customers wo are requesting transparency and further information from their suppliers regarding their actions and commitments in relation to climate change and circular economy. We've been rece The 'value chain' for a typical packaging manufacturing operation includes retailers, waste contractors, consumers, manufacturers, suppliers, employees, trade bodies and governments One of our top strategic priorities is to actively engage with stakeholders, demonstrating a commitment to understanding and listening to their perspectives. In doing so, we aim to foster valuable partnerships that are instrumental in achieving our goals.Working and engaging with suppliers, other manufacturers and our customers, all the way through to end consumers and waste

management companies is essential for building strong business relationships, ensuring smooth operations, and fostering collaboration and innovation. Throughout the year we work with suppliers, customers, waste contractors, associations to keep driving our strategy and growth. We are confident that with our collaboration we can deliver increased value over the long term in a sustainable way.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Consumers are part of the value chain and circular A change is already underway: we know that consumers now accept colour variation in plastics, as they do with the differing texture and feel of recycled paper. There remains, however, a significant opportunity to elevate market acceptance and demand, to promote the value of all recyclable packaging and to inspire consumers to go the extra mile and help get material back into the loop. Consumers are adjusting their habits, and we note how manufacturers and brands can influence public opinion and buying behaviour. Consumers need the right information to make an informed purchase and avoid poor decisions. Fortunately, perceptions about plastic packaging can be changed gradually as consumers better understand how the recycling industry works. kp Tray2Tray products offer an opportunity to further engage with customers and consumers via several attributes: • The way the product looks on the shelf and its transparency compared with virgin material – there is a very slight colour variation that is a clear selling point to end consumers, showing that the pack contains recycled material, supported by a thirdparty certification label. Seeing this shift in consumer habits towards these products and increase in sales in them will show us that this has been a success.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Innovation
☑ Other innovation, please specify

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

We are eager to continue our discussions on collaborating to develop projects that reduce carbon emissions, promote a circular economy, enhance the use of post-consumer recycled content in our products where possible, and improve recyclability.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 0-1 year

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

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Innovation

☑ Other innovation, please specify

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

We are eager to continue our discussions on collaborating to develop projects that reduce carbon emissions, promote a circular economy, enhance the use of post-consumer recycled content in our products, and improve recyclability.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 0-1 year

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

Select from:

☑ No

Row 3

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Innovation

☑ Other innovation, please specify

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

We are eager to continue our discussions on collaborating to develop projects that reduce carbon emissions, promote a circular economy, enhance the use of post-consumer recycled content in our products where possible, and improve recyclability.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 0-1 year

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

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify **:**We have done ourselves.	*We have done this ourselves.*

[Fixed 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

Operational boundary conditions provide depth to a corporate inventory by identifying which emissions sources will be accounted for within the organizational boundaries (defined above as the "control approach"). By adopting an Operational Control approach to determine the boundaries of the company's GHG inventory, KP has elected to quantify and report emissions associated with operations over which the company has direct control.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**N/A

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

N/A

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :N/A

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

N/A
[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)

Supplier primary data is now included in our GHG inventory, and it improves year on year. Further, the improvements have been retro-applied to our baseline year to allow a clear 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) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3

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

We continuously aim to improve our data quality year on year. For example, this year we have included supplier primary data in our GHG inventory. To allow for clear comparisons to be made to our baseline, we retro-apply these changes to our baseline years as well.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ ISO 14064-1

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

(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

Emissions from electricity use are estimated using ‘location-based’ and ‘market-based’ approaches. For the location-based approach, the average emissions factor for the country is used, applying country-specific emissions factors published annually by the International Energy Agency (IEA). The alternative ‘market-based’ approach refers to renewable energy certificates (given zero Hi unemissions), and where no supplier-specific data is held, factors published for residual emissions. [Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Rented offices including sales sites Sales site have been excluded from the inventory, as these are not material

(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

1

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

Rented offices have been excluded from the inventory as we currently focus on our most material emissions, and these occur in our manufacturing activities.
[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)

24418

(7.5.3) Methodological details

All the energy consumed on site, direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on site. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane, and diesel. Direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources is calculated from a fleet operated in North America; all other transportation is third party and included in Scope 3. Process gases are apportioned between onsite release and end-of-life release. Our Scope 1 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

251078.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

All electricity and purchased heat (steam) consumed on site. For the location-based approach, the average emissions factor for the country is used, applying country-specific emissions factors published annually by the relevant country or the International Energy Agency (IEA). Our Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

266826.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

All electricity and purchased heat (steam) consumed on site. The alternative “market-based” approach refers to renewable energy certificates (given zero emissions), and where no supplier-specific data is held, factors published for residual emissions by Green-E or the AIB. Our Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included. Our Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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)

1691174

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Extraction, production, and transportation of raw materials purchased in the reporting year: cradle-to-gate emissions of raw materials and inputs to production. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16808

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Extraction, production, and transportation of capital goods purchased or acquired in the reporting year. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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)

57803

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Extraction, production, and transportation of fuels and energy purchased or acquired in the reporting year, not already accounted for in scope 1 or scope 2. This includes transmission and distribution losses from the total electricity and other energy consumption for the organisation in the scope 3 emissions. For electricity, this includes all electricity covered by renewable energy certificates. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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)

83923

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 & 2 emissions from transportation and distribution of raw materials between tier 1 suppliers and Klöckner Pentaplast own operations. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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)

3214.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 & 2 emissions of waste management suppliers that occur during disposal or treatment of waste generated in operations. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6467.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 & 2 emissions from transport carriers during transportation of employees for business-related activities during the reporting year. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4039.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 & 2 emissions from transportation of employees between their home and work. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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

N/A

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)

233930

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 & 2 emissions from third-party transportation and distribution of products sold, between own operations and the end consumer. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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)

134269.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of downstream companies' energy use that occur during processing of intermediate products sold in the reporting year. This includes emissions from manufacturers' thermoforming and laminating processes. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

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)

13583.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 & 2 emissions from waste disposal and treatment of products sold in the reporting year at the end of their life. Our Scope 3 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.

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

N/A

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

N/A

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

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

N/A
[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)

17571

(7.6.3) Methodological details

All the energy consumed on site, direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on site. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane, and diesel. Direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources is calculated from a fleet operated in North America; all other transportation is third party and included in Scope 3. Process gases are apportioned between onsite release and end-of-life release. Our Scope 1 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.
[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)

168442

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

136726

(7.7.4) Methodological details

All electricity and purchased heat (steam) consumed on site. For the location-based approach, the average emissions factor for the country is used, applying country-specific emissions factors published annually by the relevant country or the International Energy Agency (IEA). The alternative "market-based" approach refers to renewable energy certificates (given zero emissions), and where no supplier-specific data is held, factors published for residual emissions by Green-E or the AIB. Our Scope 2 GHG emissions are calculated in line with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Greenhouse gases included within the boundary: Included greenhouse gases are CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6. Greenhouse gases have been calculated in CO2e. Emissions from biologically sequestered emissions have not been included.
[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)

1368433

(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

40

(7.8.5) Please explain

We collected Life Cycle Analysis data from our raw material suppliers and included this data in our 2023 GHG inventory. Around 25 % of our Purchased goods and services emissions are now covered with primary data directly from the suppliers. We continue this process to collect even more data and make the emissions even more accurate.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

14707

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Procurement includes both purchased goods and services (scope 3 Cat. 1) categorised as “indirect” by the company, and capital goods (scope 3 Cat. 2). Emissions are calculated based on the spend data provided. Capex data is included in both the “Indirects Spend” and “Capex Reporting by Division” files. The “Indirects Spend” dataset is used as the main source of data for capex and the capital expenditure file was excluded from the analysis to avoid double-counting. This is consistent with the methodology followed in previous years.

