

Pernod Ricard

# 2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

**Important: this export excludes unanswered questions**

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

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

# Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>C1. Introduction .....</b>   | <b>9</b>  |
| (1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? .....   | 9         |
| (1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. ....   | 9         |
| (1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. ....   | 9         |
| (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. ....   | 10        |
| (1.4.1) What is your organization’s annual revenue for the reporting period? .....  | 11        |
| (1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. ....  | 11        |
| (1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? .....  | 11        |
| (1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. ....   | 13        |
| (1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities? .....   | 14        |
| (1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure? .....      | 14        |
| (1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?.....  | 15        |
| (1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? .....  | 24        |
| (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? .....  | 25        |
| <b>C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities .....</b>  | <b>26</b> |
| (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? ..... | 26        |
| (2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? .....   | 27        |
| (2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? .....  | 28        |
| (2.2.2) Provide details of your organization’s process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. ....  | 28        |
| (2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? .....  | 37        |
| (2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? .....   | 37        |
| (2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? .....   | 39        |
| (2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health? .....                                    | 41        |

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities. .... 41

**C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities..... 46**

(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?..... 46

(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. .... 47

(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..... 58

(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?..... 60

(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?..... 71

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? ..... 71

(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations. .... 71

(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by. .... 72

(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?..... 74

(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? ..... 74

(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. .... 75

(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. .... 84

**C4. Governance..... 87**

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? ..... 87

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? ..... 88

(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. .... 88

(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? ..... 92

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?..... 94

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). .... 94

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? ..... 99

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). .... 100

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| (4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? .....  | 103 |
| (4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. ....  | 103 |
| (4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? .....  | 105 |
| (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? .....                                       | 106 |
| (4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year? .....   | 108 |
| (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. .... | 114 |
| (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? .....  | 126 |
| (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. ....                                    | 127 |

**C5. Business strategy ..... 130**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| (5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? .....  | 130 |
| (5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization’s scenario analysis. ....  | 130 |
| (5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization’s scenario analysis. ....  | 144 |
| (5.2) Does your organization’s strategy include a climate transition plan? .....  | 146 |
| (5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?.....   | 148 |
| (5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.....   | 148 |
| (5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning. ....  | 150 |
| (5.4) In your organization’s financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition? .....  | 152 |
| (5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition. ....   | 153 |
| (5.4.2) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that was associated with eligible and aligned activities under the sustainable finance taxonomy in the reporting year.....                     | 158 |
| (5.4.3) Provide any additional contextual and/or verification/assurance information relevant to your organization’s taxonomy alignment.....   | 192 |
| (5.9) What is the trend in your organization’s water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?..... | 193 |
| (5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? .....   | 194 |
| (5.10.1) Provide details of your organization’s internal price on carbon. ....  | 194 |
| (5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? .....   | 197 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| (5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?.....  | 198 |
| (5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? .....   | 200 |
| (5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization’s purchasing process?.....   | 202 |
| (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. .... | 203 |
| (5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization’s supplier engagement on environmental issues. ....  | 209 |
| (5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. ....   | 215 |

**C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach..... 219**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| (6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data..... | 219 |
|--|-----|

**C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change ..... 221**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| (7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?.....   | 221 |
| (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?.....  | 221 |
| (7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? .....   | 222 |
| (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?....  | 222 |
| (7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. ....   | 223 |
| (7.3) Describe your organization’s approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions. ....   | 223 |
| (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? ..... | 224 |
| (7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. ....   | 224 |
| (7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?.....   | 233 |
| (7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?.....   | 233 |
| (7.8) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. ....   | 234 |
| (7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years. ....   | 247 |
| (7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. ....   | 249 |
| (7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.....   | 249 |
| (7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements. ....   | 251 |
| (7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements. ....   | 252 |
| (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? .....   | 253 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| (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. ....           | 253 |
| (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? .....                       | 260 |
| (7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?.....  | 260 |
| (7.13.1) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions. ....   | 260 |
| (7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business? .....   | 263 |
| (7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?.....  | 268 |
| (7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. ....  | 268 |
| (7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ....  | 277 |
| (7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity. ....   | 277 |
| (7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure? .....   | 278 |
| (7.18.1) Select the form(s) in which you are reporting your agricultural/forestry emissions. ....  | 278 |
| (7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category. .... | 278 |
| (7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ....  | 281 |
| (7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity. ....   | 281 |
| (7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. ....   | 282 |
| (7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?.....   | 283 |
| (7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary.....  | 283 |
| (7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy? .....  | 309 |
| (7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. ....   | 309 |
| (7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh. ....  | 310 |
| (7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel. ....  | 313 |
| (7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. ....   | 313 |
| (7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year. ....   | 317 |
| (7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. ....   | 319 |
| (7.30.17) Provide details of your organization’s renewable electricity purchases in the reporting year by country/area. ....   | 339 |
| (7.30.18) Provide details of your organization’s low-carbon heat, steam, and cooling purchases in the reporting year by country/area. ....   | 367 |
| (7.30.19) Provide details of your organization’s renewable electricity generation by country/area in the reporting year. ....  | 369 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| (7.30.20) Describe how your organization’s renewable electricity sourcing strategy directly or indirectly contributes to bringing new capacity into the grid in the countries/areas in which you operate. ....                                    | 375 |
| (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. .... | 376 |
| (7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business. ....   | 377 |
| (7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? .....  | 380 |
| (7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. ....   | 380 |
| (7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year? .....   | 398 |
| (7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production. ....  | 398 |
| (7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).....  | 401 |
| (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. ....   | 404 |
| (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.....   | 404 |
| (7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below. ....  | 405 |
| (7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?.....  | 406 |
| (7.67) Do you implement agriculture or forest management practices on your own land with a climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefit? .....   | 408 |
| (7.67.1) Specify the agricultural or forest management practice(s) implemented on your own land with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits and provide a corresponding emissions figure, if known.....                             | 408 |
| (7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?.....   | 411 |
| (7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.....         | 411 |
| (7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged? .....   | 415 |
| (7.69) Do you know if any of the management practices implemented on your own land disclosed in 7.67.1 have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation? .....   | 415 |
| (7.69.1) Provide details on those management practices that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation and on your management response. ....   | 415 |
| (7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation? .....  | 416 |
| (7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation. ....   | 416 |
| (7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?.....   | 418 |
| (7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?.....  | 418 |
| (7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?.....  | 418 |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>C9. Environmental performance - Water security .....</b>  | <b>419</b> |
| (9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? .....   | 419        |
| (9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions .....  | 419        |
| (9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? .....   | 421        |
| (9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change? ..... | 428        |
| (9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change. ....                     | 431        |
| (9.2.5) What proportion of the produced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress? .....   | 433        |
| (9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?.....   | 434        |
| (9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. ....  | 438        |
| (9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination. ....  | 441        |
| (9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities? .....        | 444        |
| (9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year. ....   | 445        |
| (9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified? .....  | 501        |
| (9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member? .....   | 504        |
| (9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member.....  | 504        |
| (9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency. ....   | 505        |
| (9.8) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you produce. ....   | 505        |
| (9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source. ....  | 506        |
| (9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services. ....   | 512        |
| (9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? .....   | 513        |
| (9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact? .....   | 513        |
| (9.15) Do you have any water-related targets? .....  | 514        |
| (9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. ....   | 514        |
| (9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made. ....   | 515        |

**C10. Environmental performance - Plastics .....** **521**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| (10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type? ..... | 521 |
|---|-----|



|   |            |
|---|------------|
| (10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities. ....   | 521        |
| (10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content. ....                                       | 524        |
| (10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content. ....   | 525        |
| (10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used. ....   | 525        |
| <b>C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity.....</b>   | <b>527</b> |
| (11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? .....  | 527        |
| (11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities? .....   | 527        |
| (11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?.....  | 527        |
| (11.4.1) Provide details of your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity. ....   | 530        |
| <b>C13. Further information &amp; sign off.....</b>   | <b>537</b> |
| (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? ..... | 537        |
| (13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used? .....  | 537        |
| (13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. ....  | 544        |
| (13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.....                                      | 544        |

## 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

*Pernod Ricard is a world's co-leader in the industry of wines and spirits. It was created in 1975 with the merger of Pernod and Ricard companies and has today 85 subsidiaries in more than 70 countries. The company is active in a number of beverage sectors, including: whiskies, vodka, aniseed spirits, liqueurs, cognacs and brandies, gin, rums, bitters, champagne, and wines. The group's activities are focused on international brands such as Absolut, Chivas Regal, Ballantines, Beefeater, Havana Club, Malibu, Martell, The Glenlivet, Jameson or Jacob's Creek. In addition, the Group owns and distributes a number of leading local brands. Pernod Ricard's structure is divided between Brand Companies, such as the Absolut Company, Chivas Brothers or Martell Mumm Perrier-Jouët, that produce those brands and develop marketing strategies, and Market Companies, such as Pernod Ricard Europe, Middle East and Africa, Pernod Ricard North America or Pernod Ricard Asia, that are in charge of the distribution of the brands in every local market. Pernod Ricard business model is based on a decentralized organization where business decisions are made in the local markets and countries, close to the customers and to our "terroirs". Pernod Ricard is aware that climate change is one of the most urgent challenges facing this generation. Combatting it is a major focus of our environmental policy. In particular, Pernod Ricard's main impacts on climate come from its agricultural activities and packaging. Pernod Ricard has a dedicated governance and organizational structure to ensure that climate change issues are fully incorporated into its strategy. For greater transparency, the Group follows the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure (TCFD). Regarding the resilience of our organization, this year, the Group has started a climate-related scenario analysis with a pilot in one affiliate. The objectives are the understanding of climate-related risks impacts on our operations (wet goods, packaging, production and logistics) and the building of a prospective approach for*

climate-related risks scenarios applicable at Group level. The Group holds a long tradition of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), including a strong commitment towards environment protection, deeply rooted in its long history and in the local territories where its emblematic brands have been produced and developed since many generations. The Group environmental commitments are included into the Pernod Ricard Corporate Environmental Policy which is based on impacts and risks identified for the Group in term of environment. This policy covers the Group's entire value chain and all its business activities, from upstream procurement, production and market distribution to the end of the product's life. It is directed to all our stakeholders, starting with all employees across the world, as well as numerous suppliers and partners. Pernod Ricard's commitment to a Net Zero trajectory by 2050 presents an opportunity to shape a greener future. Biomethane will be one of a key success factor for our decarbonisation and to shape a more circular industry. Transitioning to renewable energies creates valuable assets for driving transformation in the spirit industry and projects like Jameson's Midleton Distillery carbon-neutral pathway and Absolut Vodka sustainable glass collaboration are catalysts for change, leading to a long-term vision in innovation and carbon neutrality pathway.

[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**

06/30/2023

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

Select from:

Yes

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

Select from:

Yes

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

Select from:

1 year

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

Select from:

1 year

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

Select from:

1 year

[Fixed row]

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

12100000000

#### (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:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  |

[Fixed row]

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

##### ISIN code - bond

#### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

Yes

## (1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

FR0000120693

### ISIN code - equity

## (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

### CUSIP number

## (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

### Ticker symbol

## (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

### SEDOL code

## (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

### LEI number

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

### D-U-N-S number

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

### Other unique identifier

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cuba    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spain     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> China   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brazil    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> India   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Canada    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Italy   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> France    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Japan   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greece    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mexico  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Finland   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Germany   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sweden  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ireland   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Armenia | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Argentina |

- Czechia
- New Zealand
- South Africa
- United States of America
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

- Australia

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

|  | Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?                     | Comment                          |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, this is confidential data | <i>This data is confidential</i> |

[Fixed row]

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

**Production**

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

Select from:

- Value chain (including own land)

**Processing/ Manufacturing**

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

Select from:

- Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

## Distribution

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

Select from:

- Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

## Consumption

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

Select from:

- Yes

[Fixed row]

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

## Cattle products

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- No

## Cocoa

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- Sourced



### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Cocoa represents a negligible part of Pernod Ricard's revenue (estimation based on FY23 agricultural commodities purchases, both in volume and spend).*

## Coffee

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Coffee represents a negligible part of Pernod Ricard's revenue (estimation based on FY23 agricultural commodities purchases, both in volume and spend).*

## Cotton

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Dairy & egg products

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Dairy represents a negligible part of Pernod Ricard's revenue (estimation based on FY23 agricultural commodities purchases, both in volume and spend).*

## Fish and seafood from aquaculture

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Fruit

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Fruits represent a negligible part of Pernod Ricard's revenue (estimation based on FY23 agricultural commodities purchases, both in volume and spend).*

## Maize/corn

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

1-10%

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Maize represents around 20% of Pernod Ricard's agricultural commodities procurement volume, in ton equivalent of raw material.*

#### Nuts

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

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

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

11-20%

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Other grain represents around 20% of Pernod Ricard's agricultural commodities procurement volume, in ton equivalent of raw material.*

## Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Palm oil

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Poultry & hog

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Rice

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

1-10%

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Rice represents around 15% of Pernod Ricard's agricultural commodities procurement volume, in ton equivalent of raw material.*

#### Soy

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

#### Sugar

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

1-10%

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Sugar represents around 3% of Pernod Ricard's agricultural commodities procurement volume (in ton equivalent of raw material) and is essential to alcoholic beverages production and formulation.*

## Tea

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Tea represents a negligible part of Pernod Ricard's revenue (estimation based on FY23 agricultural commodities purchases, both in volume and spend).*

## Timber products

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Tobacco

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Vegetable

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

## Wheat

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

1-10%

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

Select from:

Yes

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Wheat represents around 20% of Pernod Ricard's agricultural commodities procurement volume, in ton equivalent of raw material.*

## Other commodity

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Produced and sourced



### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

31-40%

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

Select from:

Yes

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Grapes represent around 15% of Pernod Ricard's agricultural commodities procurement volume, in ton equivalent of raw material.  
[Fixed row]*

## (1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

### (1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

### (1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

Upstream value chain

Downstream value chain

### (1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

Tier 4+ suppliers

### (1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

- All supplier tiers known have been mapped

### (1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

All of Pernod Ricard's Tier 1 suppliers are mapped within internal procurement and Third Party Due Dilligence tools. Tier 2 to Tier N suppliers are currently being mapped through a specific process depending on the procurement category. For example, concerning packaging, a working group is currently mapping all suppliers at patch of forest land granularity. Regarding priority agricultural terroirs, the last Tier corresponds to the farmers who are either already mapped or in the process of being mapped.

[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:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain | Select all that apply<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Upstream value chain<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Downstream value chain |

[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**

*Transitional and physical risks are integrated into the decision making related to short term Capex investments. A transversal governance was set up to ensure alignment between our main CAPEX, our SBTi targets and upcoming environmental risks*

### **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**

*Physical risks effects are included into the strategic planning surrounding aged products that will be sold in 10 years that could be impacted by either intense weather events or increased temperatures. Physical and transitional risks effects are included in the 10 years strategical planning of the group to account for the impact increased COGS with lowered global agricultural yield and increased carbon taxes*

## 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

*Our Net Zero commitment as well as the results of our TCFD study informs the long term evolution of the group, including identifying new business models, more resilient toward environmental risk and decarbonization targets*  
*[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:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both dependencies and impacts |

[Fixed row]

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

|  | Process in place  | Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process                             | Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process? |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both risks and opportunities | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes              |

[Fixed row]

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

**Row 1**

**(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue**

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

*Select all that apply*

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks
- Opportunities

### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain

### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

*Select from:*

- Full

### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

*Select all that apply*

- Tier 1 suppliers

### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

*Select from:*

- Qualitative and quantitative

### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

*Select from:*

- Annually

### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

*Select all that apply*

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

### (2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

*Select from:*

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

### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

*Select all that apply*

- Site-specific
- Local
- Sub-national
- National

### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

#### **Enterprise Risk Management**

- Risk models

#### **International methodologies and standards**

- IPCC Climate Change Projections
- ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

#### **Other**

- External consultants

- ☑ Materiality assessment
- ☑ Scenario analysis

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

#### Acute physical

- ☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
- ☑ Drought
- ☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

#### Chronic physical

- ☑ Heat stress
- ☑ Water stress
- ☑ Soil degradation
- ☑ Change in land-use
- ☑ Temperature variability
- ☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

#### Policy

- ☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
- ☑ Changes to national legislation

#### Market

- ☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- ☑ Changing customer behavior

#### Reputation

- ☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
- ☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Stigmatization of sector



## Technology

- Transition to lower emissions technology and products
- Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

## Liability

- Non-compliance with regulations

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- Customers
- Employees
- Investors
- Suppliers
- Regulators
- Local communities
- Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

- No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

a) *Identification* Integrating climate-related risks and opportunities within the broader multidisciplinary company-wide risk management process starts with identifying all potentially relevant risks & opportunities across upstream & downstream value chain, and within our own operations, as all are important to ensure the continuity of our business and activities considering climate change impacts. This identification process is performed by gathering senior executive from all potentially impacted functions to ensure a holistic approach: Finance, Procurement, Internal audit, Marketing, Operations, S&R, and Public Affairs. A risks & opportunities universe is defined following on a multi-criteria analysis based on likelihood and severity of impacts, weighted by all representatives during workshops. This bottom-up approach is complemented by continuous feedback raised at Market & Brand Level following historically observed impacts at site-level and affiliate-level, and further gathered by our Internal Audit Director. b) *Assessment* Risks highlighted during these preliminary steps are then quantified in terms of physical units impacts and financial impacts. Risks for which the impact overcomes our materiality thresholds, are prioritized in terms of adaptation actions and required investments to perform. Such process is performed for short-term, medium-term, and long-term horizons, given that the most material risks, the required and optimal adaptation levers to action to mitigate these risks, and the stakeholders to be involved are likely to diverge between those 3 horizons. Indeed, adjusting our short-term business planning and investments, in line with short-term horizon results, does not stand at the same level than revamping our strategic planning and overall brand positioning, in light with

long-term horizon results c) Respond - Reporting process Our Chief Sustainability Officer and our VP Operations and S&R report the results of these climate-related risks and opportunities workshops to our Executive Committee. - Managing processes To mitigate these risks, each manufacturing Brand Owner with is certified according to ISO 14001, and therefore has identified the impacts and risks of its activities on the environment, climate change being one of the most material. Site-level Business Continuity Plans are frequently updated and reviewed, including increased severity of extreme events induced by climate change. We further put a focus on critical facilities and warehouses for which any loss or disruption would cause the major financial impacts. Carbon price and energy dependency: To mitigate this risk, the Group is working on 2 aspects on production sites and supply chain: - Transitioning from fossil fuel to low carbon fuel. - Decreasing the Group dependence to energy by decreasing its direct and indirect consumption. This transition to a low carbon economy has been included in our 2030 roadmap in line with our SBT targets. All these actions will have to be widely implemented to achieve our carbon ambition. In FY24, Pernod Ricard started to work on the implementation of the new CSR. The Sustainable Business and Finance teams, along with Tech teams and other key functions have performed a double materiality, including IRO identification. This exercise is crucial to determine the materiality of impacts and dependencies of Pernod Ricard's activities on stakeholders as well as risks and opportunities for value creation.

## Row 2

### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Water

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

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks
- Opportunities

### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- Full

### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers

### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- Annually

### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

### (2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- Site-specific

## (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

### Commercially/publicly available tools

- WRI Aqueduct

### International methodologies and standards

- ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

### Other

- Scenario analysis

## (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

### Acute physical

- Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
- Drought
- Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

### Chronic physical

- Water stress
- Soil degradation
- Change in land-use
- Groundwater depletion
- Declining water quality
- Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

- Temperature variability
- Increased ecosystem vulnerability
- Water quality at a basin/catchment level
- Precipitation or hydrological variability
- Increased severity of extreme weather events

### Policy

- Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
- Increased pricing of water

## Market

- Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- Changing customer behavior

## Reputation

- Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

## Technology

- Data access/availability or monitoring systems
- Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

## Liability

- Non-compliance with regulations

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- Customers
- Employees
- Investors
- Suppliers
- Regulators
- Local communities
- Indigenous peoples
- Water utilities at a local level

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

Select from:

- No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*We have evaluated the effects of water risks on the success of our organisation growth strategy through different methods for our operations. 1/ The risks identification process is managed by the Internal Audit team every 2 to 3 years. This Risk Mapping covers all potential risks that may affect the Group (incl. water) with its different aspects such as water scarcity, raw materials volatility, flooding, etc. Each Brand Owner with manufacturing activities is certified ISO 14001 and*

therefore has identified the impacts of its activities on the environment (incl. water). Based on this assessment, risks are addressed through an action plan. In addition, internal audits are carried out by the internal Compliance team and cover various risks including those related to water. At Group level, we use WRI Aqueduct tool to identify the industrial sites located in high risk watersheds. For that purpose, we use Aqueduct's Overall Water Risk index. This aggregated index combines multiple physical, regulatory and reputational risks indicators, among which: Water stress, water depletion (water availability at basin level); Interannual / seasonal hydrological variability; Groudwater table decline (groundwater depletion); Coastal/riverine flood risk; Drought risk; Untreated connected wastewater, coastal eutrophication potential indicators (water quality at basin level); Unimproved/No drinking water or sanitation indicators ( WASH access); Peak RepRisk Country ESG Risk Index (regulatory and reputational risks). This tool is used for all affiliates and allows the Group to classify sites according to 4 risk categories: extremely high/high/medium/low. This survey identified 16 sites located in at least high risk areas. It covers the FY23 reporting period (July 2022 to June 2023). The periodic water risk assessments are used to inform our on-going water balance strategy and internal water use reduction efforts alongside other 2030 water goals. 2/ At business unit level, we used the methodology described above (1/) to identify risks related to our licence to operate, extreme climate conditions (flooding etc.) and discharge constraints. Then, we could anticipate risks that could have an impact on our growth strategy by implementing specific measures such as installing wastewater treatment plants and reducing the amount of water used to avoid water withdrawal exceedances. In FY24, Pernod Ricard started to work on the implementation of the new CSRD. The Sustainable Business and Finance teams, along with Tech teams and other key functions have performed a double materiality, including IRO identification. This exercise is crucial to determine the materiality of impacts of Pernod Ricard's activities on stakeholders as well as risks and opportunities for value creation.