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)

30210

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes emissions related to fuel production and energy purchased and consumed by Klockner Pentalpast in 2023 that are not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. In this case, the scope of this category includes, over the 12-month period of activity; • Fuel and electricity value chain and losses in the transmission and distribution of consumed electricity and steam • Natural gas consumption from stationary sources • Diesel consumption from mobile sources • Propane consumption • Fuel consumed by vehicles in the owned fleet

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

56988

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This was calculated based on supplier locations as listed in Klöckner Pentaplast procurement information and the site locations. Data records for transportation destination were used to generate a list of latitude and longitude for each start and delivery location. These coordinates were mapped against distances calculated in previous reporting years. For those locations which could not be matched to previously calculated distances, the Haversine Formula was used, which determines the great-circle distance between two points on a sphere given their longitudes and latitudes. These were spot-checked against real distances manually using Google Maps and any outliers were amended.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2056

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions linked to the management of the different streams of waste by each affiliate of Klockner Pentaplast during 2023 were considered. The activity data comes from a database prepared by the organization, where the billing of industrial waste is reported in mass units (kg or tons). Each waste has been classified according to its final disposal: landfill, recycling, incineration, or water treatment.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3884

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Derived from air travel. The activity data referring to air travel comes from a database, where the number of journeys made, the origin-destination and/or the mileage are reported. Emissions calculations associated with air travel are classified according to whether they are domestic flights (3,700 km) and using the factors from DESNZ. - Derived from train travel. The activity data referring to train travel comes from a database where the number of journeys made, the origin-destination and/or the mileage are reported. The emission factor used comes from DESNZ, for journeys made by train. - Derived from travel by rental cars or company cars. The activity data referring to travel by rental car or company car, have been reported according to the origin-destination, the kilometres travelled, or the litres consumed by the car during the journey. - It may be also reported the total days of a rental. In this case it has been estimated an average milage per day (in this case, 250 km). The emission factor used comes from DESNZ, for journeys by rental car or company car. - Derived from travel by rental cars or company cars. The activity data referring to travel by bus, has been reported with the total milage of the trip. The emission factor used comes from DESNZ, from the bus emissions. - Derived from overnight stays in hotels. The activity data referring to overnight stays in hotels have been reported according to the number of nights spent overnight and the number of rooms. The emission factors used come from DESNZ, which provide emission factors according to the country where the traveller spent the night.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2601

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The calculation of emissions resulting from employee commuting from home to work are calculated based on the total number of Klockner Pentaplast employees, grouped according to whether they engage face-to-face work (direct) or a combination of face-to-face work and telecommuting (indirect). The estimation of commuting impact is predicated upon the number of employees and approximate data on commuting patterns obtained from the UK Department for Transport's Travel Survey. The impact of home working was calculated using the Anthesis method, which takes into account the additional energy consumption arising from home working using regional averages. Emissions were calculated in terms of kg CO2e using the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors for Business Reporting, 2023, and Environmental Protection Agency, Stationary Combustion Emission Factors, 2023, to derive emission factors. The calculation was carried out excluding the Well-To-Tank (WTT), emissions related to extraction, refining and transportation of raw fuel sources prior to combustion.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category is not relevant for kp, as the company does not have upstream leased assets, as such emissions are not relevant.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

113582

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Discussions with KP established that most transport data is now recorded in 3T (European sites) and SAP, with a few manual files still provided. A data hierarchy was implemented to ensure data is only obtained once for each site: 3T (and RUAN), SAP data (Asia, Europe and SouthAm, marked with (SAP)), then manual files. For a small number of sites where no transport records could be provided, the sales teams for that region provided customer data by tonnage purchased for the year, and transportation routes were modeled according to customer region. In 2023, this method was used for Orsha, Melbourne, St. Petersburg, Changzhou, and Valencia. For Bertinoro, the 2022 data file was used instead of 2023, as outbound transport data for this site was not provided before the end of the data collection period.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

91272

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes the downstream processing of any product that is sold as an intermediate product. Intermediate products are products that require further processing, transformation, or inclusion in another product before use by the end consumer. Therefore, thermoforming and laminating of products sold as sheets was included, whereas products requiring filling and printing are considered as final products. The downstream processing impact calculated using industry-average process flows derived from Ecoinvent v3.10. The country-specific electricity consumption impact was calculated separately using IEA (International Energy Agency) impact factors for 2023 as follows: • Ecoinvent processes are mapped to processes in dataset. Electricity and/or heat demand per unit is extracted from Ecoinvent source data. • Country ship to is used as the reference for the electricity and heat impact factors; this represents the country where the processing takes place. • If country impact factor is not available in IEA dataset, a default factor for World Average is applied. • Assumed density for lamination is 200 GSM.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category is not relevant for kp, as there are no further emissions associated with kp's products during use phase.

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)

6325

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

There are impacts associated from the manufacture of materials/products, and further impacts associated with the end-of-life treatment of materials/products. Double counting could easily occur when materials have several lives, e.g., as recycled materials or as electricity derived from waste. Double counting of "credits" associated with recycling and energy recovery is avoided by rules defining the boundary of purchase and waste accounting. The rules are called 100-0 (recycled content) or 0-100 (cut-off) approach. The GHG Protocol recommended rule is the recycled content approach, which is used in this assessment. In this approach, purchased recycled materials have lower impacts than virgin materials, so the organization gets a carbon benefit from choosing recycled materials, but then there cannot be any benefit accounted from choosing recycling over other waste streams.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from this category are irrelevant and non-existent, as we do not have any downstream leased assets.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from this category are irrelevant and non-existent, as we do not have any franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from this category are irrelevant and non-existent, as we do not have any investments.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from this category are irrelevant and non-existent, as we do not have any additional downstream emissions beyond those already accounted for in other categories.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from this category are irrelevant and non-existent, as we do not have any additional downstream emissions beyond those already accounted for in other categories.
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

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

1601955

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

18640

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

50013

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

78734

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

4253

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

5545

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

2642

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

0

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

114959

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

0

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

121989

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

9425

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

We increased engagement with suppliers, so was able to obtain more accurate data. 0 emissions in a category reflects that not deemed relevant for us.
[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:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

[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

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Page 95-96

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(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

2023 Sustainability Report online (1).pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 95-96

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(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

2023 Sustainability Report online (1).pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 95-96

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

6

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Our 2023 internal Renewable Energy Technology Assessment identified solar energy as the best option for kp, from a range that included wind, hydrogen, biomass and battery storage. By the end of 2023, four factories (Rayong, Thailand; Valencia and Pravia, Spain; and Santo Tirso, Portugal) were operating on-site solar energy systems, and there are a further nine installations in the pipeline (five at food packaging sites and four at pharmaceutical packaging sites). We are also making use of renewables certificates (commodities bought on the open market representing renewable generation) and we are actively pursuing renewable power purchase agreements for large parts of our energy consumption. In summary, we are making progress by generating renewable energy on site and procuring renewable energy products from the market. By the end of 2023, 54% of our electricity was generated from renewable sources3 (2022: 52%). We have now increased the amount of renewable electricity used for four years in a row, with 17 sites using only renewable electricity. We avoided the generation of approximately 14,000 tCO2e from our operations (4,000 tCO2e through energy management, and around 10,000 tCO2e via renewable energy certificates and on-site solar).