[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**

As part of our climate risk analysis, both direct impact of climate change (change in global temperature) and indirect (impact on water availability, soil and ecosystem degradation) have been studied. We are currently refining our risk analysis on farmland to improve the granularity of our data and refine our analysis of combine effects of nature and climate.

[Fixed row]

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

### **(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations**

Select from:

- Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

### (2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

#### Sensitive locations

- Areas important for biodiversity
- Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

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

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

### (2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

*Direct operations: Pernod Ricard has mapped its own production sites that are located either close to any protected/sensitive area or in a high risk watershed. We use the International Union for Conservation of Nature World Database to identify sites located close to a sensitive/protected area, and WRI Aqueduct to assess the water risk level of minor water basins in which production sites are located. The assessment method consists of calculating a water risk index that takes into account Aqueduct's current overall water risk, current water stress and projected water stress indicators. We have defined thresholds to define high risk watersheds based on the index, and consider as priority sites located in these watersheds, which water consumption represents 5% of higher of the Group's total water consumption. No, we have a list/geospatial map of priority locations, but we will not be disclosing it. Upstream value chain: Pernod Ricard consolidates all data related to agricultural materials procurement. This allows to identify priority terroirs (terroir 1 raw material x 1 location) and to assess the pressure on nature that the company exerts through its purchases. Key indicators are: surface of land deforested, surface of land occupied, volumes of water withdrawn and quantities of nitrogen and phosphate released into water bodies. Finally, the pressure on nature information is overlapped with local nature vulnerability assessments (deforestation, soil organic content historic loss, water quantity & quality, ecosystem integrity & endangered species) to assess the impact of Pernod Ricard on Nature. This year, 26 combinations of crop x geography were identified to focus on water quantity and quality, 20 for soil health, 20 on ecosystem integrity and 12 countries for deforestation.*

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

### Risks

#### (2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

Qualitative

Quantitative

#### (2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

Revenue

#### (2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

% decrease

#### (2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

1-10

#### (2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

Likelihood of effect occurring



## (2.4.7) Application of definition

*Combination of likelihood of occurrence and impact is used to assess risk. Likelihood of occurrence indicates the % of chance of a risk occurring, and impact is analyzed on several types (financial, business interruption...). Both have 4 severity levels. Risk is reviewed every year by risk team and risk owners and then presented to Top Management*

### Opportunities

## (2.4.1) Type of definition

*Select all that apply*

- Qualitative
- Quantitative

## (2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

*Select from:*

- Revenue

## (2.4.3) Change to indicator

*Select from:*

- % decrease

## (2.4.4) % change to indicator

*Select from:*

- 1-10

## (2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

*Select all that apply*

- Likelihood of effect occurring

## (2.4.7) Application of definition

Combination of likelihood of occurrence and impact is used to assess opportunities. Likelihood of occurrence indicates the % of chance of an opportunity occurring, and impact is analyzed on several types (financial, business interruption...).

[Add row]

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

### **(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants**

Select from:

Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

### **(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified**

*Pernod Ricard manufacturing sites must comply with the corporate Environmental Standard in which minimum water management requirements are described. As a result, waste water discharge quantities and qualities should be monitored with an appropriate method and sampling protocol, and comply with applicable regulations. Potential pollutants (zinc, pH, biological oxygen demand, suspended solids etc.) or negative impacts of the waste water discharge on receiving bodies are assessed and controlled. Additionally, all sites environmental management systems must align to ISO 14001: 86% of sites were certified in FY23, covering 99% of production volumes. Clause 5.2 of ISO 14001:2015 requires to identify and meet compliance obligations, to make a commitment to protect the environment by preventing pollution, and to ensure continual improvement of environmental performance. The main pollutant in Pernod Ricard's production sites waste water discharge is organic matter. The pollutant load related to that parameter is expressed in Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) and is monitored through monthly sampling and reported annually at corporate level. As for Pernod Ricard-owned vineyards, farms must report annually their consumption of six different types of phytosanitary products and fertilizers (synthetic fungicide, sulphur, copper, insecticide, herbicide, fertilizer in nitrogen unit) which may be involved in water pollution. These metrics are reported in kilograms of active ingredients.*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

### **(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category**

Select from:

- Pesticides

### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*Pesticides, because they are toxic chemicals meant to kill pest species, can affect non-target species, such as plants, animals and humans. As they are used in Pernod Ricard vineyards and agricultural supply chain, they may contaminate water bodies, representing a threat for both human health and biodiversity.*

### (2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

### (2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances
- Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements
- Other, please specify :Monitoring progress for nitrates and pesticides with the share of direct affiliates who are committed to regenerative agriculture

### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*As part of its "Nurturing Terroir" strategy, Pernod Ricard has defined a set of Sustainable Agriculture Key Principles. This serves both as a guideline for company-controlled agricultural activities, and as a foundation for collaborating with suppliers in order to meet our 2030 target to have 100% of agricultural raw material produced or sourced in line with selected sustainability standards. The criteria that are addressed by these standards systematically include fertilizers management. In 2021, Pernod Ricard became the first corporate partner of the IUCN "Agriculture and Land Health initiative", which aims to build a global movement for sustainable and regenerative agriculture and create metrics to monitor progress by bringing together businesses, experts, academia and international organisations. In FY23 10,506 farmers have been empowered, supported and trained to sustainable agriculture principles through that programme. In parallel, Pernod Ricard seeks to progressively phase out of the use of fertilizers by transitioning to Regenerative Agriculture. The groups aims at having 100% of direct affiliates with a regenerative agriculture or biodiversity programme, linked to the group's priority terroirs. Local models for regenerative farming systems are currently being tested in the group's vineyards. There shall be 8 pilots by 2025, which will allow to share knowledge with the wine industry.*

**Row 3**

### (2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*The majority of waste water generated on Pernod Ricard's production sites contains organic matter that mainly comes from distillation processes (washing water, condensate from the concentration of distillation residues, etc.). The pollutant load related to that organic matter is expressed in Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD). The accumulation of these organic pollutants in the water bodies may favor the growth of different microorganisms that will eventually lead to oxygen depletion and disorder in the functioning of the aquatic ecosystem.*

### (2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

### (2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- Water recycling
- Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
- Upgrading of process equipment/methods

### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*As part of the corporate Environmental Standard requirements, Pernod Ricard manufacturing sites must take measures to reduce pollutant load at source, and to ensure waste water discharge complies with legal requirements before its release into the environment. Preventive measures to reduce pollutant load include waste water recycling (for washing, cooling system...), the recovery of wastes in a dry state and the valorization of by-products. Waste water treatments include aerobic and anaerobic digestion. Sites that most contribute to Pernod Ricard's discharge of waste water are encouraged to upgrade their treatment equipment. For instance, one of them is exploring ways to optimize the treatment of waste waters containing organic pollutants thanks to ozonation process. Progress is monitored through annual reporting of COD content of water discharge.*

**Row 4**

### (2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- Nitrates

### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*Nitrates and organic nitrogen compounds from fertilizers and manure enter groundwater through leaching and reach surface water through runoff from agricultural fields. A high level of nitrate makes water unsuitable as drinking water and excessive nutrient concentration in water systems will cause algae to grow excessively. Fertilizers use in Pernod Ricard vineyards and agricultural supply chain may affect the natural ecosystem and can lead to depletion of the oxygen in the water, having negative consequences for biodiversity, fisheries and recreational activities.*

### (2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

### (2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances
- Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements
- Other, please specify :Monitoring progress for nitrates and pesticides with the share of direct affiliates who are committed to regenerative agriculture

### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*As part of its "Nurturing Terroir" strategy, Pernod Ricard has defined a set of Sustainable Agriculture Key Principles. This serves both as a guideline for company-controlled agricultural activities, and as a foundation for collaborating with suppliers in order to meet our 2030 target to have 100% of agricultural raw material produced or sourced in line with selected sustainability standards. The criteria that are addressed by these standards systematically include fertilizers management. In 2021, Pernod Ricard became the first corporate partner of the IUCN "Agriculture and Land Health initiative", which aims to build a global movement for sustainable and regenerative agriculture and create metrics to monitor progress by bringing together businesses, experts, academia and international organisations. In FY23 10,506 farmers have been empowered, supported and trained to sustainable agriculture principles through that programme. In parallel, Pernod Ricard seeks to progressively phase out of the use of fertilizers by transitioning to Regenerative Agriculture. The groups aims at having 100% of direct affiliates with a regenerative*

*agriculture or biodiversity programme, linked to the group's priority terroirs. Local models for regenerative farming systems are currently being tested in the group's vineyards. There shall be 8 pilots by 2025, which will allow to share knowledge with the wine industry.*  
*[Add row]*

### C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

#### Climate change

##### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

*Select from:*

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

#### Water

##### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

*Select from:*

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

#### Plastics

##### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

*Select from:*

No

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

*Select from:*

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

### (3.1.3) Please explain

Plastic packaging accounts for less than 5% of primary packaging and Pernod Ricard strives to limit the quantities used, as illustrated by the Group's commitments to the New Plastics Economy vision of the Ellen MacArthur Foundation, of which the Group is a signatory and partner.

[Fixed row]

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

### Climate change

#### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk1

#### (3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

##### Acute physical

Other acute physical risk, please specify :Precipitation and/or hydrological variability, heatwaves or frost, extreme events

#### (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

Cuba

#### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk



*Reduced availability and increased price volatility of raw commodities in Pernod Ricard's supply chain due to yield decreases induced by climate change (regimes variations in temperature, precipitation and other agroclimatic drivers) will harm our activity as a food and beverage company fueled by agricultural commodities availability. Agricultural commodities are required to produce ingredients used in our beverages, and their shortage could halt our production and/or our suppliers' production. Moreover, other commodities benefit from an iconic status that require high-quality products to be sourced from specific locations (such as anise, fennel, orange, agave, etc.) and which reduced quality might harm our premium Brands production, letting alone the pure shortage risk.*

#### **(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk**

Select from:

- Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

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

Select from:

- Virtually certain

#### **(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**

*We expect an increased cost of goods sold (COGS) as well as increased risk of supply chain disruptions. Our "Nurturing terroir" strategy aims at mitigating those risks*

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

Select from:

Yes

### (3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

5600000

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

6500000

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

14600000

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

18000000

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

22500000

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

51200000

### (3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*The analysis was performed across 16 commodities and 34 terroirs of Pernod Ricard, selected based on a first multi-criteria mapping performed through all our strategic terroirs. This analysis cover 80% of our annual spend. The analysis focuses on the 2030, 2040 and 2050 time horizons across the 3 IPCC RCP scenarios: RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP8.5. We performed as follows: •Use of a FAO GAEZ-type agroclimatic portal to obtain yield variations (t/ha) per {regionXcommodity} combination (terroir), studied according to the listed horizons/scenarios, to estimate yield variations pathways. •Distinction between yield variations due to pure agroclimatic factors and variations due to soil quality and degradation, to better stress-test the impact of each of the 2 drivers and pave the way for ad-hoc adaptation measures. Final synthetic yield variations estimates are based on both agroclimatic and agroedaphic (soil-related) constraints. •Transcription of yield variations in production volumes at risk and cost variations for suppliers, who pass on part of the cost to us. These rates are estimated based on yield/price raw material elasticities using econometric modelling leveraging country-level historical time series available within USDA and FAOSTAT public databases. We considered as well*

additional price elasticities between raw materials and final processed goods purchased by Pernod Ricard, allowing to estimate the % variation in the purchase price of a product based on the % variations in price of the raw material. It allowed us to derive financial estimates per affiliate, commodity, terroir, and group-level consolidated figures. As an example, this analysis revealed that our sugarcane production terroir for Rhum is very likely to experience yield reductions from 12% to 14% by 2030, and 27% to 60% by 2050 in an RCP4.5, resp. RCP8.5. These decreases would put high pressure on the resource availability, resulting in annual increased procurement costs. Formula used to calculate financial impacts:  $\text{Increased procurement costs} = \text{yield decrease} * \text{price elasticity} * \text{future forecasted spent related to this terroir}$ . The calculation made are the following (rounded up results): RCP 4.5 2030:  $12\% * 5.2 * 9\text{Meur} = 5.6\text{Meur}$  2040:  $23\% * 5.2 * 12\text{Meur} = 14.6\text{Meur}$  2050:  $26\% * 5.2 * 16\text{Meur} = 22.5\text{Meur}$  RCP 8.5 2030:  $14\% * 5.2 * 9\text{Meur} = 6.5\text{Meur}$  2040:  $28\% * 5.2 * 12\text{Meur} = 18.1\text{Meur}$  2050:  $60\% * 5.2 * 16\text{Meur} = 51.2\text{Meur}$

### (3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

#### Policies and plans

- Adopt regenerative agriculture policies

### (3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4000000

### (3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

“Nurturing Terroir” is one of the 4 key pillars of our 2030 S&R Strategy. Our 3-step action plan helps map the various terroirs to achieve full traceability, assess environmental and social risks to these terroirs, and implement sustainability programs. Various levers are considered, among them: • Establishing a diversified and resilient cropping system • Selection and management of varieties that improve farm resilience • Agricultural practices that maintain and improve soil health • Support and training of farmers on regenerative agriculture practices • Varietal selection targeting resilience and resistance. The financial figure displayed in the cost of response to risk considers the annual part of the S&R total budget, allocated to “Nurturing Terroir” pillar, which is of 4 million euros annually from 2022 onwards up to 2030.

### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

This budget encompasses the CAPEX secured and already leveraged as part of achieving the “Nurturing Terroir” pillar of our S&R strategy, allocated notably to provide adequate training to farmers, support R&D costs on varietal research and implement regenerative agriculture practices through our first pilot projects as described above (no-tillage farming, reduced & organic fertilizer use, etc.). Case study involving our Absolut brand: The Absolut Wheat Sustainability Programme 2.0 is a program increasing focus on efforts for biodiversity, climate (CO2 emissions), water resources and soil health. In addition, we are creating a stronger compensation system, based on the starch content (quality) and sustainability actions, that reaches every farmer.

## Water

### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

- Risk1

### (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

- China
- India
- Spain
- France
- Greece
- Mexico
- Armenia
- Australia
- South Africa

### (3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Douro
- Krishna
- Godavari
- Guadiana
- Santiago
- Ganges - Brahmaputra
- Huang He (Yellow River)
- Other, please specify :Australia, South Coast ; Scheldt (France) ; Adriatic Sea, Black Sea Coast (Greece) ; South Africa, South Coast

Magdalena

### **(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk**

*As water is a key ingredient in Pernod Ricard's products and an essential resource in its industrial processes, the company mapped its production sites and dedicated co-packers (third party bottling process activities with at least 90% of production volume associated to Pernod Ricard) located in areas at high and extremely high water risk. Our water risk index is calculated based on a combination of WRI's Aqueduct overall water risk, baseline water stress and projected water stress indicators. The sites that fall in the risky category are part of our water replenishment programme, which aims at balancing the water consumed by the sites through a water replenishment project in the same minor basin.*

### **(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk**

Select from:

Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

Short-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**

*As we expect the primary water-related financial risk to be a disruption in production capacity, we mainly anticipate lost sales.*

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

Select from:

Yes

### (3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

160000

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

83000000

### (3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*We have estimated the range of financial impact based on the potential lost sales volumes that would result from a 30-day production disruption at one of the concerned sites in FY23. The minimum anticipated financial effect figure corresponds to the the estimation of potential lost sales revenue of the site that generates the lowest turnover, and the maximum anticipated financial effect figure to the estimated potential lost sales revenue of the one that generates the highest turnover.*

### (3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

#### **Infrastructure, technology and spending**

Adopt water efficiency, water reuse, recycling and conservation practices

### (3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1785000

### (3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost of response includes: 1) CAPEX invested in FY23 to implement water efficiency / reuse / recycling measures at sites located in high or extremely high risk basins and that contribute significantly to the Group's total water consumption (1.55 M); 2) Cost of water replenishment projects financed by affiliates since start of water replenishment programme (0,23 M).*

### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

*Our first response to mitigate the risk of water stress and consequent disruption in production on our production sites is to adopt water-efficiency, reuse and recycling measures so as to decrease the local consumption. These projects are formalized and planned through water roadmaps that we collect bi-annually from our distilleries located in high and extremely high risk water basins. The risk level is determined through the calculation of an internal water risk index based on WRI Aqueduct's data. Our second response is the deployment of our water replenishment programme, which consists of balancing high and extremely highly water-stressed sites's water consumption through water replenishment projects (watersheds protection and restoration, WASH projects, improvement of agricultural irrigation systems, etc.). For instance, since 2020 House of Tequila co-finances a reforestation and watershed restoration project with other peers from the beverage industry in Rio Santiago - Guadalajara region. This compensated almost 20 000 m3 of the affiliate's water consumption in FY24.*

## **Water**

### **(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier**

Select from:

- Risk2

### **(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver**

#### **Chronic physical**

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

### **(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

- Armenia
- Australia
- France
- India
- Mexico

### (3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Ganges - Brahmaputra
- Godavari
- Krishna
- Santiago
- Other, please specify :Caspian Sea, South West Coast (Armenia) ; Australia, South Coast ; Scheldt (France)

### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

*The increased severity and frequency of extreme weather events induced by climate change will impact our operations and industrial facilities, leading to direct damages to stock and content as well as business disruption periods. The most material hazards are formed by cyclones and flooding, as well as extreme heatwaves and water stress. While we are already adapted and prepared to cyclones and flooding events through ad-hoc business continuity plans, constructions designs and repeated watches, water scarcity remains a challenge. As a beverage company, water is critical for our operational processes (cleaning, cooling, heating, pasteurizing, malting, etc.) and also forms the core of our products. We have already experienced production disruptions due to water scarcity and subsequent restricted usages defined by local authorities, the latest being a shortage of energy supply from hydropower plant in our distillery located within Sichuan region during summer 2022. Indeed, more intense and longer droughts will exacerbate the local tensions between competing usages over the water resource. Facilities business interruptions could halt part of our supply chain for the related Brands and products, and reduce our production. Currently, based on analyses performed through WRI Aqueduct platform, 8 sites along our value chain are located in highly water stressed areas, highlighting how much we need to continue our adaptation planning and integrate this consideration into our operations.*

### (3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Closure of operations

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

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

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



Select from:

Very likely

#### **(3.1.1.14) Magnitude**

Select from:

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**

*We expect the impact to be limited as mitigation solution exist and as a mitigation strategy is in place*

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

Select from:

Yes

#### **(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)**

7400000

#### **(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)**

8400000

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

11300000

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

11300000

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

15200000

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

15200000

### (3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*These provided financial results represent the annual revenues losses and are based on the example of water stress, following the below calculations and methodological steps performed: We have considered own sites to run through WRI Aqueduct platform to cover 2030 and 2040 time horizons for both RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. This has allowed to define in each case all sites being very highly exposed to water stress as located in areas experiencing water stress 100%, which reflects on an overuse of the resource. - For each of those sites, the related annual production volumes (in case of glass factories & distilleries) or production storage (in case of warehouses) expressed in k9Lcs (case of 9 liters), have been gathered. - Their financial related values have then been defined, based on the 2018 average group-level revenue generated, expressed in euros/9Lcs - A 1 week business disruption has then been applied as our main stress-test hypothesis, based on our internal experts' recommendations, Annual production volumes losses and sales at site-level have been then derived accordingly, which provides a site-level impact calculated given the following formula: Decreased annual revenues at site-level 1 weeks of disruption / 52 weeks \* annual production volumes or storage at risk of water stress \* financial value per unit of production volume (euro/L9cs) Total decreased annual revenues sum of all site-level decreased revenues Considering 2030 time horizon and RCP8.5: The calculation made are the following (rounded up results) RCP 4.5 2030: 20.2 eur/9LCs \* 1/52 weeks \* 22 M L9cs of production under water stressed locations 8.4Meur 2040: 20.2 eur/9LCs \* 1/52 weeks \* 29 M L9cs of production under water stressed locations 11.3Meur 2050: 20.2 eur/9LCs \* 1/52 weeks \* 39 M L9cs of production under water stressed locations 15.2Meur RCP8.5 2030: 20.2 eur/9LCs \* 1/52 weeks \* 19 M L9cs of production under water stressed locations 7.3Meur 2040: 20.2 eur/9LCs \* 1/52 weeks \* 29 M L9cs of production under water stressed locations 11.3Meur 2050: 20.2 eur/9LCs \* 1/52 weeks \* 39 M L9cs of production under water stressed locations 15.2Meur*

### (3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

#### Compliance, monitoring and targets

- Establish site-specific targets

### (3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

2000000

### (3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*Pernod Ricard is committed to reduce water consumption through our operations by 20% by 2030 compared to our 2018 baseline, and to replenish 100% of our water consumption in watersheds of our production sites and dedicated copackers located in high-risk of water stress areas. This has been further turned into operational*

targets at site-level across our locations. This is a key feature of our adaptation strategy to ensure our affiliates and suppliers use water efficiently. This strategy has triggered investments and a detailed business plan. To build on these actions, we have estimated that a total of at least 2M euros of investments would be needed annually. This represents 18M between 2022 and 2030. Of those, 650 000 euros are clearly identified, and we are working on identifying the other actions. The cost of adaptation displayed includes all the historical and upcoming required cumulative investments to continue implementing these measures and hence reach our target.

### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our strategy has already led to a 8% reduction of the overall water consumption intensity between 2018 and 2022. In FY23, 58% of the total water consumed in high-risk areas has been replenished in the same watershed. Water replenishment projects come out in various types, including: - Improved water access and sanitation (e.g., tanks development) - Watershed protection and restoration (e.g., reforestation, ponds restoration) - Improved systems for productive use of water (e.g., installation of drip irrigation system, fixing of leakages, etc.) Case study: In Baohu Urban Wetland Park (China), the water replenishment project launched by Pernod Ricard China in 2021 consisted in the installation of drip irrigation pipes in green areas and the repair and maintenance of leaking irrigation pipelines and damaged micro-sprinklers. This allows to save around 20 000 m3 of water every year (measured with water meters in wells).

[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:

OPEX

#### (3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

4723000

#### (3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

2500000

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

*The 2.5 mEUR is the cost related to vineyards production loss due to the Cyclone Gabrielle in New-Zealand in our PRW subsidiary. The 4.7 mEUR is the cost related to the carbon taxes we pay each year on our facilities eligible to the ETS system.*

## Water

### (3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

OPEX

### (3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

### (3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

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

Select from:

- Less than 1%

**(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures**

The 2.5 mEUR is the cost related to vineyards production loss due to the Cyclone Gabrielle in New-Zealand in our PRW subsidiary.  
[Add row]

**(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?**

**Row 1**

**(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin**

**India**

- Ganges - Brahmaputra

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

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 2

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

Godavari

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

Select all that apply

Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

- Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

### Row 3

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

- Krishna

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

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

- 1-25%

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

Select from:

- Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 5

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

#### China

- Huang He (Yellow River)

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

*Select all that apply*

- Direct operations

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

1

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

*Select from:*

- 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

- Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain



*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 6

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

#### Portugal

Guadiana

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

*Select all that apply*

Direct operations

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

1

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

*Select from:*

1-25%

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

*Select from:*

Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 7

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Portugal

Douro

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

Select all that apply

Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 8

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**India**

Other, please specify :Sabarmati

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

Select all that apply

Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

**(3.2.11) Please explain**

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

**Row 9**

**(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin**

**South Africa**

Other, please specify :South Coast

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

Select all that apply

Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 10

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**Mexico**

Other, please specify :Río Lerma

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

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

- 1-25%

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

Select from:

- Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 11

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

#### Armenia

- Other, please specify :Caspian Sea, South West Coast

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

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

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

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

**(3.2.11) Please explain**

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

**Row 12****(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin**

**France**

Other, please specify :Scheldt

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

Select all that apply

Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.*

## Row 13

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**South Africa**

Breede-Gouritz

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

Select all that apply

Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

The percentage of company-wide facilities exposed to water risks within identified river basins is calculated based on the proportion of these sites' production volume compared to the group's total production volume. This facility is located in a high water risk area with strict regulation that limits water consumption.

[Add row]

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

|  | Water-related regulatory violations                    | Comment   |
|--|--|---|
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Pernod Ricard was not subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations in FY23. |

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

Yes

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

Select all that apply

EU ETS



UK ETS

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

**EU ETS**

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

16.7

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

0

**(3.5.2.3) Period start date**

06/30/2022

**(3.5.2.4) Period end date**

06/29/2023

**(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated**

15412

**(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased**

28095

**(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e**

43507

**(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e**

0

### (3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

Facilities we own and operate

### (3.5.2.10) Comment

*Two of our distilleries are regulated by the EU ETS carbon price system*

## UK ETS

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

16.7

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

0

### (3.5.2.3) Period start date

06/30/2022

### (3.5.2.4) Period end date

06/29/2023

### (3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

7717

### (3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

35842

### (3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

43557

### (3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

### (3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

Facilities we own and operate

### (3.5.2.10) Comment

*Two of our distilleries are regulated by the UK ETS carbon price system  
[Fixed row]*

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

*A description of your strategy for complying with the systems in which you participate”The Group’s two largest distilleries are participating to the EU or UK - Emissions Trading Scheme.For all of them, the strategy is:· continuous monitoring of energy consumption;· in-depth energy assessments, with the setting of energy-efficiency targets;· roll-out of consumption reduction programmes requiring the management of processes and utilities, and which may involve significant investment;· implementation of energy management systems with ISO 50 001 certification when relevant.We commit to reduce by 54% absolute scope 12 CO2 emissions from 2022 to 2030 in line with SBTi requirements which will lead to set additional investment plans to reduce significant CO2 emissions of our main distilleries.“An example of how you have applied your strategy”To date, the Nöbbelöv (Sweden), Middleton (Ireland) and Gallienne (France) distilleries and the Campo Viejo (Spain) vinification site are ISO 50001 certified.In Sweden, the Nöbbelöv distillery has a certified energy management system (ISO 50001), reuse the heat produced during the fermentation and distillation processes. In Ireland, Irish Distillers took advantage of the extension of its Middleton distillery to optimize its processes and select the best available technologies, leading to energy savings and CO2 emissions reduction.*

### (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 | <i>Select from:</i><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized |
| Water          | <i>Select from:</i><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized |

[Fixed row]

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

### Climate change

#### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

*Select from:*

Opp1

#### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

##### Resilience

Other resilience opportunity, please specify : Agricultural systems adaption

#### (3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

*Select from:*

Upstream value chain

### (3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- France

### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*“Nurturing Terroir” is one of the 4 key pillars of our 2030 S&R Strategy. Our 3-step action plan helps map the various terroirs to achieve full traceability, assess environmental and social risks to these terroirs, and implement sustainability programs. Various levers are considered, among them: • Establishing a diversified and resilient cropping system • Selection and management of varieties that improve farm resilience • Agricultural practices that maintain and improve soil health • Support and training of farmers on regenerative agriculture practices • Varietal selection targeting resilience and resistance. The financial figure displayed in the cost of response to risk considers the annual part of the S&R total budget, allocated to “Nurturing Terroir” pillar, which is of 4 million euros annually from 2022 onwards up to 2030. This budget encompasses the CAPEX secured and already leveraged as part of achieving the “Nurturing Terroir” pillar of our S&R strategy, allocated notably to provide adequate training to farmers, support R&D costs on varietal research and implement regenerative agriculture practices through our first pilot projects as described above (no-tillage farming, reduced & organic fertilizer use, etc.).*

### (3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- Other, please specify :Increased stability of agricultural systems to maintain yields

### (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
- Long-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:

Low

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

*Increased supply chain resilience leading to less supply chain disruptions and reduced cost increase from climate risks*

**(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)**

3800000

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

4500000

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

8400000

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

10000000

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

11000000

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

30000000

### (3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

We have drawn these figures by considering that the regenerative agriculture practices implemented would prevent production to decrease due to climate change impacts. We are able to draw estimated financial impacts by considering that they correspond to the prevented financial adverse impacts due to climate change. The methodology is as follows: •Use of a FAO GAEZ-type agroclimatic portal to obtain yield variations (t/ha) per {regionXcommodity} combination (terroir), studied according to the listed horizons/scenarios, in order to estimate yield variations pathways. •Distinction between yield variations due to pure agroclimatic factors and due to soil quality and degradation, to better stress-test the impact of both drivers and pave the way for ad-hoc adaptation measures. Final synthetic yield variations estimates are based on both agroclimatic and agroedaphic (soil-related) constraints. •Transcription of yield variations into production volumes at risk and cost variations for suppliers, who pass on part of the cost to Pernod Ricard. Cost pass through rates are estimated based on yield/price raw material elasticities using econometric modelling leveraging country-level historical time series available in USDA and FAOSTAT databases. We considered as well additional price elasticities between raw materials and final processed goods purchased by Pernod Ricard, allowing to estimate the variation in the purchase price of a product based on the variations in price of the raw material. All these steps allowed us to derive the avoided additional procurement costs that would have occurred without adaptation measures, per affiliate, commodity and terroir, as well as group-level consolidated figures. These yield decreases would put high pressure on the resource availability, which would lead to annual increased procurement costs, calculated below  $\text{Increased procurement costs} = \text{yield decrease} * \text{price elasticity} * \text{future forecasted spent related to the terroir}$ . The calculation made are the following (rounded up results) RCP 4.5 2030:  $13\% * 0,9 * 31,2\text{Meur} = 3,8\text{Meur}$  2040:  $22\% * 0,9 * 42,0\text{Meur} = 8,4\text{Meur}$  2050:  $21\% * 0,9 * 56,3\text{Meur} = 11,2 \text{ Meur}$  RCP 8.5 2030:  $15\% * 0,9 * 31,2\text{Meur} = 4,4 \text{ Meur}$  2040:  $26\% * 0,9 * 42,0\text{Meur} = 10,0\text{Meur}$  2050:  $57\% * 0,9 * 56,3\text{Meur} = 29,9\text{Meur}$

### (3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

4000000

### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The financial figure displayed in the cost of response to risk considers the annual part of the S&R total budget allocated to “Nurturing Terroir” pillar, which is of 4 million euros annually along the FY22-FY30 period covering our S&R roadmap, for a total of 36 m during the period. The financial figure displayed in the cost of response to risk considers the annual CAPEX secured and already leveraged as part of achieving the “Nurturing Terroir” pillar of our S&R strategy, which are allocated notably to provide adequate training to farmers, support R&D costs on varietal research and implement regenerative agriculture practices through our current pilot projects as described above (no-tillage farming, reduced & organic fertilizer use, etc.). Case study: The Absolut Wheat Sustainability Programme 2.0 is a program increasing focus on efforts for biodiversity, climate (CO2 emissions), water resources and soil health. In addition, we are creating a stronger compensation system, based on the starch content (quality) and sustainability actions, that reaches every farmer.

### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

“Nurturing Terroir” is one of the 4 key pillars of our 2030 S&R Strategy. To manage risks within agricultural supply chains, address the duty of care and achieve its ambition of nurturing terroirs, the Group has implemented a 3-level action plan. The action plan helps map the various terroirs to achieve full traceability, assess environmental and social risks to these terroirs, and implement sustainability programs. The implementation of regenerative agricultural practices and the use of technical and technological tools help increase local resilience to climatic events. Various levers are considered, among them: • Establishing a diversified and resilient

*cropping system • Selection and management of varieties that improve farm resilience • Agricultural practices that maintain and improve soil health • Support and training of farmers on regenerative agriculture practices • Varietal selection targeting resilience and resistance*

## Water

### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

- Opp1

### (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

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cuba   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mexico                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> China  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sweden                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> India  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Armenia                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Canada   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ireland                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> France   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United States of America |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |  |

### (3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply



- Spey
- Krishna
- Godavari
- Rio Grande
- St. Lawrence

- Ganges - Brahmaputra
- Huang He (Yellow River)

### **(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description**

*Water efficiency, reuse and recycling projects formalized and planned in the water roadmaps that we collect and consolidate bi-annually from our distilleries are expected to decrease water usage and therefore consumption costs. Such projects have already been implemented, however we have not been able to calculate the precise financial gains and still rely on estimations. E.g. This year a rain water harvesting device was installed at the Midleton Distillery, Ireland, allowing to save almost 15 000 m3 of water during the year.*

### **(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:*

- Medium-low

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

*Decrease in costs related to water withdrawals and discharge*

**(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)**

15000000

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

25000000

**(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures**

*With an estimated price of 5/m3 and 4 million m3 of expected water savings between FY25 and FY30, we expect a total financial effect of 15 000 000 to 25 000 000.*

**(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity**

20000000

**(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation**

*The cost to realize opportunity is estimated based on the planned FY25-30 budget to implement efficiency measures collected through the distilleries water roadmaps this year.*

**(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity**

*The Group aims at reducing the water consumption intensity at distilleries (i.e. water consumed per kL of pure alcohol distilled) by 20,9% by FY30 vs FY18 baseline. This target is linked to an internal long term incentive plan and to green bonds. We already achieved 13% of reduction vs FY18.*

## Water

### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

- Opp2

### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

#### Resource efficiency

- Water recovery from sewage treatment

### (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

- Cuba
- China
- India
- Canada
- France
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Mexico
- Sweden
- Armenia
- Ireland
- United States of America

### (3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- Spey
- Krishna
- Ganges - Brahmaputra
- Huang He (Yellow River)

- Godavari
- Rio Grande
- St. Lawrence

### **(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description**

*Water recovery from sewage treatment projects formalized and planned in the water roadmaps that we collect and consolidate bi-annually from our distilleries are expected to decrease water usage and therefore consumption costs. Such projects have already been implemented, however we have not been able to calculate the precise financial gains and still rely on estimations. E.g. This year, the permeate from the waste water treatment plant permeate was recovered using reverse osmosis at the Midleton Distillery, Ireland, allowing to save around 200 000 m3 of water during the year.*

### **(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:*

- Low

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

*Decrease in costs related to water withdrawals and discharge*

### (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)

3000000

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

5000000

### (3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*With an estimated price of 5/m<sup>3</sup> and 800 000 m<sup>3</sup> of expected water savings between FY25 and FY30 thanks to waste water recovery projects, we expect a total financial effect of 3 000 000 to 5 000 000.*

### (3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

20000000

### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost to realize opportunity is estimated based on the planned FY25-30 budget to implement efficiency measures collected through the distilleries water roadmaps this year.*

### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*The Group aims at reducing the water consumption intensity at distilleries (i.e. water consumed per kL of pure alcohol distilled) by 20,9% by FY30 vs FY18 baseline. This target is linked to an internal long term incentive plan and to green bonds. We already achieved 13% of reduction vs FY18.*

*[Add row]*

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

## Climate change

### (3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

CAPEX

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

34100000

### (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

*In FY23, Pernod Ricard invested part of its CAPEX on Green-Taxonomy eligible and aligned investments. 3,79% is the part dedicated to the activity for building construction (7.1 activity in the Green Taxonomy categories).*

## Water

### (3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

CAPEX

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

1680000

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

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

*In FY23, Pernod Ricard invested part of its CAPEX on water related projects to improve the efficiency of water usage in industrial processes*  
[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:

Half-yearly

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

Select all that apply

Non-executive directors or equivalent

Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

#### (4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

Yes, and it is publicly available

#### (4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

*The non-discrimination policy is based on reliable and consistent global talent identification and management processes, as well as succession planning focused on performance and potential. Pernod Ricard's Board of Directors, on the recommendation of the Nominations and Governance Committee, established binding objectives within its Sustainability & Responsibility roadmap relating to diversity in the Group's management bodies: by 2030, Pernod Ricard's Top Management will have to include a minimum of 40% of each gender. The Board of Directors and the Nominations and Governance Committee identify the guidelines to be issued in order to ensure the best balance possible by seeking complementary profiles from both international and diversity perspectives in terms of nationality, gender, and experience. The Nominations and Governance Committee sets formal selection criteria for new directorship candidates with the aim of achieving balanced*



representation and complementarity between the different profiles on the Board. Regarding the determination of the selection criteria, the Nominations and Governance Committee takes into account the Board of Directors' diversity policy, not only in terms of expertise and experience, but also in terms of independence, gender representation, nationality and seniority, as well as any specific expectations of the Board expressed during the assessment of its operating procedures.

#### (4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

Universel Registration Document 2023 VUK.pdf  
 [Fixed row]

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

|                | Board-level oversight of this environmental issue       |
|----------------|---|
| Climate change | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Water          | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Biodiversity   | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |

[Fixed row]

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

##### Climate change

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

Select all that apply

- Board chair
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

Select all that apply

- Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :During FY 2023, the CSR Committee's main activities included: • presentation of the Group's preliminary work on climate scenarios; • information on regulatory changes, in particular the EU Taxonomy; • information on expected changes in terms of sus

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

#### **(4.1.2.7) Please explain**

*The CSR committee meets twice a year to monitor the Group's progress, challenges the ambition of the S&R strategy and raises awareness of long-term sustainability trends. The Board then identifies priority areas for action and which relevant issues to incorporate into strategic plans and budgets at operational levels. Reports to the wider Board. A joint committee (Audit Committee members and CSR Committee members) meets one a year to oversee the reporting process, the*

preparation to the forthcoming CSRD and the CSR performance of the Groupe. The Excom, composed of the CEO, the CFO, the COO, the EVP HR, the EVP Legal & Compliance, Chairman & CEO North America, EVP Global Markets and EVP Global Brands. The Executive Committees ensures that the Group's operations are carried out properly and that its main policies are applied, including the sustainability strategy which is one of the Company's top priorities. It is thus ultimately accountable for Pernod Ricard's performance against the S&R strategic goals. The CSO reports directly to the EVP Integrated Operations & Sustainability (ExCom members) and is in charge of monitoring the reporting, progress against targets, approve CAPEX and OPEX plans and oversee employee incentives. It is responsible for monitoring the implementation of our transition plan, through regular updates.