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

we eliminate material and energy waste from our processes wherever possible. We run multiple continuous improvement projects and share best practice among our global manufacturing sites. We have a very strong track record in implementing lean principles and, given our teams' familiarity with the concept, when we used these same principles to design our sustainability-focused projects they were ready to get going straight away. We continue to go from strength to strength in tackling carbon emissions.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

-

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

-

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

-

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21040

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

12

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

There was a reduction in customer demand.

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

-

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

-

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

-

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

-

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

-
[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) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

15972

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

11

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

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

93

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ HFCs

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

1495

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

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

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

1492

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

0

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

88

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

3425

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

3425

Belarus

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

180

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

1731

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

0

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

847

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

1687

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

0

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

733

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

1195

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

0

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

655

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

5344

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

0

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

261

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

1504

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

3369

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2342

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

41003

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

81652

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

254

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

11527

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

20673

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

460

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

6995

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

0

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

33

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

4634

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

13998

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

596

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

2337

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

0

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

165

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

7860

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

0

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1445

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

546

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

118

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

323

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

9744

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

9744

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

191

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

11445

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

0

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5573

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

8676

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

0

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3426

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

47295

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

3746
[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	*Corporate*	*5404*
Row 2	*Food Packaging*	*3834*
Row 3	*Pharma, Health and Durables*	*8333*

[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	*Food Packaging*	*76986*	*61983*
Row 3	*Pharma, Health and Durables*	*91456*	*74742*

[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)

17571

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

168442

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

136726

(7.22.4) Please explain

These numbers refer to our group total.

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

There are no other entities.
[Fixed row]

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

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

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

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

390000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

11

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions are mainly from direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on site. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane and diesel. Also from our own fleet in North America.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

All the energy consumed on site, direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on sie. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane and diesel. Direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources is calculated from a fleet operated in North America; all other transportation is third party and included in Scope 3. Process gases are proportioned between onsite release and end-of-life release. We go through an assurance process for our Scope 1 and 2 emissions, the assurance statement can be found in our 2023 Sustainability report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf The allocation to emissions to J&J, has been calculated by the total kg sold to J&J to a proportion of kp's total production

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

Please see our 2023 Sustainability Report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

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

390000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

87

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions are driven by electricity and steam consumption on site. By the end of 2023, 54% of our electricity was generated from renewable sources (2022: 52%). We have now increased the amount of renewable electricity used for four years in a row, with 17 sites using only renewable electricity. We avoided the generation of approximately 14,000 tCO2e from our operations (4,000 tCO2e through energy management, and around 10,000 tCO2e via renewable energy certificates and on-site solar).

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are estimated using underlying activity data (e.g. electricity use, litres of fuel used) and the estimates are limited by the quality of the activity data

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

Please see our 2023 Sustainability Report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Kilograms

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

1440957

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

47

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions are mainly from direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on site. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane and diesel. Also from our own fleet in North America.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

All the energy consumed on site, direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on site. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane and diesel. Direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources is calculated from a fleet operated in North America; all other transportation is third party and included in Scope 3. Process gases are proportioned between onsite release and end-of-life release. We go through an assurance process for our Scope 1 and 2 emissions, the assurance statement can be found in our 2023 Sustainability report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf The allocation to emissions to Bayer, has been calculated by the total kg sold to Bayer to a proportion of kp's total production

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

Please see our 2023 Sustainability Report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

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

1440957

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

369

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions are driven by electricity and steam consumption on site. By the end of 2023, 54% of our electricity was generated from renewable sources (2022: 52%). We have now increased the amount of renewable electricity used for four years in a row, with 17 sites using only renewable electricity. We avoided the generation of approximately 14,000 tCO2e from our operations (4,000 tCO2e through energy management, and around 10,000 tCO2e via renewable energy certificates and on-site solar).

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are estimated using underlying activity data (e.g. electricity use, litres of fuel used) and the estimates are limited by the quality of the activity data

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

Please see our 2023 Sustainability Report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Kilograms

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

1662326

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

55

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions are mainly from direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on site. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane and diesel. Also from our own fleet in North America.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

All the energy consumed on site, direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources, refrigerants and process gases released on site. The fuels recorded are natural gas, propane and diesel. Direct emissions from directly controlled mobile sources is calculated from a fleet operated in North America; all other transportation is third party and included in Scope 3. Process gases are proportioned between onsite release and end-of-life release. We go through an assurance process for our Scope 1 and 2 emissions, the assurance statement can be found in our 2023 Sustainability report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf The allocation to emissions to Avery, has been calculated by the total kg sold to Avery to a proportion of kp's total production

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

Please see our 2023 Sustainability Report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Kilograms

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

1662326

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

426

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions are driven by electricity and steam consumption on site. By the end of 2023, 54% of our electricity was generated from renewable sources (2022: 52%). We have now increased the amount of renewable electricity used for four years in a row, with 17 sites using only renewable electricity. We avoided the generation of approximately 14,000 tCO2e from our operations (4,000 tCO2e through energy management, and around 10,000 tCO2e via renewable energy certificates and on-site solar).

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are estimated using underlying activity data (e.g. electricity use, litres of fuel used) and the estimates are limited by the quality of the activity data

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

Please see our 2023 Sustainability Report: https://www.kpfilms.com/en/sustainability/reports-and-disclosure/KP_SR23_online_V2.pdf
[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

We have made several climate-related public commitments – central to these are our science-based targets for all emission scopes. We monitor and report Scopes 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions on a yearly basis. We have a clear roadmap of action aligned to our validated Science-Based Targets, which focuses on renewable energy deployment as well as the transition to circular raw materials and their associated lower carbon footprint. Supplier engagement is key to decarbonising our value chain and is critical to achieving our science-based target. In 2023, we extended the engagement with our top 50 suppliers, which have been selected based on their overall Scope 3 contribution, in order to collect primary data from them. Through this engagement, we have also aimed to educate and support our suppliers and have provided training materials to accelerate progress in relation to GHG emission reductions.These activities will have a greater impact to carbon reduction, than managing reductions at an individual product level.