## Water

### (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)
- Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

Select all that apply

- Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :During FY 2023, the CSR Committee's main activities included: • presentation of the Group's preliminary work on climate scenarios; • information on regulatory changes, in particular the EU Taxonomy; • information on expected changes in terms of sus

### (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

- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

#### **(4.1.2.7) Please explain**

*The CSR committee meets twice a year to monitor the Group's progress, challenges the ambition of the S&R strategy and raises awareness of long-term sustainability trends. The Board then identifies priority areas for action and which relevant issues to incorporate into strategic plans and budgets at operational levels. Reports to the wider Board. A joint committee (Audit Committee members and CSR Committee members) meets once a year to oversee the reporting process, the preparation to the forthcoming CSRD and the CSR performance of the Groupe. The Excom, composed of the CEO, the CFO, the COO, the EVP HR, the EVP Legal & Compliance, Chairman & CEO North America, EVP Global Markets and EVP Global Brands. The Executive Committees ensures that the Group's operations are carried out properly and that its main policies are applied, including the sustainability strategy which is one of the Company's top priorities. It is thus ultimately accountable for Pernod Ricard's performance against the S&R strategic goals. The CSO reports directly to the EVP Integrated Operations & Sustainability (ExCom members) and is in charge of monitoring the reporting, progress against targets, approve CAPEX and OPEX plans and oversee employee incentives. It is responsible for monitoring the implementation of our transition plan, through regular 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)
- Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

Select all that apply

- Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :During FY 2023, the CSR Committee’s main activities included: • presentation of the Group’s preliminary work on climate scenarios; • information on regulatory changes, in particular the EU Taxonomy; • information on expected changes in terms of sus

#### (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

- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
- Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*The CSR committee meets twice a year to monitor the Group’s progress, challenges the ambition of the S&R strategy and raises awareness of long-term sustainability trends. The Board then identifies priority areas for action and which relevant issues to incorporate into strategic plans and budgets at operational levels. Reports to the wider Board. A joint committee (Audit Committee members and CSR Committee members) meets one a year to oversee the reporting process, the preparation to the forthcoming CSRD and the CSR performance of the Groupe. The Excom, composed of the CEO, the CFO, the COO, the EVP HR, the EVP Legal & Compliance, Chairman & CEO North America, EVP Global Markets and EVP Global Brands. The Executive Committees ensures that the Group’s operations are carried out properly and that its main policies are applied, including the sustainability strategy which is one of the Company’s top priorities. It is thus ultimately accountable for Pernod Ricard’s performance against the S&R strategic goals. The CSO reports directly to the EVP Integrated Operations & Sustainability (ExCom members) and is in charge of monitoring the reporting, progress against targets, approve CAPEX and OPEX plans and oversee employee incentives. It is responsible for monitoring the implementation of our transition plan, through regular updates.*  
[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

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

### (4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

#### Additional training

Training in an environmental subject by a certified organization, please specify :IFA - Institut Français des Administrateurs

#### Experience

Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

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

## Water

### (4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes

### (4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

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

Other, please specify :The Group also held the Climate Leadership Day, an executive level event on climate-related issues. This first-of-its-kind event brought together the Executive Committee members to discuss and agree on initiatives

### (4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

#### Additional training

Training in an environmental subject by a certified organization, please specify :IFA - Institut Français des Administrateurs

#### Experience

Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

## Climate change

### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

#### Executive level

- Chief Operating Officer (COO)

### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

#### Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

#### Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

#### Policies, commitments, and targets

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

#### Strategy and financial planning

- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Developing a climate transition plan
- Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- 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 CSR Committee meets twice a year to monitor the Group's progress, challenges the ambition of the S&R strategy and raises awareness of long-term sustainability trends. The Board then identifies priority areas for action and which relevant issues to incorporate into strategic plans and budgets at operational levels. Reports to the wider Board. The newly appointed Joint Committee (Audit committee and S&R committee) is in charge of overseeing the reporting processes, Group ESG performance and audit, notably in regards to the forthcoming CSRD. The EVP Integrated Operations & S&R is in charge or overseeing Climate Change related topics, including the development of a transition plan to ensure the resilience of the Group's activities.*

## Water

#### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

##### Executive level

- Chief Operating Officer (COO)

#### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

##### Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

##### Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

##### Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

- Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

#### **Strategy and financial planning**

- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Developing a climate transition plan
- Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- 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 CSR Committee meets twice a year to monitor the Group's progress, challenges the ambition of the S&R strategy and raises awareness of long-term sustainability trends. The Board then identifies priority areas for action and which relevant issues to incorporate into strategic plans and budgets at operational levels. Reports to the wider Board. The newly appointed Joint Committee (Audit committee and S&R committee) is in charge of overseeing the reporting processes, Group ESG performance and audit, notably in regards to the forthcoming CSRD. The EVP Integrated Operations & S&R is in charge or overseeing Climate Change related topics, including the development of a transition plan to ensure the resilience of the Group's activities.*

## **Biodiversity**

### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

#### Executive level

- Chief Operating Officer (COO)

### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

#### Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

#### Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

#### Policies, commitments, and targets

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

#### Strategy and financial planning

- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Developing a climate transition plan
- Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- 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 CSR Committee meets twice a year to monitor the Group's progress, challenges the ambition of the S&R strategy and raises awareness of long-term sustainability trends. The Board then identifies priority areas for action and which relevant issues to incorporate into strategic plans and budgets at operational levels. Reports to the wider Board. The newly appointed Joint Committee (Audit committee and S&R committee) is in charge of overseeing the reporting processes, Group ESG performance and audit, notably in regards to the forthcoming CSRD. The EVP Integrated Operations & S&R is in charge or overseeing Climate Change related topics, including the development of a transition plan to ensure the resilience of the Group's activities.*

[Add row]

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

#### Climate change

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

Select from:

Yes

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

5

#### (4.5.3) Please explain

*The Group's Long-Term Incentives Plan (LTIP) includes CSR criteria, one of them being linked to the implementation of the scope 1 and 2 roadmap (i.e., a 54% reduction in scope 1 and 2 of production sites in 2030 compared to FY18).*

## Water

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

Select from:

Yes

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

5

### (4.5.3) Please explain

*The Group's Long-Term Incentives Plan (LTIP) includes CSR criteria, one of them being linked to the implementation of the water roadmap (i.e., a 20.9% reduction in water consumption intensity in distilleries by 2030 compared to FY18).*

*[Fixed row]*

**(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).**

## Climate change

### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

**Board or executive level**

Corporate executive team

### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

Shares

### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

## Targets

- Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

## Strategy and financial planning

- Achievement of climate transition plan

### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

- Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual multi-year bonus)

### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*Long-Term Incentive Plan (for Executive Directors and Top Management (band C and above)): The Board of Directors has decided in 2021 to grant shares free of charge to some employees and Executive Directors of the Company and Group companies, and introduced a criterion based on social responsibility in line with its roadmap in this area. The shares to be allocated would be subject notably to an internal performance condition related to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) based on 4 sub-criteria. One of them is related to carbon and related to the implementation of the roadmap to reduce direct CO2 emissions generated by Pernod Ricard's sites in order to reach Net Zero ambition by 2030. Therefore, for the Company's Executive Directors and members of the Executive Committee, the weighting of each of the three performance criteria would be as follows: 50% of the allocations would be subject to the internal PRO (Group Profit from Recurring Operations) performance condition, 20% would be subject to the internal CSR performance condition and 30% would be subject to the external TSR performance condition. For the other beneficiaries, the weighting would be as follows: 80% of the allocations would be subject to the internal PRO performance condition and 20% would be subject to the internal CSR performance condition.*

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

*This incentive scheme encourages the Group to pursue the reduction targets, develop innovative ideas to decrease emissions and invest massively in our distilleries (example with the new Kentucky distillery in the US or our major investments on the Middleton distillery for Irish Distillers).*

## Water

### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

#### Board or executive level

- Corporate executive team

### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

- Shares

### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

#### Targets

- Achievement of environmental targets

#### Resource use and efficiency

- Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

- Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual multi-year bonus)

### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*Long-Term Incentive Plan (for Executive Directors and Top Management (band C and above)): The Board of Directors has decided in 2021 to grant shares free of charge to some employees and Executive Directors of the Company and Group companies, and introduced a criterion based on social responsibility in line with its roadmap in this area. The shares to be allocated would be subject notably to an internal performance condition related to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) based on 4 sub-criteria. One of them is related to water and related to the implementation of the roadmap to reduce direct water consumption at Pernod Ricard's distilleries by 20.9% by FY30 vs FY18. Therefore, for the Company's Executive Directors and members of the Executive Committee, the weighting of each of the three performance criteria would be as follows: 50% of the allocations would be subject to the internal PRO (Group Profit from Recurring Operations) performance condition, 20% would be subject to the internal CSR performance condition and 30% would be subject to the external TSR performance condition. For the other beneficiaries, the weighting would be as follows: 80% of the allocations would be subject to the internal PRO performance condition and 20% would be subject to the internal CSR performance condition.*

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

*This incentive scheme encourages the Group to pursue the reduction targets, develop innovative ideas to decrease water consumption and invest massively in our distilleries (example with the Group's investments in MVR which contributes directly to reducing water consumption).*

[Add row]

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <b>Does your organization have any environmental policies?</b> |
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes        |

[Fixed row]

#### **(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.**

##### **Row 1**

#### **(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered**

*Select all that apply*

- Climate change
- Water
- Biodiversity

#### **(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage**

*Select from:*

- Organization-wide

#### **(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered**



Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

#### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*Our commitments on climate change cover both our operations and our upstream value chain (agricultural material, packaging, logistic suppliers, etc.). Our commitments on water currently cover our operations, and we plan to revise their ambition by FY26 to include our upstream value chain as well. Our commitments on biodiversity cover our upstream value chain (agricultural material suppliers), which is the most material of our value chain stages on that matter.*

#### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

##### **Environmental commitments**

- Commitment to a circular economy strategy
- Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues
- Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems
- Commitment to engage in integrated, multi-stakeholder landscape (including river basin) initiatives to promote shared sustainability goals

##### **Climate-specific commitments**

- Commitment to net-zero emissions
- Commitment to not funding climate-denial or lobbying against climate regulations
- Other climate-related commitment, please specify :Commit to 100% renewable electricity

##### **Water-specific commitments**

- Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution
- Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes
- Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities
- Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems
- Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

#### Additional references/Descriptions

- Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation
- Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems
- Description of environmental requirements for procurement
- Description of renewable electricity procurement practices
- Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

#### (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
- Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation
- Yes, in line with another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :In line with Sustainable Development Goal 12, 13, 14, 15.

#### (4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- Publicly available

#### (4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

URD FY23 English.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

- RE100
- UN Global Compact
- European Climate Pact
- Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation Global Commitment
- Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
- World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)
- Other, please specify :**One Planet Business for Biodiversity**

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

- Ellen MacArthur Foundation: Pernod Ricard became a partner of the Ellen MacArthur Foundation in FY22 and is signatory of "New Plastics Economy Global Commitment" - RE100: Pernod Ricard is committed to RE100 since 2019, and has set an goal to reach 100% of renewable electricity consumption for its offices and productions sites in 2025 - SBTi: Pernod Ricard submitted a greenhouse gas emission reduction target to the Science-Based Targets (SBT) initiative. In May 2024, the SBT initiative approved our targets, which are aligned with a 1,5C scenario for our Scope 1 and 2 emission, meaning a 54% scope 1 and 2 absolute emission reduction by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050 - TCFD: Pernod Ricard follows the recommendations of the TCFD to ensure its climate change strategy is aligned to global stakes - UN Global Compact: The Group has been a member of the Global Compact since 2003. It is actively working with others to develop initiatives that fully align with the business's commitment to sustainability - EU Climate Pact: Pernod Ricard's objectives on GHG emissions reduction are aligned to the ambition described in the European Green Deal. - WBCSD / OP2B: Pernod Ricard joined the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), a coalition of global businesses working together to limit the climate crisis, restore nature and tackle inequality, with a vision to build a world where nine billion people are living well and within the boundaries of the planet, by 2050. As part of its membership, Pernod Ricard has also joined the One Planet Business for Biodiversity (OP2B) - an international, cross-sectoral and action-oriented business coalition on biodiversity with a specific focus on regenerative agriculture.

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement  
 Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

#### **(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement**

*Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf.\_2.pdf*

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

Select from:

- Yes

#### **(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on**

Select all that apply

- Mandatory government register

#### **(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization**

*EU Transparency Register n 352172811-92 Register for Haute Autorité pour la Transparence de la Vie Publique*

#### **(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**

To ensure that our engagement activities are consistent with our climate change strategy and water policy, we engage in extensive collaboration with the Public Affairs, S&R and Operations teams. This allows us to best select our engagements, ensuring that our messages are well aligned with our strategy, roadmap and ambitions, as well as our reduction targets. Moreover, all Pernod Ricard employees are expected to apply a strong sense of ethics to their daily activities, including any lobbying initiatives they may undertake to influence policy making and decision taking that affects the Group and the industry. Employees have to ensure that all lobbying initiatives are consistent with the Group's CSR commitments. Pernod Ricard encourages a culture of trust, openness and transparency, where all employees can raise their genuine concerns in confidence. The Group's Code of Business Conduct advocates a Speak-up policy, calling on all employees to inform management of any suspicions they may have. This may relate to a practice or situation deemed to be contrary to or inconsistent with this Code, associated policies or any legal or regulatory standard. Pernod Ricard launched a Group-wide system titled Speak-Up. This allows stakeholders who wish to report such misconducts to the Group to do so in a safe and confidential manner. Hosted by a third party, it is available 24/7. Reports that are deemed to be filed in good faith can be subject to internal investigation following a preliminary assessment from the Integrity Committee. This is comprised of the following Group-level functions: Legal, Internal Audit, HR and S&R. This Speak-Up Policy also includes the possibility to report, in good faith, any potential violation of environmental practices.

[Fixed row]

#### **(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?**

##### **Row 1**

##### **(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers**

*EU green deal*

##### **(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to**

*Select all that apply*

Climate change

##### **(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment**

##### **Other**

Climate transition plans

Corporate environmental targets

##### **(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation**

Select from:

Regional

#### **(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to**

Select all that apply

Europe

#### **(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation**

Select from:

Neutral

#### **(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation**

Select all that apply

Regular meetings

Discussion in public forums

Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

Responding to consultations

#### **(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)**

0

#### **(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement**

*The EU Green Deal includes a comprehensive policy and regulatory package that potentially impacts all the relevant stages of our supply chain, from soils to waste, and therefore represents a key enabling policy framework for the achievement of our commitments.*

#### **(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals**

Select from:

- Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

#### **(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation**

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement

### **Row 2**

#### **(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers**

*For our cognac distillation process we have invested in a research programme aiming at developing a carbon neutral distillation adapted to the specific cognac double distillation in potstill "méthode charentaise".*

#### **(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to**

Select all that apply

- Climate change

#### **(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment**

##### **Environmental impacts and pressures**

- Emissions – CO2

#### **(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation**

Select from:

- National

#### **(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to**

Select all that apply

France

#### **(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation**

Select from:

Neutral

#### **(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation**

Select all that apply

Regular meetings

Ad-hoc meetings

Discussion in public forums

Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

Responding to consultations

#### **(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)**

0

#### **(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement**

*As cognac is party of our product portfolio, reducing the carbon footprint of its distillation process is key to reducing our global footprint.*

#### **(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals**

Select from:

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned



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

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement

### Row 3

#### (4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

*French regulation on classified installations for environmental protection*

#### (4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

- Water

#### (4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

##### Low-impact production and innovation

- Water use and efficiency

#### (4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

- National

#### (4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

- France

#### (4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

Neutral

#### **(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation**

Select all that apply

Ad-hoc meetings

#### **(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)**

0

#### **(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement**

*Innovation related to water use efficiency (such as water reuse and recycling) often requires adjustment to local regulation on environment protection and food safety. In order to achieve our water use reduction targets we often discuss with local authorities to anticipate possible barriers to these innovation. We also inform the public authorities about how we save water and how to apply water regulations*

#### **(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals**

Select from:

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

#### **(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation**

Select all that apply

Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

[Add row]

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

**Row 1**

**(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement**

*Select from:*

Indirect engagement via a trade association

**(4.11.2.4) Trade association**

**Europe**

FoodDrinkEurope

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

*Select all that apply*

Climate change

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

*Select from:*

Consistent

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

*Select from:*

Yes, and they have changed 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 green transition must be a driver of investment, job creation and growth in Europe. We are consistently promoting progressive policies including enabling conditions supporting a successful green transition and decarbonization in line with our commitments, including policy coherence, promotion of public(-private) investment and regulatory efforts to ensure proportionate and level playing field regulatory framework. We participate in the consultations and governance bodies of these associations that define their priorities and positions according to their statutory rules.*

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

84000

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

*Regular annual membership fees, to support an important organization for our brands and company that is furthering our PR's business & sustainability aims.*

**(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

##### Europe

- Mouvement des Entreprises de France (MEDEF)

#### (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 MEDEF supports all initiatives that encourage companies to start an ecological transition. The organization launched The French Business Climate Pledge, a voluntary commitment by companies based in France to take concrete action to make the transition to a low-carbon economy a success and to innovate and develop low-carbon solutions, technologies, products and services. The aim of this collective mobilization is to show that the voluntary initiative has a key role to play in making a success of the ecological transition and to highlight the diversity of the solutions provided by companies in the fight against climate change. Pernod Ricard is one of the signatory companies. We did not attempt to influence their position as Pernod Ricard is aligned with their position to enhance the energy transition.*

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

10000

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

*We are affiliated with the MEDEF to be accompanied regarding business and sustainability issues.*

#### (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

##### Europe

Other trade association in Europe, please specify :Association Française des entreprises privées (AFEP)

#### **(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 french association for private companies, AFEP, fully supports the implementation of the Paris Agreement at the European and national levels. Large companies play a key role in the development of new sustainable production models and technological solutions, while having the capacity to bring together other large companies and SMEs. The energy transition must be a source of investment, job creation and growth in an attractive Europe. To achieve this, the AFEP defends the need to provide companies with a long-term, stable, coherent and integrated political and regulatory framework. We did not attempt to influence their position as Pernod Ricard is aligned with their position to enhance the energy transition.*

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

70000

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

*We are affiliated with the AFEP to be accompagnied regarding business and sustanibility issues.*

#### (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 4

#### (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 :Sprints Europe

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

Select from:



Consistent

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

Select from:

Yes, and they have changed 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**

*spiritsEUROPE represents one of Europe's most valuable agri-food export sectors and, with it, the interests of 31 associations of spirits producers as well as 11 leading multinational companies. spiritsEUROPE's mission is to represent, defend and promote the European spirits sector and help members achieve sustainable business growth. The green transition must be a driver of investment, job creation and growth in Europe. We are consistently promoting progressive policies including enabling conditions supporting a successful green transition and decarbonization in line with our commitments, including policy coherence, promotion of public(-private) investment and regulatory efforts to ensure proportionate and level playing field regulatory framework We participate in the consultations and governance bodies of these associations that define their priorities and positions according to their statutory rules.*

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

32500

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

*Regular annual membership fees, to support an important organization for our brands and company that is furthering our PR's business & sustainability aims.*

**(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 5

#### (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 :European Comity for Wine companies (CEEV)

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

Select from:

- Consistent

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

Select from:

Yes, and they have changed 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**

*CEEV aims to promote production and trading practices that are environmentally sound, socially equitable and economically feasible, for the sake of the wine sector's sustainability. Their objective is, among others: - to improve the environmental performance of the EU wine sector by preserving natural assets and promoting environmentally sustainable wine-making practices. - to foster the wine companies commitment to tangibly improve and communicate their sustainability performance. CEEV is therefore committed to tangibly contribute to the environmental, health, economic and social sustainability of the EU wine system and value chain. to support the EU in developing appropriate and adapted tools to measure wines' and wine companies' environmental performance and communicate it to consumers. We are consistently promoting progressive policies including enabling conditions supporting a successful green transition and decarbonization in line with our commitments, including policy coherence, promotion of public(-private) investment and regulatory efforts to ensure proportionate and level playing field regulatory framework. We changed their position by participating in the consultations and governance bodies of these associations that define their priorities and positions according to their statutory rules.*

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

11700

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

*Regular annual membership fees, to support an important organization for the Wines, Champagne and aromatised wines sector and portfolio of Pernod Ricard that is furthering PR's business & sustainability aims.*

#### **(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 6

### (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 :World Federation of Advisertisers (WFA)

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

Select from:

- Consistent

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

Select from:

- Yes, and they have changed 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

WFA "Planet Pledge" is a Chief Marketing Officers -led framework designed to galvanise action from marketers to promote and reinforce attitudes and behaviours which will help the world meet the challenges laid out in the UN SDGs - including environmental sustainability and climate change related. They commit to being a part of, and a champion for, the global Race to Zero campaign, and encourage marketing supply chain to do the same. We are consistently promoting progressive policies including enabling conditions supporting a successful green transition and decarbonization in line with our commitments, including policy coherence, promotion of public(-private) investment and regulatory efforts to ensure proportionate and level playing field regulatory framework. We participate in the consultations and governance bodies of these associations that define their priorities and positions according to their statutory rules.

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

28000

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

Regular annual membership fees, to support an important organization for our brands and company that is furthering our PR's business & sustainability aims.