Row 3

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

kp has over 8000 customers with an extensive portfolio of high quality plastic packaging and related solutions across the world. This makes it difficult to allocate emissions to individual products. kp continues to develop products that help protect the environment and drive circular economy. Calculating emissions at the company level is the best approach for kp. We have a robust methodology to carry out our GHG inventory, and we have kept improving that methodology throughout the years. We are confident on the methodology that we follow to allocate emissions to our customers and do so based on the kg purchased out of our total volume produced. We have also developed an kp carbon tool, where we can map out kp product portfolio to provide carbon emissions by product. This tool has been externally verified.
[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

The carbon footprint tool developed by Klöckner Pentaplast (KP) employs a structured methodology based on Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) principles, adhering to ISO 14040 and 14044 standards. It offers a "Cradle-to-Gate Excluding End-of-Life" option, focusing on raw material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation while excluding downstream activities. The tool assesses 1 kg of plastic, primarily utilizing data from the Ecoinvent database (version 3.9) and emission factors from the IPCC's GWP 2013 model for consistency. It covers three main life cycle stages: raw materials, transportation, and manufacturing processes. Users manually input relevant data, including polymer amounts and production yields. A cut-off allocation method assigns impacts to the end user, ensuring that recycling and energy recovery do not credit original producers. The tool also accounts for geographical sourcing, allowing users to reflect regional differences using weighted averages from supplier data. Designed as an Excel file, it is accessible for users with varying levels of LCA knowledge, featuring sections for methodology, product data, results, and comparative analysis. We are planning updates to include supplier-specific data and the latest Ecoinvent factors, enhancing the tool's accuracy and ensuring compliance with evolving environmental standards.
[Fixed row]

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:

☑ More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:*

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

☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

52496

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

52496

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

298958

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

254668

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

553627

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

15915

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

15915

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

5435

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

5435

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

304394

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

324432

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

628826
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ 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:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4289

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

4289

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This comes in the form of diesel.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

48207

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

48207

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This comes in the form of natural gas and propane.

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

52496

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

52496

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

5435

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

5435

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

5435

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

5435

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**(36% of renewable as part of the grid mix).

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

41899

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ REGO

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

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in the UK is covered by renewable energy certificates

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Poland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Poland grid mix

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

11301

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Poland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Poland is covered by renewable energy certificates

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Grid mix from Spain

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

53768

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Spain

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Spain is covered by renewable energy certificates.

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

11858

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Canada

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Canada is covered by renewable energy certificates.

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

112262

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

80% of electricity consumption in Canada is covered by renewable energy certificates.

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4827

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Argentina

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Argentina covered by renewable energy certificates.

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belarus

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

5409

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Belarus

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Belarus covered by renewable energy certificates.

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Russian Federation

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

6429

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Russian Federation

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Russia covered by renewable energy certificates

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

12571

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Brazil covered by renewable energy certificates

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

8727

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ China

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in China covered by renewable energy certificates

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

27136

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Turkey

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% of electricity consumption in Turkey covered by renewable energy certificates

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2284

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Generated solar energy on site.

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1962

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Spain

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Generated solar energy.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Portugal

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1189

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Portugal

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Generated solar energy.
[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4827

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

4827.00

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5269

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

5269.00

Belarus

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5410

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

0

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

243

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

0

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

5653.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12571

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

0

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

4647

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

0

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

17218.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11858

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

0

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

4042

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

0

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

15900.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8727

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

0

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

1747

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

0

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

10474.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26307

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

0

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

437

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

0

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

26744.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

115840

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

0

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

27529

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

0

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

143369.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

44875

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

0

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

420

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

0

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

45295.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11301

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

0

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

1664

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

0

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

12965.00

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

30591

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

1189

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

0

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

0

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

31780.00

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6429

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

0

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

3258

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

0

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

9687.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

53768

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

1962

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

0

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

0

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

55730.00

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5795

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

0

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

6521

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

0

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

12316.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20700

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

2284

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

1745

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

0

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

24729.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

27136

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

0

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

421

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

0

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

27557.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

41899

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

0

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

433

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

0

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

42332.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

121676

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

0

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

15304

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

0

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

136980.00
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0000781964

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

154297

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

1973208000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

13

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Due to a fall in customer demand, we experienced a fall in revenue, which has caused an increase in our intensity value.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

41153

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

kg

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

n/a

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

37

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

This year, we achieved zero waste to landfill at six more sites, meaning that we have now met our target in full. The key to our success is 'lean' thinking in managing waste. Lean thinking is highly relevant to sustainability in manufacturing environments, as it promotes efficiency, waste reduction, and continuous improvement all of which are crucial for sustainable practices. • In Montreal, Canada, we found a new recycling supplier, and a new waste contractor in Rural Retreat, USA. • In Beaver, USA, we installed a new waste compactor, and in Melbourne, Australia, we found a waste-to-energy plant in a neighbouring state. • We regrind our laminated waste in Argentina to send to Brazil for recycling as a raw material for our site in Totoral, as Argentina lacks suitable recycling infrastructure. Following the achievement of zero waste to landfill, our focus now moves to further minimising waste overall. Reducing waste remains a perennial focus area for kp.

Row 3

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

628826

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

kWh

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

n/a

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

9

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Our expert 'Energy Champions' implement many of the lessons learned from our 'lean, clean and green' programme, and in 2023, through the Energy Task Force, they delivered more than 100 projects globally. During the year, we invested 2m in sustainabilityrelated technology and equipment. There was also a fall in production numbers.

Row 4

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

31

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

%

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

n/a

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

1

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

In 2023, the recyclability of our packaging portfolio, based on our sales volumes, was 31%, up 9% since 2019. Without any compromise on their primary purpose of protection, 68% (2022: 63%) of our product range has a recyclable alternative, and we are constantly expanding the recyclable options available in our portfolio. [Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

☑ Intensity 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

SBTi screenshot.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

09/08/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(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)

24418

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

266826

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

0.000

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

291244.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

145622.000

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

17571

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

136726

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

154297.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

94.04

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The emissions targets and progress, including this target, are based on the new Sustainability Strategy launched by kp in 2020. Targets have been approved by SBTi in September 2021, following a 1.5C pathway.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We set this target to conform with the SBTi guidelines.

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

We are making good progress on our goal to halve our operational emissions (Scope 1 and 2) by the end of 2025. GHG emissions reduction at kp is 'lean and green'. Being lean means using the minimum possible amount of energy, followed by green energy supply from renewables. By the end of 2022, 54% of our electricity was generated from renewable sources (2021: 28%). We have now increased the amount of renewable energy used for three years in a row. Using more renewable energy helps us not only meet our emissions reduction goals, but also to secure our supplies of energy. No site was left untouched by our efficiency projects, with initiatives covering renewable energy, insulation, compressed air, line planning, cooling systems, motors, drives and pumps, automation, heating systems, material transportation, LED lighting and air conditioning, among others. Particularly notable are the solar energy installations at our Valencia and Pravia sites in Spain and our Santo Tirso site in Portugal. Ultimately, we delivered annual energy cost savings of 2.9m (8,500 MWh), reducing operational carbon emissions by 12% versus 2022.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi screenshot.pdf

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

09/08/2021

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3

(7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:** (metric tons CO2e per tonne of raw material)

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(7.53.2.15) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.591

(7.53.2.24) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.206

(7.53.2.26) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.021

(7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.8180000000

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.8180000000

(7.53.2.36) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services covered by this Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services intensity figure

94

(7.53.2.45) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products covered by this Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.47) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products covered by this Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.53) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this total Scope 3 intensity figure

76

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

76

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2029

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

20.4

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.2431280000

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

-25

(7.53.2.62) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.604

(7.53.2.71) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.174

(7.53.2.73) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.012

(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.7900000000

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.7900000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

4.87

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our goal focuses on the purchased goods to make our products (raw materials), the subsequent processing of the products, and end-of-life treatment. This requires an increase of recycled material inputs and other 'low embodied carbon' materials, as well as increasing the recyclability of our products.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

We set this objective to conform with SBTi requirements.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.2.89) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

As part of our supplier engagement programme, we prioritise our top 50 suppliers (by Scope 3 category 1 – purchased goods and services, representing 74% of our total emissions), who are responsible for more than 50% of overall Scope 3 emissions. We request that these 'carbon-strategic' suppliers manage GHG emissions using targets, Life Cycle Analyses (LCA) and action programmes. Responsiveness and data from these suppliers continue to improve year on year. At the end of 2023, 16% of these suppliers set their own science-based targets, and we received primary data from more than 40%. In 2023, we achieved a reduction of 2.1% in Scope 3 emissions per tonne of raw material (baseline: 2019; 2022: 0.1%)5. We continue to work with suppliers to cut the carbon intensity of petrochemical supply chains and continue with our supplier engagement programme. By using recycled – rather than virgin – material in our operations, we have avoided more than 321,000 tonnes of CO2e emissions
[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

☑ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

09/08/2021

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ All energy carriers

(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)

773358425

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

20

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

55

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

48

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

80.00

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Our goal is to halve Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2025, against our 2019 baseline. Our work on energy efficiency and renewable electricity are the two fundamental programmes which drive our success in reducing GHG emissions.

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi screenshot.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target is an internal target and is to support the achievement of targets to reduce scope 2 emissions.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

We set this target to aid us in conforming with SBTi guidelines.

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

Our 2023 internal Renewable Energy Technology Assessment identified solar energy as the best option for kp, from a range that included wind, hydrogen, biomass and battery storage. By the end of 2023, four factories (Rayong, Thailand; Valencia and Pravia, Spain; and Santo Tirso, Portugal) were operating on-site solar energy systems, and there are a further nine installations in the pipeline (five at food packaging sites and four at pharmaceutical packaging sites). We are also making use of renewables certificates (commodities bought on the open market representing renewable generation) and we are actively pursuing renewable power purchase agreements for large parts of our energy consumption. In summary, we are making progress by generating renewable energy on site and procuring renewable energy products from the market. By the end of 2023, 54% of our electricity was generated from renewable sources3 (2022: 52%). We have now increased the amount of renewable electricity used for four years in a row, with 17 sites using only renewable electricity. Out total energy from renewable sources has increased from 45% in 2022 to
[Add row]

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

02/26/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ metric tons of waste diverted from landfill

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

86

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2023

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

100

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

100

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.0000000000

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Not part of emission target.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

'Waste' comprises material from production that cannot be reprocessed, or used items discarded in the normal operation of a site. We aim to divert all such material from our organization-wide landfill through reduction, reuse, recycling and waste to energy.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

Stakeholder engagement showed us this was a material topic for us.

(7.54.2.21) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

Given that the way waste is managed across all our sites varies considerably, we owe this achievement to the hard work of our teams on the ground and their ingenuity in solving each problem that arose on the way to zero landfill. We achieved this significant milestone through: • Engagement with local plastics processors to take waste that we cannot reprocess or recycle, in some cases at no cost. • Specific negotiations with preferred local suppliers in the USA, where zero waste to landfill was problematic for the Rural Retreat, Beaver and Greenville sites. • Finding innovative, alternative solutions; for example, waste to energy at our Montreal site, where waste treatment suppliers and reprocessors occasionally face challenges preventing them from delivering the contracted service. • Strategic decisions by kp leadership in some locations, recognising that although landfill was the most financially attractive option, it was important to commit to more circular methods of waste treatment, through a strong commitment to avoiding landfill.

Row 2

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 2

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

02/26/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ Percentage of total waste generated that is recycled

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

23

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

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

100

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

31

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

10.3896103896

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Not part of emission target.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This targets all of our products, with no exclusions.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

Recyclability is a key attribute which makes markets more efficient by attracting high-quality products that allow greater amounts of high-quality feedstock into collection, sorting and recycling systems. The concepts of recyclability and quality go hand-in-hand.

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

We will continue to develop policies and programmes that promote recyclability.
[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*61*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*39*	*1959*
Implementation commenced	*73*	*3667*
Implemented	*483*	*6994*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Process optimization

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

4150

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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 C0.4)

3000000

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

1000000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

At kp we know the most sustainable energy is the energy you don't use in the first place, and energy is a large controllable cost for many organisations. Operational efficiency is energy efficiency. Many measures to reduce energy consumption do not require capex- Our global Energy Task Force is sponsored by the leadership team, tools such as our "lean, clean, green" programme is made available to site managers and cover energy management techniques. The logic is simple: use less to be lean, invest in efficient clean tech and go for greener, renewable power

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Cooling technology

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

966

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

400000

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

600000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Cooling technology optimisation is one of the key focus areas for kp for energy efficiency. Globally, approximately 12% of kp's total energy is used in cooling material and buildings that are processing plastic materials. Each year, there are countless example of chiller plant efficiency projects across the plants. These include condenser cooling, heat exchanger cooling, variable speed drive investments in pumps and fans, upgrades to chiller plant control systems to better match the demand with the consumption, use of free cooling technology to avoid the need to use too much electrical energy. Cooling systems are audited at least 3 yearly to ensure they are operating at efficient temperatures. In 2023, a significant proportion of kp's capital investment budget was invested into improved cooling systems.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Compressed air

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

714

(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 C0.4)

650000

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

400000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Compressed air is one of the most expensive forms of energy to use. At kp approximately 10% of all the energy consumed in the plants is in the form of compressed air. The compressed air systems of each plant are challenged each year to understand what potential there is to improve energy efficiency. This includes everything from fixing of compressed air leaks, to implemented procedures to ensure compressed air is shut-off when lines are not in operation, improved air flow control to check that air is only distributed around the plant as it is needed, and not used to meet artificial demand. Compressors in different factories are upgraded yearly. There is a continuous process ongoing. As an example in 2023 air leakage checks were carried out at all sites through our quick win action list

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Smart control system

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

319

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

300000

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

350000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Manufacturing environments are complicated places and control systems that can better manage temperatures, cooling systems compressed air and other areas. Each year each plant invests in these types of projects to save energy and optimise production process control. This starts with process mapping of where energy is used. Different Lean manufacturing techniques are used to eliminate waste.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Lighting

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

351

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

400000

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

400000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

kp has a target to be 100% LED lighting across all building operations during the sustainability strategy journey. A majority of kp plants (70%) have already in the previous 5 years upgraded their entire lighting systems to high efficiency LED lighting. Each year capital projects to the value of 0.5m are supported to close any remaining gaps.