#### (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 7

#### (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 :European Brand Association (AIM)

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

Select all that apply

Climate change

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

Select from:

Consistent

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

Select from:

Yes, and they have changed 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

*AIM brands fully support the objective of the Green Deal and the new Circular Economy Action Plan to mobilise industry towards a clean, circular and climate neutral economy. Brands are in a unique position to promote environmental sustainability, health and well-being of citizens and their communities, and to shape consumer behaviour and choices in line with the SDGs. They do this by focusing on: •Innovating to develop and market goods and services that have a more sustainable life cycle. •Optimising the economic and environmental efficiency as well as the social impact of current products and activities in the supply chain. •Communicating their efforts on sustainable development based on proven science and in line with EU policy on advertising and claims. AIM member companies are integrating circular thinking into their business strategies through sustainable product and packaging design, optimised resource use and efficient waste management and recycling of their products, but also efficient production processes, responsible sourcing practices (AIM-Progress) and consumer involvement (Brands Nudging for Good). Brands are united in these efforts, commitments and progress towards a sustainable future, in terms of achieving a clean and circular economy but also to reach the 2030 UN Sustainable Development Goals, However, in order to reach the objective of a truly circular and climate neutral economy, much more needs to be done and invested*

*in the upcoming years. These aspects are highlighted in our AIM position on the Circular Economy Action Plan. AIM supports the Commission's various initiatives regarding product sustainability information for consumers, substantiating green claims and tackling greenwashing, to ensure the continuing veracity and relevance of product claims related to environmental attributes. We need a coordinated, harmonised and holistic approach, bringing together the different measures that relate to the various aspects of consumer information. We are consistently promoting progressive policies including enabling conditions supporting a successful green transition and decarbonization in line with our commitments, including policy coherence, promotion of public(-private) investment and regulatory efforts to ensure proportionate and level playing field regulatory framework. We participate in the consultations and governance bodies of these associations that define their priorities and positions according to their statutory rules.*

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

28000

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

*Regular annual membership fees, to support an important organization for our brands and company that is furthering our PR's business & sustainability aims.*

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

Select from:

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

Yes

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

## Row 1

### (4.12.1.1) Publication

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

TCFD

### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

*Select all that apply*

Climate change

Forests

Water

Biodiversity

### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

*Select from:*

Complete

### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

*Select all that apply*

Strategy

Value chain engagement



- Governance
- Emission targets
- Emissions figures
- Risks & Opportunities

- Dependencies & Impacts
- Public policy engagement
- Water accounting figures
- Content of environmental policies

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

*Section 3.4 our environmental sustainability (p97 to 121)*

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

*Universel Registration Document 2023 VUK.pdf*

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*FD - French DPEF*

### Row 2

#### (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

#### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

*Select all that apply*

- Climate change
- Forests

- Water
- Biodiversity

#### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

- Complete

#### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Value chain engagement            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governance            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dependencies & Impacts            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emission targets      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public policy engagement          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emissions figures     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water accounting figures          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risks & Opportunities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Content of environmental policies |

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Section 3.4 our environmental sustainability (p97 to 121)

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf.\_2.pdf

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

FD - French DPEF  
[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:

More than once a year

### Water

#### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Annually

[Fixed row]

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

### Climate change

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

#### 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:

Organization-wide

### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

Acute physical

Chronic physical

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

2.0°C - 2.4°C

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2025
- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

#### Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Changes to the state of nature
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*We followed best-in-class scientific practices by evaluating results on a 30-year time period, ie “2030” actually referring to the average yearly impacts over 2020-2050 period. We relied on top-notch external providers to gather data regarding both agricultural impacts (through FAO portals) and climate-related extreme events (water stress & coastal/riverine flooding from WRI Aqueduct, tropical cyclones from NOAA IBtracs database) all aligned with RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Our analysis provided a first consistent screening but this first iteration could not analyze compound and cascading risks (complex modelling topic), since we did analyze each risk separately without including retroactive feedback loops (e.g. how repeated combined heatwaves and water scarcity can increase the risk of facility business disruption). We look at integrating a wider compound view in the future. Both physical risks related to raw materials reduced availability and climate-related events impacts on operations have been used using those physical scenarios. About the transition risks and opportunities studied, we used 2 NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution (energy mix per geography, carbon price, emission factors, etc.). More specifically, we use NGFS “Delayed Transition” and “NDC” scenarii, which relate resp. to a 1.6C and 2.6C world.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*Following TCFD recommendations, two scenarii focused on the physical impacts have been considered when assessing physical climate risks and activities exposure: RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. We used these 2 scenarii to derive gross financial estimates as stated in the previous questions, before taking any mitigation measure. We then defined measures to adapt our business and lower the risk to define our residual remaining impact. It allowed us to draw 2 transition narratives which impact policy reaction steepness and homogeneity across geographical areas, while ensuring to keep a*

## Water

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

#### Water scenarios

- WRI Aqueduct

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

- Business division

### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Acute physical
- Chronic physical
- Policy
- Reputation

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

#### Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Changes to the state of nature
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*We used WRI Aqueduct to evaluate the evolution of physical, regulatory and reputational risks related to water usage in our own operations, on a 2030, 2040 and 2050 timeframe. The scenario used for this assessment was "Business as usual". The ponderation allocated to water stress is heavier than other indicators in our analysis because it is the risk that was defined as most material regarding our production sites. In the future, water shortages could cause disruptions in production.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*We chose a "Business as usual" scenario in order to reflect the potential evolution of water risks in a 1.5C scenario. As a result, we aim to ensure that our risk prioritization and response to these risks are more than sufficient to be aligned with a*

## 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:

- Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Acute physical
- Chronic physical

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 4.0°C and above

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**

- Changes to the state of nature
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)



### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*We followed best-in-class scientific practices by evaluating results on a 30-year time period, ie “2030” actually referring to the average yearly impacts over 2020-2050 period. We relied on top-notch external providers to gather data regarding both agricultural impacts (through FAO portals) and climate-related extreme events (water stress & coastal/riverine flooding from WRI Aqueduct, tropical cyclones from NOAA IBtracs database) all aligned with RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Our analysis provided a first consistent screening but this first iteration could not analyze compound and cascading risks (complex modelling topic), since we did analyze each risk separately without including retroactive feedback loops (e.g. how repeated combined heatwaves and water scarcity can increase the risk of facility business disruption). We look at integrating a wider compound view in the future. Both physical risks related to raw materials reduced availability and climate-related events impacts on operations have been used using those physical scenarios. About the transition risks and opportunities studied, we used 2 NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution (energy mix per geography, carbon price, emission factors, etc.). More specifically, we use NGFS “Delayed Transition” and “NDC” scenarii, which relate resp. to a 1.6C and 2.6C world.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*Following TCFD recommendations, two scenarii focused on the physical impacts have been considered when assessing physical climate risks and activities exposure: RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. We used these 2 scenarii to derive gross financial estimates as stated in the previous questions, before taking any mitigation measure. We then defined measures to adapt our business and lower the risk to define our residual remaining impact. It allowed us to draw 2 transition narratives which impact policy reaction steepness and homogeneity across geographical areas, while ensuring to keep a*

## Climate change

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

#### Climate transition scenarios

Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

Qualitative and quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

*Select all that apply*

- Policy
- Market
- Reputation
- Technology

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

- 1.5°C or lower

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

##### **Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**

- Changes to the state of nature
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*We followed best-in-class scientific practices by evaluating results on a 30-year time period, ie “2030” actually referring to the average yearly impacts over 2020-2050 period. We relied on top-notch external providers to gather data regarding both agricultural impacts (through FAO portals) and climate-related extreme events (water stress & coastal/riverine flooding from WRI Aqueduct, tropical cyclones from NOAA IBtracs database) all aligned with RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Our analysis provided a first consistent screening but this first iteration could not analyze compound and cascading risks (complex modelling topic), since we did analyze each risk separately without including retroactive feedback loops (e.g. how repeated combined heatwaves and water scarcity can increase the risk of facility business disruption). We look at integrating a wider compound view in the future. Both physical risks related to raw materials reduced availability and climate-related events impacts on operations have been used using those physical scenarios. About the transition risks and opportunities studied, we used 2 NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution (energy mix per geography, carbon price, emission factors, etc.). More specifically, we use NGFS “Delayed Transition” and “NDC” scenarii, which relate resp. to a 1.6C and 2.6C world.*

### **(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario**

*Following TCFD recommendations, two scenarii focused on the physical impacts have been considered when assessing physical climate risks and activities exposure: RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. We used these 2 scenarii to derive gross financial estimates as stated in the previous questions, before taking any mitigation measure. We then defined measures to adapt our business and lower the risk to define our residual remaining impact. It allowed us to draw 2 transition narratives which impact policy reaction steepness and homogeneity across geographical areas, while ensuring to keep a*

## **Climate change**

### **(5.1.1.1) Scenario used**

#### **Climate transition scenarios**

Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution

### **(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario**

Select from:

Qualitative and quantitative

### **(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage**

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

*Select all that apply*

- Policy
- Market
- Reputation
- Technology

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

- 3.5°C - 3.9°C

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**

- Changes to the state of nature
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We followed best-in-class scientific practices by evaluating results on a 30-year time period, ie “2030” actually referring to the average yearly impacts over 2020-2050 period. We relied on top-notch external providers to gather data regarding both agricultural impacts (through FAO portals) and climate-related extreme events (water stress & coastal/riverine flooding from WRI Aqueduct, tropical cyclones from NOAA IBtracs database) all aligned with RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Our analysis provided a first consistent screening but this first iteration could not analyze compound and cascading risks (complex modelling topic), since we did analyze each risk separately without including retroactive feedback loops (e.g. how repeated combined heatwaves and water scarcity can increase the risk of facility business disruption). We look at integrating a wider compound view in the future. Both physical risks related to raw materials reduced availability and climate-related events impacts on operations have been used using those physical scenarios. About the transition risks and opportunities studied, we used 2 NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution (energy mix per geography, carbon price, emission factors, etc.). More specifically, we use NGFS “Delayed Transition” and “NDC” scenarii, which relate resp. to a 1.6C and 2.6C world.

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following TCFD recommendations, two scenarii focused on the physical impacts have been considered when assessing physical climate risks and activities exposure: RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. We used these 2 scenarii to derive gross financial estimates as stated in the previous questions, before taking any mitigation measure. We then defined measures to adapt our business and lower the risk to define our residual remaining impact. It allowed us to draw 2 transition narratives which impact policy reaction steepness and homogeneity across geographical areas, while ensuring to keep a

## Water

### (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:

- Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Acute physical
- Chronic physical

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 2.0°C - 2.4°C

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2025
- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**

- Changes to the state of nature
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We followed best-in-class scientific practices by evaluating results on a 30-year time period, ie “2030” actually referring to the average yearly impacts over 2020-2050 period. We relied on top-notch external providers to gather data regarding both agricultural impacts (through FAO portals) and climate-related extreme events (water stress & coastal/riverine flooding from WRI Aqueduct, tropical cyclones from NOAA IBtracs database) all aligned with RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Our analysis provided a first consistent screening but this first iteration could not analyze compound and cascading risks (complex modelling topic), since we did analyze each risk separately without including retroactive feedback loops (e.g. how repeated combined heatwaves and water scarcity can increase the risk of facility business disruption). We look at integrating a wider compound view in the future. Both physical risks related to raw materials reduced availability and climate-related events impacts on operations have been used using those physical scenarios. About the transition risks and opportunities studied, we used 2 NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution (energy mix per geography, carbon price, emission factors, etc.). More specifically, we use NGFS “Delayed Transition” and “NDC” scenarii, which relate resp. to a 1.6C and 2.6C world.

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Following TCFD recommendations, two scenarii focused on the physical impacts have been considered when assessing physical climate risks and activities exposure: RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. We used these 2 scenarii to derive gross financial estimates as stated in the previous questions, before taking any mitigation measure. We then defined measures to adapt our business and lower the risk to define our residual remaining impact. It allowed us to draw 2 transition narratives which impact policy reaction steepness and homogeneity across geographical areas, while ensuring to keep a

## Water

### (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:

- Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Acute physical
- Chronic physical

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 4.0°C and above

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**

- Changes to the state of nature
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario



*We followed best-in-class scientific practices by evaluating results on a 30-year time period, ie “2030” actually referring to the average yearly impacts over 2020-2050 period. We relied on top-notch external providers to gather data regarding both agricultural impacts (through FAO portals) and climate-related extreme events (water stress & coastal/riverine flooding from WRI Aqueduct, tropical cyclones from NOAA IBtracs database) all aligned with RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Our analysis provided a first consistent screening but this first iteration could not analyze compound and cascading risks (complex modelling topic), since we did analyze each risk separately without including retroactive feedback loops (e.g. how repeated combined heatwaves and water scarcity can increase the risk of facility business disruption). We look at integrating a wider compound view in the future. Both physical risks related to raw materials reduced availability and climate-related events impacts on operations have been used using those physical scenarios. About the transition risks and opportunities studied, we used 2 NGFS scenarii that we further customized to provide a comprehensive view on energy-related drivers evolution (energy mix per geography, carbon price, emission factors, etc.). More specifically, we use NGFS “Delayed Transition” and “NDC” scenarii, which relate resp. to a 1.6C and 2.6C world.*

### **(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario**

*Following TCFD recommendations, two scenarii focused on the physical impacts have been considered when assessing physical climate risks and activities exposure: RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. We used these 2 scenarii to derive gross financial estimates as stated in the previous questions, before taking any mitigation measure. We then defined measures to adapt our business and lower the risk to define our residual remaining impact. It allowed us to draw 2 transition narratives which impact policy reaction steepness and homogeneity across geographical areas, while ensuring to keep a*  
[Add row]

## **(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization’s scenario analysis.**

### **Climate change**

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

*Select all that apply*

- Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- Strategy and financial planning
- Resilience of business model and strategy
- Capacity building
- Target setting and transition planning

#### **(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis**

*Select from:*

- Organization-wide

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

*Among the various actions taken to adapt our current business strategy to each of the most material climate-related risks highlighted and analyzed, we will explore the most relevant investments related to securing and implementing all the required measures in order to reach our SBT near-term and long-term commitments. Reaching our SBT targets will allow us not only to mitigate our impacts, but as well to increase our resilience to financial exogenous shocks coming from carbon price mechanisms expansion and strengthening, as well as increased fossil-fuel energy prices volatility. Regarding our own operations on which we have the full operational and financial control, we have adapted our Capex strategy and financial planning by securing a CAPEX plan of 323 cumulated million euros over the FY22- FY30 period, spread across all our major affiliates. This CAPEX plan will be used to implement on-site decarbonation measures such as MRV, biomass and biofuel uses within our operations. We also have defined 2 pilot distilleries that should become Net Zero by 2026, as part of this overall decarbonation roadmap. Regarding our work along our supply chain, we are working with our suppliers and securing significant investments as well, be it on commodities sourcing, glass manufacturing process or logistics optimization.*

## Water

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

*Select all that apply*

- Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- Strategy and financial planning
- Resilience of business model and strategy
- Target setting and transition planning

### (5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

*Select from:*

- Organization-wide

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

*Among the actions taken to adapt our current business strategy to the water risks highlighted and analyzed, we will make the most relevant investments related to securing and implementing water reduction and replenishment measures a priority. Regarding our own operations on which we have the full operational and financial control, we have secured a CAPEX plan of 20 cumulated million euros over the FY23 - FY30 period, spread across all our major affiliates. This CAPEX plan will be used to implement on-site water consumption reduction measures such as sewage water treatment for reuse or closed-loop cooling towers. Our affiliates are also financing water replenishment projects in high and extremely high water risk watersheds where our sites operate.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### **(5.2.1) Transition plan**

Select from:

Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

### **(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan**

Select from:

Yes

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

Select from:

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

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

*We are currently reviewing our commitments and policies as part of our CSRD and double materiality work. New commitments might be taken once this work is finished*

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

Select from:

We have a different feedback mechanism in place

### **(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism**

*Different feedback mechanisms are put in place to collect feedbacks from shareholders on climate-related topics and S&R strategy and act at different decision levels within the Group. The Lead Independent Director is in charge of collecting and discussing the investors' requests during specific meetings. In addition, governance*

roadshows are organized every year with Investor Relations and Legal Departments, which is an opportunity to exchange on our S&R strategy and collect feedback. In addition to that, the Annual General Meeting of Shareholders can be the opportunity to collect feedback and discuss ESG topics, including CSR criteria (including carbon performance criteria). Finally, the Chief Sustainability Officer and the Investment Relations Director collect feedback from investors throughout the year during specific meetings dedicated to ESG.

### (5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

More frequently than annually

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

In June 2019, the Science-Based Targets initiative (SBTi) approved the first Pernod Ricard's GHG emission reduction targets. In July 2021, Pernod Ricard joined the "Business Ambition for 1.5C" to align its climate mitigation objectives with the Paris Agreement: to achieve net-zero global emissions by 2050 at the latest to limit global warming to 1.5C. In May 2024, a new set of targets aligned with 1,5C Net Zero was validated by the SBTi, following the recommendation to set Forest Land and Agriculture (FLAG) targets over the medium- and long-term A decarbonisation roadmap has been defined for all Group production sites. This is based on major CapEx projects and renewable energy initiatives implemented at the main Group distilleries. On Scope 3, the Group is working alongside its main suppliers and building lasting relationships to accelerate their decarbonisation pathways, through e.g., co-constructing roadmaps and conducting pilots. Scopes 1 and 2 – Own sites' emissions: The reduction of emissions from production sites relies mainly on two levers: improving energy efficiency; using low-carbon energy sources. Carbon footprint reduction initiatives on Scopes 1 and 2 emissions. Scope 3 – indirect GHG emissions: The Group is undertaking initiatives to reduce its main Scope 3 emissions, namely: agricultural raw materials; packaging and point of sale materials; logistics & transport. This involves not only in-house innovation efforts, but also a strong commitment to suppliers.

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

The progress against the targets is on track, substantial reduction are already being delivered against the FY22 baseline on the following SBTi targets: - Reduce Scopes 1 and 2 non-FLAG GHG emissions by 54% (in absolute value) by FY30 vs FY22: -11% in FY23 compared to FY22 (see page XX in URD 23 - 24) - Reduce Scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions by 30.3% (in absolute value) vs FY22: -3% in FY23 compared to F22 (see page XX in URD 23 - 24) - Reduce Scope 3 non FLAG (purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution) GHG emissions by 25% (in absolute value) vs FY22: -3% in FY23 vs FY22 (see page XX in URD 23 - 24)

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

PERNOD-RICARD\_DEU\_23-24\_VUK\_MEL\_2409.pdf

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

Select all that apply

No other environmental issue considered

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

Products and services

Upstream/downstream value chain

Operations

[Fixed row]

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

#### **Products and services**

##### **(5.3.1.1) Effect type**

Select all that apply

Risks

Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

Consumers' expectations towards our brands are more and more driven by their need for a more sustainable world and for sustainable products and brands. Consumer studies we led show that their trust in our brands must be based on a strong environmental engagement by businesses, for example, by offering low emissions products and services. This is even more important for millennials and the young generations, which is highlighted in our Global risk mapping and strongly influences our marketing strategy. Higher demand for lower emissions products and services and the incorporation of sustainability concerns are strong drivers to foster innovation and an opportunity to increase market share. With this in mind, innovation and digital are considered immediate strategic priorities at Pernod Ricard since the launch of our 2018 strategy 'Transform and Accelerate', with different entities working on innovative projects involving new product and service offerings with the purpose of addressing this short-term opportunity and gaining greater market share as we align our business value. CASE STUDY: Both the risk and opportunity of shifting consumer preferences for sustainability is factored into Group marketing strategy. For example, the Pernod Ricard eco-design policy aims to make the products more sustainable throughout their lifecycle such as bottle weight reduction, increased recycled content, reducing CO2 emissions. The launch of the Absolut paper bottle prototype, marking the brand's first step to a bio-based bottle able to contain spirits is an example of this eco-design. The paper bottle, made of - paper and a thin plastic inner layer, can be successfully recycled in the paper recycling stream

## Upstream/downstream value chain

### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Water

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

Climate and water-related risks influence our supply chain and thus impact our decision-making and sourcing strategy. These climate risks shape part of the Groups current global risk mapping process and have influenced strategic decisions such as setting targets. For example, by 2025 we will pilot local models for regenerative farming systems in the Group's vineyards in eight wine regions, capturing more carbon in soils, and share them with the wine industry. To date, this has meant greater engagement with our Agricultural raw materials suppliers to start building resilient agriculture models and progress toward regenerative agriculture practices that can later be shared with the wine industry. Further strategic decisions in our supply chain are being informed by our 'terroir risk mapping tool' work. CASE

*STUDY: To face extreme variability in both acute and chronic weather patterns, projected to worsen and cause big impact in our agricultural supply chain in the long-term, the Group adopted a hedging strategy to limit the extent to which climate factors influence seasonal volatility by securing fixed prices and volumes, and included environmental factors in our Responsible Procurement Policy and Procurement Code of Ethics. Following the results of our Terroir Mapping analysis, we have also set up a target of 100% of priority terroirs under a high or medium global risk covered by risk mitigation projects by 2030 and are launching both internal and external audits to ensure all our 60 strategic priority terroirs (92% of our annual spend) listed follow the guidelines on our Group-level Regenerative Agriculture & Biodiversity program.*

## Operations

### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

Risks

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

Select all that apply

Climate change

Water

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

*Climate and water-related risks are accounted for as part of our environmental risk mapping that is assessed every year and monitored at Group level; they influence our Operations decision-making in different ways: - In our own vineyards, we are requesting certification according to sustainable agriculture standards or other environmental standards to make them more resilient to climate change and water stress. - In 2023, 86% of our sites are ISO 14001-certified (covering 99.5% of our production) and the vast majority of our vineyards are certified according to environmental standards. - We set operational targets for water, energy and CO2 reduction to decrease our dependence on natural resources on all production sites. These include our approved short term science-based targets for 2030. - Long-term physical risks, such as natural disasters, also represent a danger to our industrial sites and could result in operational disruption of the supply of certain products, either through warehouses content destruction or key facility (distillery, glass factory) business interruption. CASE STUDY: The Group has implemented measures to prevent physical risks to damage its own and its suppliers' facilities, such as: auditing industrial sites along with insurers and establishing business continuity management systems that take into account future climate-related hazards increased intensity. A full update of all own sites Business Continuity Plans has been performed in 2022 following the audits performed, allowing to highlight the sites being the most exposed to any extreme event, and build with our affiliates regarding site-level adaptation planning.*