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Fugitive emissions reductions

☑ Other, please specify **:**Heating system upgrades

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

238

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

250000

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

250000

(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

Heating systems in kp's 31 factories are upgraded on an ongoing basis to reduce the consumption of natural gas. In 2022 and 2023 due to the energy crisis in Europe a risk assessment was completed of all kp plants to understand there exposure should natural gas supply be cut off. In addition, heating systems were upgraded in Featherstone UK and Montabaur Germany. Furthermore, heat recovery projects to use heat from production lines to replace Scope 1 emissions are under various stages of development and implementation. This will also be an important focus for energy efficiency projects in 2024

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Solar PV

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

256

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

100000

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Four of kp's 31 factories are now fitted with rooftop solar systems. This includes Rayong in Thailand, Santo Tirso in Portugal, Valencia in Spain and Pravia in Spain. There is a pipeline in place to equip as many as 10 other factories with solar energy as part of our long term sustainability journey. Due to the amount of energy consumed within kp plants, it is not possible to meet all the requirements using on-site solar. The cost is 0, as solar Projects are done with a lease, PPAs or similar. That's why they haven't budgeted any capex
[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:
☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Manufacturing is energy intensive, and each year our operations consume energy equivalent to 200,000 average European homes. Most of our energy is used in heating up and processing raw materials, cooling, and compressing air, as shown in the graphic. Our operations are powered mainly by electricity (90%), with additional natural gas, diesel and other fuels. Most processes use heat, such as extrusion, calendaring and thermoforming, which operate at between 100C and 350C. In 2023 saw continued high energy costs and further geopolitical turbulence, following the price volatility of 2022. This climate has made it more important than ever to continue improving energy efficiency by adjusting production methods and upgrading equipment. We've demonstrated repeatedly that the impact of higher energy prices, uncertainty and market complexities can be mitigated by our talented teams and investment in new technology. Our expert 'Energy Champions' implement many of the lessons learned from our 'lean, clean and green' programme, and in 2023, through the Energy Task Force, they delivered more than 100 projects globally. During the year, we invested 2m in sustainabilityrelated technology and equipment.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Employee engagement is crucial for us to advance on our Investing in better strategy. In order to reach our employees in all areas and in all regions, we hold quarterly Sustainability Forums. In each of the sessions, we touch base on key material topics from our Sustainability strategy (Energy, climate, recyclability, DE&I, etc) in order to keep employees up to date and give the opportunity to ask questions.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Each site systematically manages its environmental management, energy management and quality processes to ensure compliance with regulations, and with our own policies

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

A dedicated sustainability budget is in place to cover greenhouse gas (GHG) management and is used to fund initiatives which will further our sustainability objectives. Some of our energy management initiatives are covered under our operations budget
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?

Select from:

☑ Yes, I will provide data through the CDP questionnaire

(7.73.1) Give the overall percentage of total emissions, for all Scopes, that are covered by these products.

100

(7.73.2) Complete the following table for the goods/services for which you want to provide data.

Row 1

(7.73.2.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.2.2) Name of good/ service

Medical Device film - MD EG10R01

(7.73.2.3) Description of good/ service

Data refers to 1kg of plastic film

(7.73.2.4) Type of product

Select from:
☑ Intermediate

(7.73.2.5) Unique product identifier

MD EG10R01

(7.73.2.6) Total emissions in kg CO2e per unit

3.75

(7.73.2.9) Explanation of change

This is the first time that we have provided date. It is based on a recently launched carbon footprint tool that we have developed. The tool has been developed in accordance with international standards ISO14040 and 14044. The contents of the kp Calculator are provided for information only. While efforts have been made to ensure its accuracy, the results of the kp Calculator are estimates and not exact due to various assumptions and reasons, such as complexities related to emissions, quality, and accuracy of data, among other things

(7.73.2.10) Methods used to estimate lifecycle emissions

Select from:

☑ ISO 14040 & 14044

Row 2

(7.73.2.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.2.2) Name of good/ service

Pressure Sensitive Label film - LE88F10

(7.73.2.3) Description of good/ service

Data refers to 1kg of plastic film

(7.73.2.4) Type of product

Select from:

☑ Intermediate

(7.73.2.5) Unique product identifier

LE88F10-Avery

(7.73.2.6) Total emissions in kg CO2e per unit

2.03

(7.73.2.9) Explanation of change

This is the first time that we have provided date. It is based on a recently launched carbon footprint tool that we have developed. The tool has been developed in accordance with international standards ISO14040 and 14044. The contents of the kp Calculator are provided for information only. While efforts have been made to ensure its accuracy, the results of the kp Calculator are estimates and not exact due to various assumptions and reasons, such as complexities related to emissions, quality, and accuracy of data, among other things

(7.73.2.10) Methods used to estimate lifecycle emissions

Select from:

☑ ISO 14040 & 14044

Row 3

(7.73.2.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.2.2) Name of good/ service

Medical Device G10

(7.73.2.3) Description of good/ service

Data refers to 1kg of plastic film

(7.73.2.4) Type of product

Select from:

☑ Intermediate

(7.73.2.5) Unique product identifier

MD G10

(7.73.2.6) Total emissions in kg CO2e per unit

4.29

(7.73.2.9) Explanation of change

This is the first time that we have provided date. It is based on a recently launched carbon footprint tool that we have developed. The tool has been developed in accordance with international standards ISO14040 and 14044. The contents of the kp Calculator are provided for information only. While efforts have been made to ensure its accuracy, the results of the kp Calculator are estimates and not exact due to various assumptions and reasons, such as complexities related to emissions, quality, and accuracy of data, among other things

(7.73.2.10) Methods used to estimate lifecycle emissions

Select from:

☑ ISO 14040 & 14044

Row 4

(7.73.2.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.2.2) Name of good/ service

Duplex Films PVC/PVDC

(7.73.2.3) Description of good/ service

Data refers to 1kg of plastic film

(7.73.2.4) Type of product

Select from:

☑ Intermediate

(7.73.2.5) Unique product identifier

PC SG 250/40-71/9400

(7.73.2.6) Total emissions in kg CO2e per unit

3.17

(7.73.2.9) Explanation of change

This is the first time that we have provided date. It is based on a recently launched carbon footprint tool that we have developed. The tool has been developed in accordance with international standards ISO14040 and 14044. The contents of the kp Calculator are provided for information only. While efforts have been made to ensure its accuracy, the results of the kp Calculator are estimates and not exact due to various assumptions and reasons, such as complexities related to emissions, quality, and accuracy of data, among other things

(7.73.2.10) Methods used to estimate lifecycle emissions

Select from:

☑ ISO 14040 & 14044

[Add row]

(7.73.3) Complete the following table with data for lifecycle stages of your goods and/or services.