[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

- Capital expenditures

### (5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

*Among the various actions taken to adapt our current business strategy to each of the most material climate-related risks highlighted and analyzed, we will explore the most relevant investments related to securing and implementing all the required measures in order to reach our SBT near-term and long-term commitments. Reaching our SBT targets will allow us not only to mitigate our impacts, but as well to increase our resilience to financial exogenous shocks coming from carbon price mechanisms expansion and strengthening, as well as increased fossil-fuel energy prices volatility. Regarding our own operations on which we have the full operational and financial control, we have adapted our Capex strategy and financial planning by securing a CAPEX plan of 323 cumulated million euros over the FY22- FY30 period, spread across all our major affiliates. This CAPEX plan will be used to implement on-site decarbonation measures such as MRV, biomass and biofuel uses within our operations. We also have defined 2 pilot distilleries that should become Net Zero by 2026, as part of this overall decarbonation roadmap. Regarding our work along our supply chain, we are working with our suppliers and securing significant investments as well, be it on commodities sourcing, glass manufacturing process or logistics optimization.*

## Row 2

### (5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected



Select all that apply

- Capital expenditures

### (5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- Water

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

*Among the various actions taken to adapt our current business strategy to the water-related risks highlighted and analyzed, we will explore the most relevant investments related to securing and implementing the required measures in order to reach our water consumption reduction objectives. Regarding our own operations on which we have the full operational and financial control, we have adapted our Capex strategy and financial planning by securing a CAPEX plan of over 200 cumulated million euros over the FY23 - FY30 period, spread across all our major affiliates. This CAPEX plan will be used to implement on-site water reduction measures such as waste water recycling, rainwater harvesting or equipment upgrade.*

[Add row]

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

|  | Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition | Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition | Indicate the level at which you identify the alignment of your spending/revenue with a sustainable finance taxonomy |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  | Select all that apply<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A sustainable finance taxonomy   | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At both the organization and activity level                     |

[Fixed row]

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

#### Row 1

##### (5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

- A sustainable finance taxonomy

##### (5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

- EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

##### (5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

- Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

##### (5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

Yes

**(5.4.1.5) Financial metric**

Select from:

Revenue/Turnover

**(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)**

0

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

0

**(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)**

0

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

0

**(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)**

0

**(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)**

100

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

*EU Green Taxonomy*

**Row 2**

#### (5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

- A sustainable finance taxonomy

#### (5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

- EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

#### (5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

- Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

#### (5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

- Yes

#### (5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

- CAPEX

#### (5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

48500000

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

5.4

#### (5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

5

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

5

**(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)**

24.6

**(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)**

75.4

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

*EU Green Taxonomy*

**Row 3**

**(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment**

*Select from:*

A sustainable finance taxonomy

**(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported**

*Select from:*

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

**(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported**

*Select from:*

Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

**(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective**

Select from:

Yes

**(5.4.1.5) Financial metric**

Select from:

OPEX

**(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)**

0

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

0

**(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)**

0

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

0

**(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)**

0

**(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)**

100

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

**(5.4.2) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that was associated with eligible and aligned activities under the sustainable finance taxonomy in the reporting year.**

**Row 1**

**(5.4.2.1) Economic activity**

Select from:

- Renovation of existing buildings

**(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported**

Select from:

- EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

**(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment**

Select from:

- Taxonomy-aligned

**(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics**

Select all that apply

- Turnover
- CAPEX
- OPEX

**(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution**

Select all that apply

Activity enabling mitigation

**(5.4.2.6) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.7) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.8) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.9) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**



0

#### (5.4.2.20) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

#### (5.4.2.21) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity as % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.22) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.23) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

*EU Green Taxonomy*

#### (5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial*

contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,

#### **(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met**

Select from:

Yes

#### **(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis**

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### **(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met**

Select from:

Yes

### **Row 2**

#### **(5.4.2.1) Economic activity**

Select from:

Acquisition and ownership of buildings

#### **(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported**

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

#### **(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment**

Select from:

Taxonomy-aligned

#### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

#### (5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

Activity enabling mitigation

#### (5.4.2.6) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

#### (5.4.2.7) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.8) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.9) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

**(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

1.2

**(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

1.2

**(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.20) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.21) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity as % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.22) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.23) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information**

#### (5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,*

#### (5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

*For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.*

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

**Row 3**

### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

- Construction of new buildings

### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

- EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

- Taxonomy-aligned

### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

- Turnover
- CAPEX
- OPEX

### (5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

- Activity enabling mitigation

### (5.4.2.6) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

### (5.4.2.7) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

**(5.4.2.8) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.9) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

34100000

**(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

3.8

**(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

3.8

**(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.20) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.21) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity as % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

#### (5.4.2.22) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.23) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

EU Green Taxonomy

#### (5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,*

#### (5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes



#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### Row 4

#### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Installation, maintenance and repair of energy efficiency equipment

#### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

#### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-aligned

#### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

#### **(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution**

Select all that apply

Activity enabling mitigation

#### **(5.4.2.6) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

#### **(5.4.2.7) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

#### **(5.4.2.8) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

#### **(5.4.2.9) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

#### **(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

2800000

#### **(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0.3

#### **(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0.3

**(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.20) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.21) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity as % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.22) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.23) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information**

*EU Green Taxonomy*

**(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met**

Select from:

Yes

**(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis**

The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,

#### **(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met**

Select from:

Yes

#### **(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis**

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### **(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met**

Select from:

Yes

### **Row 5**

#### **(5.4.2.1) Economic activity**

Select from:

Installation, maintenance and repair of renewable energy technologies

#### **(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported**

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-aligned

### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

### (5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

Activity enabling mitigation

### (5.4.2.6) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

### (5.4.2.7) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

### (5.4.2.8) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

**(5.4.2.9) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

200000

**(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.20) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.21) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity as % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.22) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

#### (5.4.2.23) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

EU Green Taxonomy

#### (5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,*

#### (5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

*For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to*

scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### Row 6

#### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Transport by motorbikes, passenger cars and light commercial vehicles

#### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

#### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-aligned

#### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

#### (5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply



Activity enabling mitigation

**(5.4.2.6) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.7) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.8) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.9) Taxonomy-aligned turnover from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

900000

**(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0.1

**(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0.1

**(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

0

#### (5.4.2.20) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

#### (5.4.2.21) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity as % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.22) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.23) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

*EU Green Taxonomy*

#### (5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial*

contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,

#### (5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

### Row 7

#### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Renovation of existing buildings

#### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

#### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned

#### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

#### (5.4.2.10) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

#### (5.4.2.11) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.17) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)

23100000

#### (5.4.2.18) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

2.6

#### (5.4.2.24) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

#### (5.4.2.25) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity as % total OPEX in the reporting year

0

#### (5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

**(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met**

Select from:

 Yes**(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis**

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,*

**(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met**

Select from:

 Yes**(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis**

*For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.*

**(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met**

Select from:

 Yes**Row 8**

### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

- Acquisition and ownership of buildings

### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

- EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

- Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned

### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

- Turnover
- CAPEX
- OPEX

### (5.4.2.10) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

### (5.4.2.11) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

### (5.4.2.17) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)

53700000

### (5.4.2.18) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

**(5.4.2.24) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.25) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity as % total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information***EU Green Taxonomy***(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met**

Select from:

 Yes**(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis**

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,*

**(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met**

Select from:

 Yes**(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis**

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### Row 9

#### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Construction of new buildings

#### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

#### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned

#### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

#### (5.4.2.10) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)



0

**(5.4.2.11) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.17) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

3100000

**(5.4.2.18) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

2.6

**(5.4.2.24) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.25) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity as % total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information**

*EU Green Taxonomy*

**(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met**

Select from:

Yes

**(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis**

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this*

exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,

#### (5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

### Row 10

#### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Installation, maintenance and repair of energy efficiency equipment

#### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

### **(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment**

Select from:

Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned

### **(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics**

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

### **(5.4.2.10) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

### **(5.4.2.11) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

### **(5.4.2.17) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

23200000

### **(5.4.2.18) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

2.6

### **(5.4.2.24) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

### **(5.4.2.25) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity as % total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

#### (5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

EU Green Taxonomy

#### (5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,*

#### (5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

*For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.*

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

## Row 11

### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Installation, maintenance and repair of renewable energy technologies

### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned

### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

Turnover

CAPEX

OPEX

### (5.4.2.10) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

0

### (5.4.2.11) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year

0

### (5.4.2.17) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)

**(5.4.2.18) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

1.2

**(5.4.2.24) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.25) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity as % total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information***EU Green Taxonomy***(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met**

Select from:

 Yes**(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis**

*The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,*

**(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met**

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

### Row 12

#### (5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Transport by motorbikes, passenger cars and light commercial vehicles

#### (5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

#### (5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned

#### (5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

- Turnover
- CAPEX
- OPEX

**(5.4.2.10) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.11) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned turnover from this activity as % of total turnover in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.17) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

30900000

**(5.4.2.18) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year**

3.4

**(5.4.2.24) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)**

0

**(5.4.2.25) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity as % total OPEX in the reporting year**

0

**(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information**

*EU Green Taxonomy*

**(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met**

Select from:

- Yes



#### (5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

The group has conducted the review of substantial contribution criteria for all identified eligible activities. For 6.5, only electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles were deemed to meet the substantial contribution criteria related to CO2 emissions. In the case of real estate assets, the Group checked compliance with the technical screening criteria and, in particular, for criteria related to nearly zero-energy building (nZEB), the European nZEB averages for houses and offices were used for this exercise for countries outside Europe. When the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) was not available, the French Top 15% of the most efficient buildings in terms of operational Primary Energy Demand was used. None of the renovation projects that were identified as eligible to 7.2 were compliant with the substantial contribution criteria for 7.2: • Either being a major renovation, which implies, according to Directive 2010/31/EU: • Total cost of the renovation relating to the building envelope or the technical building systems 25% of the value of the building, excluding the value of the land upon which the building is situated; • Or more than 25% of the surface of the building envelope undergoes renovation; • Or the renovation leads to a reduction of primary energy demand (PED) of at least 30%. The substantial contribution criteria for 7.3 and 7.6 are, respectively,

#### (5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For reporting on the contribution to the objective of climate change mitigation, the Group has carried out a Taxonomy-compliant climate risk and vulnerability assessment in 3 steps: 1. Analysis of the exposure of the Taxonomy-eligible activities to physical climate risks. 2. Assessment of physical climate risks according to scenarios RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. 3. Implementation and assessment of adaptation solutions. For other DNSH, the Group will update and strengthen the alignment assessment in fiscal year 2024, especially for the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria.

#### (5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

[Add row]

**(5.4.3) Provide any additional contextual and/or verification/assurance information relevant to your organization's taxonomy alignment.**

#### (5.4.3.1) Details of minimum safeguards analysis

Minimum safeguards were reviewed at Group level, in light of the requirements of the Platform on Sustainable Finance's report on minimum safeguards (44) published in October 2022, in terms of human rights, consumer interest, anti-corruption, responsible taxation and competition laws. To be compliant with minimum safeguards, the Group guarantees that procedures have been implemented to ensure the alignment with the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the United Nations International Bill of Human Rights and the fundamental instruments identified in the Declaration of the International Labour Organization (ILO) on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

#### **(5.4.3.2) Additional contextual information relevant to your taxonomy accounting**

*Pernod Ricard's core business, related to the manufacture and sale of beverages, is at present not included in the Climate Delegated Act.*

#### **(5.4.3.3) Indicate whether you will be providing verification/assurance information relevant to your taxonomy alignment in question 13.1**

Select from:

Yes

[Fixed row]

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

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

98

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

31

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

0

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

### (5.9.5) Please explain

Every year, we monitor capital expenditure (i.e. funds used to acquire, upgrade, and maintain physical assets such as plants, buildings, technology, or equipment) related to measures implemented in order to align to our water use reduction ambition. The amount spent on CAPEX has increased compared to last reporting year due to new projects launched (e.g. rain water harvesting system at Middleton Distillery) or postponed the year before, hence more investments in the reporting year. Over the next year, we plan to increase the CAPEX spend on water meters installation and water saving projects (mainly cooling towers enhanced heat recovery projects), which will mainly concern our affiliates Hiram Walker & Sons and Chivas Brothers. We do not monitor water related operating expenditure yet, but plan to do so in the following years (i.e. shorter-term expenses required to meet the ongoing operational costs of running activities).

[Fixed row]

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

|  | Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities  | Environmental externality priced                                    |
|--|---|---|
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | Select all that apply<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carbon |

[Fixed row]

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

##### Row 1

#### (5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

Shadow price

#### (5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

*Select all that apply*

- Drive energy efficiency
- Drive low-carbon investment
- Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
- Influence strategy and/or financial planning
- Setting and/or achieving of climate-related policies and targets
- Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making
- Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in risk assessment

### **(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price**

*Select all that apply*

- Alignment with the price of a carbon tax
- Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme
- Scenario analysis

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

*The price was set to an amount similar to the EU-ETS level at this time*

### **(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered**

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

### **(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance**

*Select from:*

- Uniform

### **(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance**

*Select from:*

- Static

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

80

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

80

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

Select all that apply

- Capital expenditure
- Operations
- Procurement

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

Select from:

- Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify :This impacts our business because for each investment, the calculation of the return on investment considers the internal price of carbon as any other elements including the investment amount and all the savings and cash in generated by the investmen

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

100

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

*This impacts our business because for each investment, the calculation of the return on investment considers the internal price of carbon as any other elements including the investment amount and all the savings and cash in generated by the investment. This allows us to invest in low carbon projects.*

[Add row]

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

### Suppliers

#### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

Water

### Customers

#### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

### Investors and shareholders

#### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

## (5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

Water

## Other value chain stakeholders

### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

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

*Our customers (retailers, bars, hotels...) are considered to have a non significant impact on water-related issues compared to our suppliers of agricultural commodities and packaging material.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

#### **(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed**

Select from:

76-99%

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

*Regarding the CO2 emissions from our agricultural supply chain, we define as hotspots the suppliers who contribute to 94% of our agricultural materials footprint. Regarding Dry goods category, we define as hotspots the suppliers who contribute to 95% of our glass category footprint (representing 78% of our total dry goods footprint).*

#### **(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**

89

## **Water**

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

Select from:

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



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

Select all that apply

- Basin/landscape condition
- Dependence on water
- Impact on water availability

### (5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

- 100%

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

*Regarding the water impact of our agricultural supply chain, we define as hotspots the suppliers who contribute to 80% of the water withdrawn for the agricultural materials that we source and produce.*

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

Select from:

- 26-50%

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

186

[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
- Business risk mitigation
- Material sourcing
- Strategic status of suppliers
- Vulnerability of suppliers

### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*As part of our responsible sourcing program, we complete an analysis of direct suppliers (Dry Goods and agricultural raw materials) and key indirect suppliers (POS) on environmental and supply chain risks of the supplier. We are currently revamping our program, working on a new suppliers risk mapping covering more risks (including climate and water) and procurement categories. This new questionnaire is being test in a pilot phase in order to be deployed in the next fiscal year.*

## Water

### (5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Business risk mitigation
- Material sourcing
- Procurement spend
- Strategic status of suppliers

- Vulnerability of suppliers

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*As part of our responsible sourcing program, we complete an analysis of direct suppliers (Dry Goods and agricultural raw materials) and key indirect suppliers (POS) on environmental and supply chain risks of the supplier. We are currently revamping our program, working on a new suppliers risk mapping covering more risks (including climate and water) and procurement categories. This new questionnaire is being test in a pilot phase in order to be deployed in the next fiscal year.  
[Fixed row]*

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

##### Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

#### (5.11.5.3) Comment

*As part of Pernod Ricard's Responsible Procurement process, all direct suppliers of packaging, raw materials and promotional items are entitled to sign a CSR Supplier Standard. Its includes commitments on Carbon and Water and is aligned to internationally recognized standards and guidelines. The signature is mandatory, and suppliers must also ensure that this document is observed by subcontractors. Currently, 78% of concerned suppliers have signed the Suppliers Standards document. By the end of FY24, the Group has decided to add the Supplier Standards in the Terms and Conditions (T&Cs) and Contracts with the suppliers. This is part of the simplification and reinforcement of its Responsible Procurement ambition.*

##### Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

### **(5.11.5.3) Comment**

*As part of Pernod Ricard's Responsible Procurement process, all direct suppliers of packaging, raw materials and promotional items are entitled to sign a CSR Supplier Standard. Its includes commitments on Carbon and Water and is aligned to internationally recognized standards and guidelines. The signature is mandatory, and suppliers must also ensure that this document is observed by subcontractors. Currently, 78% of concerned suppliers have signed the Suppliers Standards document. By the end of FY24, the Group has decided to add the Supplier Standards in the Terms and Conditions (T&Cs) and Contracts with the suppliers. This is part of the simplification and reinforcement of its Responsible Procurement ambition.*

*[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, 2 and 3)

### **(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement**

Select all that apply

- Community-based monitoring

- 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:

- 100%

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

Select from:

- 76-99%

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

Select from:

- 100%

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

Select from:

- 76-99%

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

Select from:

- Suspend and engage

### **(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged**

Select from:

- 1-25%

### (5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- 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

*The Supplier Standards are a supplier code of conduct, mandatory signed by all Pernod Ricard suppliers who also must also ensure that this document is observed by subcontractors. It includes commitments on Health & Safety and is aligned to internationally recognized standards and guidelines. IN FY24, 78% of suppliers in the scope of the responsible procurement process (Packaging, Raw Materials and POS) have signed this document. As part of the Health & Safety requirements, suppliers shall provide workers with ready access to clean toilet facilities, drinkable water and sanitary food preparation, storage, and eating facilities. These measures must be under regular control to avoid the creation of new risks. If there is no commitment or lack of corrective measures following audits, such may result in Pernod Ricard ceasing to do business, and as a final resort terminating the contract. In FY24, the document has been updated and the Group added Water and Wastewater, land and water rights of communities and indigenous people, Sanitation, Food and Housing and provision of WASH services. As part of this update, a grievance mechanism has been added for the suppliers to be able to signal any activity that could negatively impact them. Supplier performance reviews are also being formalized for Key and Strategic suppliers with specific criteria still being defined regarding their ESG performance.*

## Water

### (5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- Provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all employees

### (5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- Certification
- Off-site third-party audit
- On-site third-party audit

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

Select from:

100%

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

Select from:

76-99%

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

Select from:

100%

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Suspend and engage

#### **(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged**

Select from:

1-25%

#### **(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

*The Supplier Standards are a supplier code of conduct, mandatory signed by all Pernod Ricard suppliers who also must also ensure that this document is observed by subcontractor. It includes commitments on Health & Safety and is aligned to internationally recognized standards and guidelines. In FY24, 78% of suppliers in the scope of the responsible procurement process (Packaging, Raw Materials and POS) have signed this document As part of Health & Safety requirements, suppliers shall provide workers with ready access to clean toilet facilities, drinkable water and sanitary food preparation, storage, and eating facilities. These measures must be under regular control to avoid the creation of new risks. If there is no commitment or lack of corrective measures following audits, such may result in Pernod Ricard ceasing to do business, and as a final resort terminating the contract. In FY24, the document has been update and the Group added Water and Wastewater, land and water rights of communities and indigenous people, Sanitation, Food and Housing and provision of WASH services. As part of this update, a grievance mechanism has been added for the suppliers to be able to signal any activity that could negatively impact them. Supplier performance reviews are also being formalized for Key and Strategic suppliers with specific criteria still being defined regarding their ESG performance.*

## Water

### (5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- Other, please specify :Reducing water demands in water stressed basins

### (5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- Certification
- Off-site third-party audit
- On-site third-party audit

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

Select from:

- 100%

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

Select from:

- 76-99%



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

Select from:

100%

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

Suspend and engage

#### **(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged**

Select from:

1-25%

#### **(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**

*The Supplier Standards are a supplier code of conduct, mandatory signed by all Pernod Ricard suppliers who also must also ensure that this document is observed by subcontractor. It includes commitments on environmental impact and is aligned to internationally recognized standards and guidelines. IN FY24, 78% of suppliers in the scope of the responsible procurement process (Packaging, Raw Materials and POS) have signed this document As part of environmental requirements, suppliers shall measure and optimize water consumptions, especially in water-stressed areas. The wastewaters of any kind shall be monitored, controlled and treated*

before discharge. Suppliers considered as risky in our due diligence screening must undertake an EcoVadis or Smeta assessment. If there is no commitment or lack of corrective measures following audits, such may result in Pernod Ricard ceasing to do business, and as a final resort terminating the contract. In FY24, the document has been update and the Group added Water and Wastewater, land and water rights of communities and indigenous people, Sanitation, Food and Housing and provision of WASH services. As part of this update, a grievance mechanism has been added for the suppliers to be able to signal any activity that could negatively impact them. Supplier performance reviews are also being formalized for Key and Strategic suppliers with specific criteria still being defined regarding their ESG performance.