Row 1

(7.73.3.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.3.2) Name of good/ service

Medical Device film - MD EG10R01

(7.73.3.3) Scope

Select from:

☑ Scope 1, 2 & 3

(7.73.3.4) Lifecycle stage

Select from:

☑ Cradle to gate

(7.73.3.5) Emissions at the lifecycle stage in kg CO2e per unit

3.75

(7.73.3.6) Lifecycle stage under your ownership or control

Select from:

☑ No

(7.73.3.7) Type of data used

Select from:

☑ Primary and secondary

(7.73.3.8) Data quality

The carbon footprint tool developed by Klöckner Pentaplast kp follows a structured methodology grounded in Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) principles, adhering to ISO 14040 and 14044 standards. Users can choose the "Cradle-to-Gate Excluding End-of-Life" option, which focuses solely on the phases of raw material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation, omitting downstream activities like distribution and product use. The declared unit for assessment is 1 kg of plastic. Data for the tool is primarily sourced from the Ecoinvent database, specifically version 3.9, known for its extensive datasets on various materials and processes. Emission factors are derived from the IPCC's GWP 2013 model to ensure consistency across datasets. In terms of life cycle stages, the tool considers three main areas: raw materials, transportation to the manufacturing site, and manufacturing processes. Users input relevant data manually, including the amounts of each polymer and the yields of raw material production. The methodology employs a cut-off allocation approach, where the impacts of primary production are assigned to the end user, ensuring that recycling and energy recovery processes do not provide credits to the original producers. Additionally, the tool takes geographical sourcing into account, allowing users to reflect regional differences by using weighted averages from supplier data. The interface is designed as an Excel file, making it user-friendly for individuals with varying levels of LCA knowledge. It features sections for methodology, product data, summary results, and comparative analysis, facilitating a transparent and accessible framework for assessing the carbon footprint of KP's products. Regular updates to the tool are recommended to incorporate the latest data and adapt to evolving environmental standards.

(7.73.3.9) If applicable, describe the verification/assurance of the product emissions data

A critical review of kp's Carbon Calculator tool was commissioned to ensure its effectiveness and was carried out by IFEU. This review process began in March 2023, with the final evaluation completed by February 2024. The tool allows for carbon footprint calculations of up to two products simultaneously, using data primarily from the Ecoinvent 3.9 database. While the methodology is deemed appropriate, the reviewer emphasizes the importance of updates to account for significant changes in

emission factors, particularly in plastics, as new data becomes available. Overall, the tool is user-friendly and fulfills its intended purpose, though improvements in data accuracy are necessary.

Row 2

(7.73.3.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.3.2) Name of good/ service

Pressure Sensitive Label film - LE88F10

(7.73.3.3) Scope

Select from:

☑ Scope 1, 2 & 3

(7.73.3.4) Lifecycle stage

Select from:

☑ Cradle to gate

(7.73.3.5) Emissions at the lifecycle stage in kg CO2e per unit

2.03

(7.73.3.6) Lifecycle stage under your ownership or control

Select from:

☑ No

(7.73.3.7) Type of data used

Select from:

☑ Primary and secondary

(7.73.3.8) Data quality

The carbon footprint tool developed by Klöckner Pentaplast kp follows a structured methodology grounded in Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) principles, adhering to ISO 14040 and 14044 standards. Users can choose the "Cradle-to-Gate Excluding End-of-Life" option, which focuses solely on the phases of raw material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation, omitting downstream activities like distribution and product use. The declared unit for assessment is 1 kg of plastic. Data for the tool is primarily sourced from the Ecoinvent database, specifically version 3.9, known for its extensive datasets on various materials and processes. Emission factors are derived from the IPCC's GWP 2013 model to ensure consistency across datasets. In terms of life cycle stages, the tool considers three main areas: raw materials, transportation to the manufacturing site, and manufacturing processes. Users input relevant data manually, including the amounts of each polymer and the yields of raw material production. The methodology employs a cut-off allocation approach, where the impacts of primary production are assigned to the end user, ensuring that recycling and energy recovery processes do not provide credits to the original producers. Additionally, the tool takes geographical sourcing into account, allowing users to reflect regional differences by using weighted averages from supplier data. The interface is designed as an Excel file, making it user-friendly for individuals with varying levels of LCA knowledge. It features sections for methodology, product data, summary results, and comparative analysis, facilitating a transparent and accessible framework for assessing the carbon footprint of KP's products. Regular updates to the tool are recommended to incorporate the latest data and adapt to evolving environmental standards.

(7.73.3.9) If applicable, describe the verification/assurance of the product emissions data

A critical review of kp's Carbon Calculator tool was commissioned to ensure its effectiveness and was carried out by IFEU. This review process began in March 2023, with the final evaluation completed by February 2024. The tool allows for carbon footprint calculations of up to two products simultaneously, using data primarily from the Ecoinvent 3.9 database. While the methodology is deemed appropriate, the reviewer emphasizes the importance of updates to account for significant changes in emission factors, particularly in plastics, as new data becomes available. Overall, the tool is user-friendly and fulfills its intended purpose, though improvements in data accuracy are necessary.

Row 3

(7.73.3.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.3.2) Name of good/ service

Medical Device G10

(7.73.3.3) Scope

Select from:

☑ Scope 1, 2 & 3

(7.73.3.4) Lifecycle stage

Select from:

☑ Cradle to gate

(7.73.3.5) Emissions at the lifecycle stage in kg CO2e per unit

4.29

(7.73.3.6) Lifecycle stage under your ownership or control

Select from:

☑ No

(7.73.3.7) Type of data used

Select from:

☑ Primary and secondary

(7.73.3.8) Data quality

The carbon footprint tool developed by Klöckner Pentaplast kp follows a structured methodology grounded in Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) principles, adhering to ISO 14040 and 14044 standards. Users can choose the "Cradle-to-Gate Excluding End-of-Life" option, which focuses solely on the phases of raw material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation, omitting downstream activities like distribution and product use. The declared unit for assessment is 1 kg of plastic. Data for the tool is primarily sourced from the Ecoinvent database, specifically version 3.9, known for its extensive datasets on various materials and processes. Emission factors are derived from the IPCC's GWP 2013 model to ensure consistency across datasets. In terms of life cycle stages, the tool considers three main areas: raw materials, transportation to the manufacturing site, and manufacturing processes. Users input relevant data manually, including the amounts of each polymer and the yields of raw material production. The methodology employs a cut-off allocation approach, where the impacts of primary production are assigned to the end user, ensuring that recycling and energy recovery processes do not provide credits to the original producers. Additionally, the tool takes geographical sourcing into account, allowing users to reflect regional differences by using weighted averages from supplier data. The interface is designed as an Excel file, making it user-friendly for individuals with varying levels of LCA knowledge. It features sections for methodology, product data, summary results, and comparative analysis, facilitating a transparent and accessible framework for assessing the carbon footprint of KP's products. Regular updates to the tool are recommended to incorporate the latest data and adapt to evolving environmental standards.

(7.73.3.9) If applicable, describe the verification/assurance of the product emissions data

A critical review of kp's Carbon Calculator tool was commissioned to ensure its effectiveness and was carried out by IFEU. This review process began in March 2023, with the final evaluation completed by February 2024. The tool allows for carbon footprint calculations of up to two products simultaneously, using data primarily from the Ecoinvent 3.9 database. While the methodology is deemed appropriate, the reviewer emphasizes the importance of updates to account for significant changes in emission factors, particularly in plastics, as new data becomes available. Overall, the tool is user-friendly and fulfills its intended purpose, though improvements in data accuracy are necessary.

Row 4

(7.73.3.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.73.3.2) Name of good/ service

Duplex Films PVC/PVDC

(7.73.3.3) Scope

Select from:

☑ Scope 1, 2 & 3

(7.73.3.4) Lifecycle stage

Select from:

☑ Cradle to gate

(7.73.3.5) Emissions at the lifecycle stage in kg CO2e per unit

3.17

(7.73.3.6) Lifecycle stage under your ownership or control

Select from:

☑ No

(7.73.3.7) Type of data used

Select from:

☑ Primary and secondary

(7.73.3.8) Data quality

The carbon footprint tool developed by Klöckner Pentaplast kp follows a structured methodology grounded in Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) principles, adhering to ISO 14040 and 14044 standards. Users can choose the "Cradle-to-Gate Excluding End-of-Life" option, which focuses solely on the phases of raw material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation, omitting downstream activities like distribution and product use. The declared unit for assessment is 1 kg of plastic. Data for the tool is primarily sourced from the Ecoinvent database, specifically version 3.9, known for its extensive datasets on various materials and processes. Emission factors are derived from the IPCC's GWP 2013 model to ensure consistency across datasets. In terms of life cycle stages, the tool considers three main areas: raw materials, transportation to the manufacturing site, and manufacturing processes. Users input relevant data manually, including the amounts of each polymer and the yields of raw material production. The methodology employs a cut-off allocation approach, where the impacts of primary production are assigned to the end user, ensuring that recycling and energy recovery processes do not provide credits to the original producers. Additionally, the tool takes geographical sourcing into account, allowing users to reflect regional differences by using weighted averages from supplier data. The interface is designed as an Excel file, making it user-friendly for individuals with varying levels of LCA knowledge. It features sections for methodology, product data, summary results, and comparative analysis, facilitating a transparent and accessible framework for assessing the carbon footprint of KP's products. Regular updates to the tool are recommended to incorporate the latest data and adapt to evolving environmental standards.

(7.73.3.9) If applicable, describe the verification/assurance of the product emissions data

A critical review of kp's Carbon Calculator tool was commissioned to ensure its effectiveness and was carried out by IFEU. This review process began in March 2023, with the final evaluation completed by February 2024. The tool allows for carbon footprint calculations of up to two products simultaneously, using data primarily from the Ecoinvent 3.9 database. While the methodology is deemed appropriate, the reviewer emphasizes the importance of updates to account for significant changes in emission factors, particularly in plastics, as new data becomes available. Overall, the tool is user-friendly and fulfills its intended purpose, though improvements in data accuracy are necessary.
[Add row]

(7.73.4) Please detail emissions reduction initiatives completed or planned for this product.

Row 1

(7.73.4.1) Name of good/ service

All

(7.73.4.2) Initiative ID

Select from:

☑ Initiative 1

(7.73.4.3) Description of initiative

Our operational energy use generated 148,000 tonnes of CO2e emissions, 90% of which comes from the use of electricity in our manufacturing plants. Consequently, increasing the use of renewable energy is a key focus area for kp, to help meet our emissions reduction goals and to secure our supplies of energy. We continue to use more renewable power sources. We are planning to develop further on-site or near-site solar projects, where financially viable. And we look forward to making progress against our targets based on a planned mix of physical installations, long-term power purchase agreements and renewable certificates.

(7.73.4.4) Completed or planned

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

[Add row]

(7.73.5) Have any of the initiatives described in 7.73.4 been driven by requesting CDP Supply Chain members?

Select from:

☑ No

(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:

☑ Group of products or services

(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)

Power

☑ Other, please specify

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

kp has been using post-consumer recycled (PCR) material to produce high-quality products that meet global safety standards and consumer expectations for nearly two decades. Part of this effort has involved supporting our customers to include more recycled content in their packaging.Some of our products which contain PCR content that we classify as low-carbon include: - kp Zapora, kp MonoSeal, kp Elite, kp Eternal, kp MonoSeal, and Pentalabel SmartCycle Pro mono-material packaging, as well as kp SmartCycle films. Those offers are recyclable and contain PCR material, in line with market demand. The above products either generate less carbon, or incorporate more recycled content (and therefore require less fossil fuels for extraction, transportation, and processing of resin/polymers), and/or are designed for recyclability (and therefore reduce our Scope 3 emissions).

(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:

☑ Other, please specify **:**The methodology used to assess avoided emissions in the last year is the one that we use to calculate our Scope 3 emissions.

(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

Not relevant

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Baseline scenario is our 2023 raw materials mix

(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

321000

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

The methodology used to assess avoided emissions in the last year is the one used to assess our Scope 3 emissions from our Raw materials. The amount of recycled content purchased is multiplied by the relevant emission factor from Ecoinvent. That same volume is also multiplied by the virgin Emision factor, The result allows us to compare avoided emissions from using recyled conent rather than virgin content. Using recycled content in our products also reduces the carbon footprint of our products. In 2023, we used 25% of PCR material in the plastic packaging we produced; using recycled rather than virgin material in our operations equates to more than 321,000 tonnes of avoided CO2e emissions

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

32
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to undertake any biodiversity-related actions

[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?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

n/a

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

n/a

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

n/a

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

n/a

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Two of our sites in spain (Girona and Pravia) are located in between 10-50% overlap of a KBA, more specifically in Massis del Montseny and Cabo Busto. Our site in Turkey, Gebze, is located in between 10-50% overlap of a KBA - Pendik Vadisi.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

n/a
[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Turkey

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Pendik Vadisi.

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

20

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

We have a manufacturing site in Gebze.

(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:

☑ Not assessed

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Massis del Montseny and Cabo Busto.

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

We have a manufacturing site in Girona and another one in Pravia.

(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:

☑ Not assessed

[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

☑ Base year emissions

☑ Energy attribute certificates (EACs)

☑ Fuel consumption

☑ Waste data

☑ Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 1 and 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

Data assured: Selected information The scope and boundary of our work is restricted to the key performance indicators included within the Report for 2023 reporting year (the "Selected Information"), listed below. Key Performance Indicators Reported value 2023 Unit Scope 1 GHG emissions 17,571 tCO2e Scope 2 GHG emissions – location-based 168,442 tCO2e Scope 2 GHG emissions – market-based 136,726 tCO2e Energy intensity 1,179 kWh per tonne of product produced Total waste generation 41,153 tonnes Total number of zero landfill sites 29 number Waste to landfill 882 tonnes Waste to energy 5,608 tonnes Waste recycled 34,664 tonnes Women at management level 25.5 % Lost-time accident (LTA) rate 0.35 accident per 200,000 hours Post consumer recycled content in packaging 25 % To assess the Selected Information, which includes an assessment of the risk of material misstatement in the Report, we have used kp's Basis of Reporting 2023 (the "criteria") which can be found here4. We have not performed any work, and do not express any conclusion, on any other information that may be published in the Report or on kp's website for the current reporting period or for previous periods

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

2023 Sustainability Report online (6).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

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

[Fixed row]