[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**

##### **Innovation and collaboration**

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

#### **(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage**

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

- 26-50%

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

Select from:

76-99%

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

*Suppliers for this assessment are selected based on their total scope 3 emissions taken as a proportion of Pernod Ricard Group's emissions. Pernod Ricard prioritises "hotspots" within the supply chain (Purchased goods category including our dry and wet goods purchases). Therefore the percentage of scope 3 emissions covered by this engagement covers all our suppliers from the category "Purchased goods & services" which represents 3 611 607 tCO2e over a total scope 3 of 4 653 712 tCO2e. This led to 78% of supplier-related scope 3 emissions. Engagement is tailored to understand main emissions hotspots in a better way and to reinforce Group's CO2 reduction strategy. One of the key steps Pernod Ricard takes is to facilitate adoption of climate transition plan with our suppliers. We engage them to collect better primary CO2 data and share or build CO2 transition plan by 2030. We understand that accurate and comprehensive data is the foundation for informed decision-making. We are running a yearly data collection campaign to collect supplier primary data that will be used to calculate the CO2 footprint of procured goods using internal tools. Besides, we exchange regularly and support suppliers to collect or co-build a climate transition plan focusing on CO2 targets definition and reduction ambition by 2030. The approach is unified across our different categories. We target 95% of our suppliers-related scope 3 on CO2 engagement (CO2 data and roadmap) as measure of success. In FY23, on the glass part, 95% of the volume of glass purchased by the group concerned products for which the EF was specific (the 5% remaining were semi-specific) and it represented 93% of the glass carbon footprint. 90% of the glass was under a scope 3 roadmap. In FY23, on the wet goods part, 79% of the spend of tier 1 suppliers concerned products for which the EF was specific or semi-specific, and which represented 84% of the wet goods' carbon footprint. 71% of the wet goods were under a scope 3 roadmap.*

### **(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 :Carbon emissions reduction

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

Select from:

Yes

## **Water**

### **(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement**

Select from:

Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

### (5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

#### Innovation and collaboration

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

### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

- Less than 1%

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

Select from:

- Less than 1%

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

*A sustainable project has been developed starting in 2016 with additional steps until 2021 with our main coffee supplier in Mexico. The objective was to increase sustainable development based on organization, teamwork, participatory planning and involvement of supplier and local people as main actors of their development. A focus has been made on preserving environmental services provided by coffee farms and forests as means to achieve biodiversity, soil and water preservation, as well as high yields in production, food crops, and other outcomes. Trainings to use water in a sustainable way and preserve water reservoirs were included. To achieve project goals, we needed to improve skills in economic production with a focus on coffee farming, and to provide all the necessary training and incomes to generate the conditions to produce high yields and fair trade with farmers (our suppliers). The beneficial outcomes of the activity are social, environmental and economic, primarily resulting from improved economic development in the targeted communities and the implementation of more sustainable on-farm practices. The environmental dimension of the project has for objective to improve coffee management in farms with focused on environmental services conservation and integrating landscapes elements. The social dimension of the project has for objective to increase social cohesion in four villages, and to addressing communities' most basic needs, such as improving access to fresh water and sanitation. The economic dimension of the project has for objective to achieve an income greater than 4 000 MXN per family per month. The impact of the engagement and measure of success are assessed with a "Balance ScoreCard" that details all the specific objectives of the project on three pillars (environmental, economic and social), the KPIs related to each objective, the expected results and the responsibilities to achieve the*

target. An example of Environmental KPI is: % Of people identifying and managing farms to conserve Environmental Services. An example of Social KPI is: % Families with water access and sanitation

#### **(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 :Improving water stewardship

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

Select from:

Yes

### **Climate change**

#### **(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement**

Select from:

Emissions reduction

#### **(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement**

##### **Innovation and collaboration**

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

#### **(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage**

Select all that apply

Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

Select from:

51-75%

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

Suppliers for this assessment are selected based on their total scope 3 emissions taken as a proportion of Pernod Ricard Group's emissions and with a significant Scope 1 & 2-related emissions (representing more than 50% of the product emission factor). Two purchased goods categories are focused: glass and grain neutral spirit. Therefore the percentage of scope 3 emissions covered by this engagement covers all our suppliers from these two categories which represents 879 904 tCO2e for glass and 1 861 847 tCO2e for grain neutral spirit over a total scope 3 of 4 653 712 tCO2e. This led to 59% of supplier-related scope 3 emissions. Pernod Ricard is exploring new long-term partnerships with its suppliers looking at CO2 reduction through the use of alternative energy sources in suppliers' furnaces for glass or suppliers' distilleries for Grain Neutral Alcohol Spirit (GNS). Examples include hydrogen pilots and co-investment exploration in electric furnaces, biofuels sourcing. Measure of success is a reduction in glass and GNS absolute emissions for a total of 25% for non FLAG, 30,3% for FLAG in 2030 and 90% for non FLAG, 72% for FLAG in 2050 as per our SBTi objective. Between FY22 and FY23, the emission factors decreased by -3% and CO2 emissions decreased by -4% for glass. Still between FY22 and FY23, the emission factors decreased by -3% and CO2 emissions decreased by -2% for GNS.

#### (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 :Carbon emissions reduction

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

Select from:

Yes

### Climate change

#### (5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- Adaptation to climate change

### (5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

#### Financial incentives

- Provide financial incentives for environmental performance

### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

*Select all that apply*

- Tier 2 suppliers
- Tier 3 suppliers
- Tier 4+ suppliers

### (5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

1888

## 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

#### Innovation and collaboration

- Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts on products and services
- Other innovation and collaboration activity, please specify :With our CSR Programs on W.A.L (Water, Agriculture, Livelihoods) vertical, communities in water-stressed areas have adopted a circular approach and eventually have become more resilient in their approach to water use while increasing their disposable

#### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

- Tier 2 suppliers
- Tier 3 suppliers
- Tier 4+ suppliers

#### (5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

7610

[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

##### Innovation and collaboration

- Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions

#### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 100%

#### (5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions



Select from:

100%

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

*The environmental impact of the Group's activities begins with product, packaging & point of sale material design and continues throughout the life cycle. The packaging and point of sale material development phases represent a key levers to minimise waste and reduce the Group's environmental footprint. For this reason, Pernod Ricard adopts eco-design principles when designing new packaging and point of sale material and ensures it can be used sustainably. It also participates in local packaging collection and recycling schemes to address packaging end-of-life. A regular monitoring of consumer trends and innovation is conducted.*

### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*Pernod Ricard aims to be recognised as a pioneer in the definition of industry standards relating to the circularity of packaging and point of sale material. With this in mind, Pernod Ricard became a partner of the Ellen MacArthur Foundation, a key step towards increased circularity, during FY22. Most packaging waste produced by the Group's activities is generated after final consumption of products. The key issue is therefore to improve waste sorting solutions for consumers so that packaging can be recycled or reused. Pernod Ricard has set up or joined various programmes worldwide to improve recycling or reuse packaging: - Europe: Group contribution of around 11M to national schemes designed to improve the collection and recycling of domestic packaging, including glass; - United States: joined the "Glass Recycling Coalition" to foster efficient and economically viable recycling channels by involving all players in the chain (glass manufacturers, bottlers, recycling service providers, etc.); - Brazil: joined the "Glass is Good" project, designed to increase the glass recycling rate by involving all industry players. Projects are being explored with local partners in 9 key markets (India, US, Canada, China, France, Brazil, Spain, South Africa and Poland) to increase glass collection, recycling and reuse.*

## Water

### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

Investors and shareholders

### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

#### Education/Information sharing

Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

100%

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

*This year, Pernod Ricard's EVP Integrated Operations & Sustainability, Chief Sustainability Officer and Global Head of Terroir invited all Pernod Ricard's investors to join them for a Q&A session on Pernod Ricard's Sustainability and Responsibility (S&R) roadmap "Good Times from a Good Place". S&R is a key driver for Pernod Ricard, whose mission is to create sustainable and responsible conviviality moments.*

### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*Creation of a 30 minutes long film on S&R roadmap, a live Q&A session, and regular engagement calls with specific investors.*

## Climate change

### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

Investors and shareholders

### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

#### Education/Information sharing

Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

100%

### (5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

100%

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

*This year, Pernod Ricard's EVP Integrated Operations & Sustainability, Chief Sustainability Officer and Global Head of Terroir invited all Pernod Ricard's investors to join them for a Q&A session on Pernod Ricard's Sustainability and Responsibility (S&R) roadmap "Good Times from a Good Place". S&R is a key driver for Pernod Ricard, whose mission is to create sustainable and responsible conviviality moments.*

### **(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success**

*Creation of a 30 minutes long film on S&R roadmap, a live Q&A session, and regular engagement calls with specific investors.  
[Add row]*

## C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

### Climate change

#### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

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

*Pernod Ricard uses the same consolidation approach for environmental impact as for its financial accounting*

### Water

#### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

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

*Pernod Ricard uses the same consolidation approach for environmental impact as for its financial accounting*  
*Pernod Ricard uses the same consolidation approach for environmental impact as for its financial accounting.*

### Plastics

#### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

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

*Pernod Ricard uses the same consolidation approach for environmental impact as for its financial accounting*  
*Pernod Ricard uses the same consolidation approach for environmental impact as for its financial accounting.*

### **Biodiversity**

## (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

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

*Pernod Ricard uses the same consolidation approach for environmental impact as for its financial accounting*  
*Pernod Ricard uses the same consolidation approach for environmental impact as for its financial accounting.*

[Fixed row]

## C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:

No

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

#### (7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply

Yes, an acquisition

Yes, a divestment

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

Acquired or constructed: Petroni (Spain), TX Whiskey Ranch (USA), Rabbit Hole Distillery (USA), Inverroche Distillery (South Africa), The Kyoto Distillery (Japan), The Chuan Distillery (China). Divested: Tormore Distillery (GB)

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

Time of Pernod Ricard taking majority stake in acquisitions and new sites: Petroni Sept 2020; TX Whiskey Ranch Aug 2019; Rabbit Hole Distillery July 2019; Inverroche Distillery Aug 2019; The Kyoto Distillery Jan 2021; The Chuan Distillery Apr 2021. Tormore divested during FY23. New sites' environmental data are added to the Group's environmental reporting perimeter at the latest two full fiscal years after the time of majority stake. Sites or companies divested during the current fiscal year are removed from the environmental reporting perimeter.

[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
- Yes, a change in boundary

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

*As part of our SBTI target resubmission, new perimeters were included in our footprint: emissions linked to investments, downstream transportation, use of sold products, indirect procurement,  
[Fixed row]*

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

### **(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation**

*Select from:*

- Yes

### **(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated**

*Select all that apply*

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

- Scope 3

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

*Pernod Ricard can face different type of changes that might impact their GHG emissions and requires them to recalculate the GHG emissions in the baseline year. This depends on different factors including the type of changes, their materiality to Pernod Ricard's total GHG emissions and the types of GHG emissions reduction targets set by Pernod Ricard. Several changes could require a recalculation: reporting perimeter change, insourcing or outsourcing, methodological changes and emissions inventory changes. Those recalculations will be triggered if the impact of those changes is significant, meaning above a materiality threshold. The materiality threshold has been set to 1%, in line with the industry practice and the Beverage Industry Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Sector Guidance.*

### (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

- Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019
- The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
- The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance
- The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

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

### (7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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



### (7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

### (7.3.3) Comment

*The Group is using the Greenhouse Gas Protocol database for national electricity emission factors and the DEFRA emission factor for heat/steam/cooling. Consequently, country electricity emission factors were applied for all sites. All these emissions factors are verified by external parties.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

Select from:

No

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

#### Scope 1

##### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

##### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

273580

##### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Perimeter: industrial sites owned by Pernod Ricard*

#### Scope 2 (location-based)

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

06/29/2022

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

68555

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Perimeter: industrial sites owned by Pernod Ricard*

## **Scope 2 (market-based)**

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

06/29/2022

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

28127

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Perimeter: industrial sites owned by Pernod Ricard*

## **Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services**

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

06/29/2022

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

3630940

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Every affiliate with manufacturing activity reports each year the amounts of wet goods, dry goods, and points of sale purchased. The collected data is then consolidated, and emission factors from various data bases are applied to calculate the associated CO2e emissions.*

### **Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

06/29/2022

#### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

220378

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Financial teams report the CAPEX invested during the year following financial categories. The categories are then reorganized to fit with Exiobase process. Exiobase then associates emission factors to the categories for each country. CAPEX figures are then consolidated, and the emission factors are applied to calculate the global emissions of our CAPEX.*

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

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

06/29/2022

#### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

77160

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Each affiliate reports through a dedicated platform the energy consumed by type of energy during the fiscal year. The data is then consolidated, and DEFRA emission factors (WTT fuel, WTT bioenergy, WTT generation, Transport and distribution losses for electricity) are applied to calculate the scope 3 CO2e emissions linked to fuel and energy.*

## Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

373174

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Upstream transportation is divided in several categories of transportation: - Upstream transportation between manufacturing sites and the Tier 1 suppliers. Every manufacturing affiliate reports the amount of wet goods and dry goods purchased along with the location of the supplier. A mapping of these flows is then done with associated tonnage of transported goods, and a mode of transport (truck or seaship) is applied to every flow, depending on the geography. A tool is then used to calculate the resulting t.km and CO2e emissions. For other dry goods than glass, an average distance and average emission factors are applied. - Intersites (only within the same affiliate). Every affiliate fills a form to report their intersite activities. Two methods can be used depending on the available data. They can use an energy method, by reporting the amount of fuel consumed by category of fuel, or a tons.km method where they report the tonnage of goods transported by category of transportation (trucks depending on the weight, rail, sea...). Emission factors are then applied to calculate the CO2e emissions. - Brand to market transportation: Every affiliate reports through a dedicated tool information on their shipments to markets: Items quantities and weights, information on the shipper, location of the buyer end the delivery, mode of transport. With these data, a mapping is done, as for upstream transportation, and the mapping tool calculates the resulting CO2e emissions. - In-market transportation (from market companies to wholesale distributors). An internal study defined an average distance for our main market companies for the transport between warehouses and distribution points. Then, with the total volume distributed (9L cases) from each market company, a total tons.km is calculated for in-market transportation, and an average truck emission factor (calculated in the study) is applied to calculate the CO2e emissions. Transportation of points of sales are not included in the scope of this category.*

## Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

828

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Each affiliate with manufacturing activities reports through a dedicated platform the quantity of solid waste generated in manufacturing sites. The data is then consolidated and DEFRA emission factors are applied to the different types of waste and treatment.

## Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9791

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Most of the affiliates are involved in a reporting service for business travel, which compiles all business travels during the year. The service provider sends at the end of the fiscal year an excel file with the CO2e emissions per affiliate. The data is then extrapolated to cover also the non-covered affiliates.

## Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31826

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Each year, HR department consolidates the total number of employees working for Pernod Ricard during the year, using an internal tool. An emission factor, specific to each affiliate, and calculated within a study led for the group on Scope 3, is applied to the data to calculate the total amount of CO2e emissions linked to employee commuting.

## Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

28107

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Our upstream leased assets emissions cover all emissions from energy consumed by the offices during fiscal year, as well as fuel consumed by the vehicles owned or leased by the Group. Emission factors from specific databases are then applied to these consumptions.*

## Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

158154

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*This category includes emissions from storage of sold product in retailers warehouses, and emissions linked to consumers ride to the retailer. Calculation uses data on volumes sold to retailers, combined with generic data on average Energy consumptions of warehouses per square, meters, average distance traveled by consumers and average fuel consumption from consumer vehicles.*

## Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*This category represents 0 CO2e emissions in Pernod Ricard's activity as our sold products don't need further processing by downstream customers*

### Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

#### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

758

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Following the BIER (Beverage Industry Environmental Roundtable) latest greenhouse gas emission sector guidance, we calculated the emissions linked to the use of our fridge to cool our products before being consumed. We accounted the number of fridges bought in different countries, applied an emission factor on the associated consumption of electricity. We added emissions linked to the production phase and the end of life phase of the fridges. We extended the figure on ten years of use to take into account the whole life of the fridges, which gave 758 tons of CO2e. As the result accounts for less than 0.5% of our gross global scope 3 emissions, we considered this category as not relevant.*

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

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

#### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27514

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

To calculate emissions related to end of life treatment of sold products, data of all glass and cardboard purchased during fiscal year (see Purchased goods and services) are being considered. "European Union - 27 countries (from 2020)" treatment rates and DEFRA waste emission factors are then applied to these data. All packaging bought by non-manufacturing affiliates, and other than glass and cardboard, as well as all points of sales, are excluded from this category.

### **Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

06/29/2022

#### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0.0

#### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*This category represents 0 CO2e emissions in Pernod Ricard's activity because Pernod Ricard does not lease assets to third parties.*

### **Scope 3 category 14: Franchises**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

06/29/2022

#### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0.0

#### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*This category represents 0 CO2e emissions in Pernod Ricard's activity because Pernod Ricard does not operate any franchises.*

### **Scope 3 category 15: Investments**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**



06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5217

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*This includes the GHG footprint of the companies on which PR has invested minority shares. The Percentage of the emissions of the companies considered is equal to the percentage of the company owned by PR. The calculation are based on spend based emission factors calculated using intensity metrics extracted from Pernod-Ricard own activities.*

### Scope 3: Other (upstream)

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*This category represents 0 as all the emissions are accounted for in other categories*

### Scope 3: Other (downstream)

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

06/29/2022

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*This category represents 0 as all the emissions are accounted for in other categories*  
*[Fixed row]*

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

|                | Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e) | End date   | Methodological details                                    |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| Reporting year | 232381  | <i>Date input [must be between [10/01/2015 - 10/01/2023]</i> | <i>Perimeter: industrial sites owned by Pernod Ricard</i> |
| Past year 1    | 273580  | 06/29/2022   | <i>Perimeter: industrial sites owned by Pernod Ricard</i> |

*[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)

73348

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

30842

#### (7.7.4) Methodological details

*Perimeter: industrial sites owned by Pernod Ricard*

## Past year 1

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

68555

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

28127

### (7.7.3) End date

06/29/2022

### (7.7.4) Methodological details

*Perimeter: industrial sites owned by Pernod Ricard  
[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)

3611607

#### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Hybrid method

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

100

#### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Every affiliate with manufacturing activity reports each year the amounts of wet goods, dry goods, and points of sale purchased. The collected data is then consolidated, and emission factors from various data bases are applied to calculate the associated CO2e emissions. The sum of every emission of purchased items gives a global emission of 3611607 tons of CO2e*

### Capital goods

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

318121

#### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average spend-based method

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

0

#### (7.8.5) Please explain

Financial teams report the CAPEX invested during the year following financial categories. The categories are then reorganized to fit with Exiobase process. Exiobase then associates emission factors to the categories for each country. CAPEX figures are then consolidated, and the emission factors are applied to calculate the global emissions of our CAPEX. This calculation gave this year 318121 tons of CO2e

## 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)

80009

### (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

Each affiliate reports through a dedicated platform the energy consumed by type of energy during the fiscal year. The data is then consolidated, and DEFRA emission factors (WTT fuel, WTT bioenergy, WTT generation, Transport and distribution losses for electricity) are applied to calculate the scope 3 CO2e emissions linked to fuel and energy. This year, the calculation gave emissions of 80009 tons of CO2e

## Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

377515

## (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

*Upstream transportation is divided in several categories of transportation: - Upstream transportation between manufacturing sites and the Tier 1 suppliers. Every manufacturing affiliate reports the amount of wet goods and dry goods purchased along with the location of the supplier. A mapping of these flows is then done with associated tonnage of transported goods, and a mode of transport (truck or seaship) is applied to every flow, depending on the geography. A tool is then used to calculate the resulting t.km and CO2e emissions. For other dry goods than glass, an average distance and average emission factors are applied. - Intersites (only within the same affiliate). Every affiliate fills a form to report their intersite activities. Two methods can be used depending on the available data. They can use an energy method, by reporting the amount of fuel consumed by category of fuel, or a tons.km method where they report the tonnage of goods transported by category of transportation (trucks depending on the weight, rail, sea...). Emission factors are then applied to calculate the CO2e emissions. - Brand to market transportation: Every affiliate reports through a dedicated tool information on their shipments to markets: Items quantities and weights, information on the shipper, location of the buyer end the delivery, mode of transport. With these data, a mapping is done, as for upstream transportation, and the mapping tool calculates the resulting CO2e emissions. - In-market transportation (from market companies to wholesale distributors). An internal study defined an average distance for our main market companies for the transport between warehouses and distribution points. Then, with the total volume distributed (9L cases) from each market company, a total tons.km is calculated for in-market transportation, and an average truck emission factor (calculated in the study) is applied to calculate the CO2e emissions. Transportation of points of sales are not included in the scope of this category. The calculation resulted in emissions of 377515 tons of CO2e*

## Waste generated in operations

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

- Relevant, calculated

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

820

### (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

*Each affiliate with manufacturing activities reports through a dedicated platform the quantity of solid waste generated in manufacturing sites. The data is then consolidated and DEFRA emission factors are applied to the different types of waste and treatment. The emission calculation resulted in a footprint of 820 tons of CO2e*

## Business travel

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

18946

### (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

*Most of the affiliates are involved in a reporting service for business travel, which compiles all business travels during the year. The service provider sends at the end of the fiscal year an excel file with the CO2e emissions per affiliate. The data is then extrapolated to cover also the non-covered affiliates. This year, business travel accounted for 18946 tons of CO2e*

### Employee commuting

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

34315

#### (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

*Each year, HR department consolidates the total number of employees working for Pernod Ricard during the year, using an internal tool. An emission factor, specific to each affiliate, and calculated within a study led for the group on Scope 3, is applied to the data to calculate the total amount of CO2e emissions linked to employee commuting. This year, it led to 34315 tons of CO2e*



## Upstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

29783

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Hybrid method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Our upstream leased assets emissions cover all emissions from energy consumed by the offices during fiscal year, aswell as fuel consumed by the vehicles owned or leased by the Group. Emission factors from specific databases are then applied to these consumptions. It resulted this year in emissions of 29783 tons of CO2e*

## Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

179230

### (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

*This category includes emissions from storage of sold product in retailers warehouses, and emissions linked to consumers ride to the retailer. Calculation uses data on volumes sold to retailers, combined with generic data on average Energy consumptions of warehouses per square, meters, average distance traveled by consumers and average fuel consumption from consumer vehicles. It resulted in 179230 tons of CO2e emissions*

## Processing of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

- Not relevant, calculated

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

0

### (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 represents 0 CO2e emissions in Pernod Ricard's activity as our sold products don't need further processing by downstream customers*

## Use of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

758

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Hybrid method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Following the BIER (Beverage Industry Environmental Roundtable) latest greenhouse gas emission sector guidance, we calculated the emissions linked to the use of our fridge to cool our products before being consumed. We accounted the number of fridges bought in different countries, applied an emission factor on the associated consumption of electricity. We added emissions linked to the production phase and the end of life phase of the fridges. We extended the figure on ten years of use to take into account the whole life of the fridges, which gave 758 tons of CO2e. As the result accouts for less than 0.5% of our gross global scope 3 emissions, we considered this category as not relevant.*

## 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)

26480

### (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

*To calculate emissions related to end of life treatment of sold products, data of all glass and cardboard purchased during fiscal year (see Purchased goods and services) are being considered. "European Union - 27 countries (from 2020)" treatment rates and DEFRA waste emission factors are then applied to these datas. All packaging bought by non-manufacturing affiliates, and other than glass and cardboard, aswelle as all points of sales, are excluded from this category. This year, end of lie treatment of sold products generated 26480 tons of CO2e*

## Downstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

0

### (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 represents 0 CO2e emissions in Pernod Ricard's activity because Pernod Ricard does not lease assets to third parties.*

### Franchises

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

0

#### (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 represents 0 CO2e emissions in Pernod Ricard's activity because Pernod Ricard does not operate any franchises.*

## Investments

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

5913

### (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 includes the GHG footprint of the companies on which PR has invested minority shares. The Percentage of the emissions of the companies considered is equal to the percentage of the company owned by PR. The calculation are based on spend based emission factors calculated using intensity metrics extracted from Pernod-Ricard own activities. This year it resulted n the emission of 5913 tons of CO2e*

## Other (upstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

0

### (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 represents 0 as all the emissions are accounted for in other categories*

### Other (downstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

0

### (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 represents 0 as all the emissions are 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**

*06/29/2022*

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

*3630940*

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

*220378*

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

*77160*

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

*373174*

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

*828*

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



9791

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

31826

**(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)**

158154

**(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)**

758

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

27514

**(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)**

**(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**

None

*[Fixed row]***(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.**

|  | Verification/assurance status   |
|--|---|
| Scope 1                                  | <i>Select from:</i><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place |
| Scope 2 (location-based or market-based) | <i>Select from:</i><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place |
| Scope 3                                  | <i>Select from:</i><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place |

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

## Row 1

### (7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

### (7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

### (7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

*Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf. (1).pdf*

### (7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

*P165-167 of the registration document attached, section 3.9.2: "Report of one of the Statutory Auditors, appointed as independent third party, on the verification of the consolidated non-financial statement"*

### (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 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**

*Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf. (1).pdf*

**(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference**

*P165-167 of the registration document attached, section 3.9.2: "Report of one of the Statutory Auditors, appointed as independent third party, on the verification of the consolidated non-financial statement"*

### (7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

- ISAE3000

### (7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

#### Row 1

### (7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

- Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

- Annual process

### (7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

- Complete

### (7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

*Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf. (1).pdf*

### (7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

*P165-167 of the registration document attached, section 3.9.: "Report of one of the Statutory Auditors, appointed as independent third party, on the verification of the consolidated non-financial statement"*

### (7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

### (7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

86

[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)**

33398

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

11

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Based on FY22 performance and FY23 production volumes, CO2e emissions related to coal consumption should have resulted in 37 869 tCO2e in FY23. However, the achieved emissions amounted to 4 471 tCO2e thanks to the switch from coal to renewable biomass at Pernod Ricard India. Therefore, we consider the difference (4 471 - 37 869 - 33 398) as the change in emissions caused by change in renewable energy consumption. Indeed, biomass increased by 268% between FY22 and FY23.*

## Other emissions reduction activities

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36847

### (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

Based on FY22 performance and FY23 production volumes, CO2e emissions related to energy consumption (excluding coal) should have resulted in 506 795 tCO2e in FY23. However, the achieved emissions amounted to 469 948 tCO2e, mainly thanks to the decrease in heavy fuel oil consumption due to the installation of high efficiency equipment and to the switch to biofuel. Therefore, we consider the difference (469 948 - 506 795 - 36 847) as the change in emissions caused by other reduction activities.

## 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

No divestment in FY23

## Acquisitions

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7195

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Increased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)



**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

We integrated 6 new sites to the environmental reporting in FY23: The Chuan distillery (China), Petroni bottling site (Spain), The Kyoto Distillery (Japan), Rabbit Hole and TX Whiskey Ranch distilleries (USA), Inverroche distillery (South Africa).

**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**

No mergers in FY23

**Change in output****(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

11624

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

Select from:

Increased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Between FY22 and FY23, our volume of distilled alcohol increased by 4%. Our FY22 scope 1&2 emissions amounted to 301 706 tCO2e.  $4\% * 301\ 706 = 11\ 644$ : If no decarbonization measures had been implemented, increased production would have generated an extra 4% of emissions.*

### Change in methodology

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*No change in methodology in FY23*

### 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

*No change in boundary in FY23*

## 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

*No change in physical operating conditions in FY23*

## 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**

N/A

**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**

N/A

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

Market-based

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

Select from:

Yes

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

**CO2 emissions from land use management**

**(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)**

15944

**(7.13.1.2) Methodology**

Select all that apply

Default emissions factors

**(7.13.1.3) Please explain**

*This part corresponds to all the dry matter recovered from the vineyards' plots and returned to the plot as fertilizer.*

**CO2 removals from land use management**

**(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)**

52482

### (7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

Default emissions factors

### (7.13.1.3) Please explain

*This corresponds to the organic matter retrieved from our production sites and transformed into biofuels (bioethanol, biodiesel, biomethane)*

## Sequestration during land use change

### (7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

### (7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

Default emissions factors

### (7.13.1.3) Please explain

*Experiments in agroforestry and cover cropping have begun, but their impact is yet to be measured*

## CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

### (7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

### (7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

Default emissions factors

### (7.13.1.3) Please explain

*No biofuel is used by our land machinery*

## CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

### (7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

52482

### (7.13.1.2) Methodology

*Select all that apply*

Default emissions factors

### (7.13.1.3) Please explain

*This relates to Scope 1 emissions from biofuel (bioethanol, biodiesel, biomethane) consumption on our production sites.*

## CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

### (7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

### (7.13.1.2) Methodology

*Select all that apply*

Default emissions factors

### (7.13.1.3) Please explain

*There is no other biofuel consumption than the one occurring in our production site  
[Fixed row]*

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

**Maize/corn**

**(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity**

Select from:

Yes

**(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by**

Select from:

Total

**(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)**

99912

**(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production**

Select from:

Metric tons

**(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(7.14.6) Please explain**

*Stable volumes*

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



### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

192270

### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*Stable volumes*

## Rice

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1576142

### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*Stable volumes*

## Sugar

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21757

### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*Stable volumes*

## Wheat

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100140

### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*New volumes in scope.*

### Other commodity

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

232153

### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

Metric tons

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (7.14.6) Please explain

Stable volumes

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

No

### (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)

454.17

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

1232.69

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

1232.69

#### Armenia

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2969.83

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

495.27

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

495.27

**Australia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

833.66

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

9417.91

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

9417.91

**Brazil**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

18.14

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

256.44

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

0

## Canada

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

59990.36

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

3259.09

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

3181.81

## China

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2099.13

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

2030.29

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

600.72

## Cuba

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4783.71

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

1119.79

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

1119.79

**Czechia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

167.61

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

287.57

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

0

**Finland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

237.49

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

0

**France**



**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

8750.1

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

1240.36

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

0

**Germany**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

48.01

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

177.86

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

0

**Greece**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

65.1

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

65.97

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

0

**India**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

6559.29

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

4699.49

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

4699.49

**Ireland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

44552.77

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

13480.63

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

0

**Italy**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

232.69

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

370.31

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

0

## **Japan**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

66.02

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

137.53

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

136.15

## **Mexico**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

6184.51

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

1258.9

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

1258.9

## **New Zealand**

### **(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

354.57

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

662.47

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

0

## **Poland**

### **(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

7.61

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

7928.63

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

5938.82

## **South Africa**

### **(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

19.37

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

82.47

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

82.47

**Spain**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

646.25

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

2351.78

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

0

**Sweden**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1983.71

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

858.56

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

1.32

## United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

87922.21

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

15437.99

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

0

## United States of America

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4794.6

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

6237.62

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

2677.08

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

By activity

## (7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

|       | Activity  | Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e) |
|-------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Row 1 | <i>Distillation</i>                                   | 218141.54                            |
| Row 2 | <i>Others</i>   | 949.91                               |
| Row 3 | <i>Ageing</i>   | 1195                                 |
| Row 4 | <i>Bottling</i>                                       | 9787.46                              |
| Row 5 | <i>Winemaking (including bottling of wine making)</i> | 3429.53                              |

[Add row]

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

Select from:

Yes

**(7.18.1) Select the form(s) in which you are reporting your agricultural/forestry emissions.**

Select from:

Emissions disaggregated by category (advised by the GHG Protocol)

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

Row 1

**(7.18.2.1) Activity**

Select from:

Processing/Manufacturing

### (7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

Non-mechanical

### (7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

8236

### (7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

Empirical models

### (7.18.2.5) Please explain

*These are the scope 1 FLAG emissions linked to the group's owned vineyards. 8 236tCO<sub>2</sub> are from FLAG category and 862 tCO<sub>2</sub> from non-FLAG.*

## Row 2

### (7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

Processing/Manufacturing

### (7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

Mechanical

### (7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

862



#### (7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

- Empirical models

#### (7.18.2.5) Please explain

These are the scope 1 non-FLAG emissions linked to the group's owned vineyards. 8 236tCO2 are from FLAG category and 862 tCO2 from non-FLAG.

### Row 3

#### (7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

- Processing/Manufacturing

#### (7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

- Land use change

#### (7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

405

#### (7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

- Default emissions factor

#### (7.18.2.5) Please explain

Conservative hypothesis regarding LUC, we are in the process of gathering the documents to attest for 0 LUC on scope 1 vineyards.

### Row 4

### (7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

Processing/Manufacturing

### (7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

Mechanical

### (7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

263223

### (7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

Default emissions factor

### (7.18.2.5) Please explain

*These are Scope 1 non-FLAG emissions linked to our manufacturing sites operations.*

*[Add row]*

## **(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.**

Select all that apply

By activity

### **(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.**

|       | Activity   | Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e) | Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e) |
|-------|--|--|--|
| Row 1 | <i>Bottling</i>                                      | 20785.56                                   | 8070.35                                  |
| Row 2 | <i>Distillation</i>                                  | 32792.12                                   | 8871.87                                  |
| Row 4 | <i>Ageing</i>  | 2559.43                                    | 267.91                                   |
| Row 5 | <i>Winemaking (including bottling of winemaking)</i> | 10784.1                                    | 8271.7                                   |
| Row 6 | <i>Others</i>  | 6405.88                                    | 5360.61                                  |

[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)**

232381

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

73348

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

30842

**(7.22.4) Please explain**

Perimeter: all Pernod Ricard owned industrial sites, aligned with financial reporting

## 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

*Pernod Ricard does not have Scope 1&2 emissions related to other entities that are not included in this response.  
[Fixed row]*

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

Select from:

Yes

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

#### Row 1

##### (7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Wyborova

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

7.61

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

7928.63

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

5938.82

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 3**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard India*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

6559.29

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

4699.49

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

4699.49

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 4**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Winemaker USA*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

224.16

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

1109.97

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

1109.97

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 5**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

Havana Club

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

4783.71

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

1119.79

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

1119.79

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 6**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Argentina*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

454.17



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

1232.69

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

1232.69

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 7**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Yerevan Brandy Company*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2969.83

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

495.27

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

495.27

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 8**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Winemakers Australia*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

833.66

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

9417.91

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

9417.91

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 9**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*The Absolute Company*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1983.71

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

858.56

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

1.32

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

## Row 10

### (7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

*GH Mumm & Cie / Perrier-Jouët*

### (7.23.1.2) Primary activity

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

### (7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*2059.48*

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

*325.86*

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

*0*

### (7.23.1.15) Comment

*N/A*

## Row 11

### (7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

6184.51

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

1258.9

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

1258.9

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 12**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

Chivas

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

87922.21

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

15437.99

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 13**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Irish Distillers*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

44552.77

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

13480.63

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 14**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Finland*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0.0

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

237.49

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 15**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard France*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**



1477.46

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

366

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 16**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Hiram Walker & Sons*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

59990.36

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

3259.08

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

3181.81

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 17**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

Martell & Co

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

5213.16

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

569.77

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 18**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Brasil*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

18.14

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

256.44

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

## Row 19

### (7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

*Pernod Ricard Hellas*

### (7.23.1.2) Primary activity

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

### (7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

65.1

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

65.97

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

0.0

### (7.23.1.15) Comment

N/A

## Row 20

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Black Forest Distillers*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*48.01*

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

*177.86*

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

*0.0*

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

*N/A*

**Row 21**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Helan Mountain*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

12.51

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

600.72

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

600.72

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 22**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard USA*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

4570.44

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

5127.65

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

1567.11

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 23**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Winemakers New Zealand*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

354.57

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

662.47

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 24**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Winemakers Spain*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier



**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

296.31

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

1524.07

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 25**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard España*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

349.94

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

827.71

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

0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 26**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

Jan Becher

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

167.61

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

287.57

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 27**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Italia*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

232.69

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

370.31

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

0.0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

**Row 28**

**(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name**

*Pernod Ricard Emeishan*

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2086.62

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

1429.57

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

0

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

## Row 29

### (7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

*Pernod Ricard South Africa*

### (7.23.1.2) Primary activity

*Select from:*

Alcoholic beverages

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

*Select all that apply*

No unique identifier

### (7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*66.02*

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

*137.53*

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

*136.15*

### (7.23.1.15) Comment

*N/A*

## Row 30

### (7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

Alcoholic beverages

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

Select all that apply

No unique identifier

**(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

19.37

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

82.47

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

82.47

**(7.23.1.15) Comment**

N/A

[Add 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:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes   |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity   | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes   |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired heat          | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired steam         | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes   |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling       | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |
| Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes   |

[Fixed row]

### (7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

#### Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

##### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV (lower heating value)

##### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

162347

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1117262

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

1279609

## Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV (lower heating value)

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

232783.11

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

58362.87

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

291145.98

## Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV (lower heating value)



### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

27006.08

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

27006.08

## Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV (lower heating value)

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

4857.08

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

4857.08

## Total energy consumption

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV (lower heating value)

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

**(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources**

1202630.95

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

1602618.14

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

*[Fixed row]***(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.**

## Sustainable biomass

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

110330.13

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels*

## Other biomass

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels*

## Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

52017.36

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels*

## Coal

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

13165.05

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels*

## Oil

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

46563.88

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels*

### Gas

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1057533.03

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels*

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

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

27006.08

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels*

### Total fuel

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1306615.53

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Electricity self-generated by Pernod Ricard only comes from solar panels  
[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)

5468.18

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

4857.08

#### (7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

5468.18

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

4857.08

## 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]

**(7.30.16) 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)

3837.78

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

0

### (7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

Select from:

No



**(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)**

3837.78

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Armenia**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

2602.58

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

2602.58

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Australia**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

13283.37

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

1810.12

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

15093.49

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Brazil**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

2574.65

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

2574.65

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Canada**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

24840.62

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

24840.62

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**China**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

3309.35

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

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

133.45

**(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)**

3442.80

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Cuba**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

2331.93

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

221.2

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

2553.13

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Czechia**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

582.84

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

582.84

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Finland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

2033.29

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

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

1995.44

**(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)**

4028.73

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**France**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

23022.32

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

23022.32

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A



## Germany

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

445.42

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

0

### (7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

Select from:

No

### (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)

445.42

### (7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded

N/A

## Greece

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

121.29

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

121.29

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**India**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

6291.15

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

1280.91

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

7572.06

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Ireland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

40862.76

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

40862.76

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Italy**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

1207.02

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

1207.02

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Japan**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

275

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

275.00

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

## Mexico

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2766.81

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

859.77

### (7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

Select from:

No

### (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)

3626.58

### (7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded

N/A

## New Zealand

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6111.37

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

6111.37

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Poland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

2817.62

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

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

20354.99

**(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)**

23172.61

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**South Africa**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

91.26

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No



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

107.2

**(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)**

198.46

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**Spain**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

9108.35

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

678.14

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

9786.49

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

## Sweden

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

64454

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

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

4415

**(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)**

68869.00

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

67859.29

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

67859.29

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

**United States of America**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

15172.99

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

No

**(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)**

15172.99

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

N/A

[Fixed row]

**(7.30.17) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity purchases in the reporting year by country/area.**

**Row 1**

**(7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

Spain

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Solar

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

9108.35

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Spain

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

### (7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)

Select from:

2023

### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

## Row 2

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Brazil

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Solar

**(7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

2574.65

**(7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

I-REC

**(7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

Brazil

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

### Row 3

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

France

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

23022.32

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:



France

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

Select from:

No

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

2020

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

**(7.30.17.12) Comment**

N/A

#### Row 4

**(7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

Greece

### **(7.30.17.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

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

### **(7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

- Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### **(7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

121.29

### **(7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

- GO

### **(7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

- Greece

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

Select from:

- No

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

2020

### **(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

#### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

#### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

#### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

### Row 5

#### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Ireland

#### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

#### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

40862.76

#### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Ireland

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

#### (7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)

Select from:

2023

#### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

#### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

### Row 6

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Italy

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1207.02

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Italy

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

**(7.30.17.12) Comment**

N/A

**Row 7**

**(7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

New Zealand

**(7.30.17.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

### **(7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

Wind

### **(7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

6111.37

### **(7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

I-REC

### **(7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

New Zealand

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

### **(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

## Row 8

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Poland

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Wind

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2817.62

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used



Select from:

GO

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Poland

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

Select from:

No

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

2021

### (7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)

Select from:

2023

### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

## Row 9

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Czechia

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

582.84

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Czechia

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

Select from:

No

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

2019

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

**(7.30.17.12) Comment**

N/A

**Row 10**

**(7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

Sweden

**(7.30.17.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

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

**(7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

64454

#### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Sweden

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

#### (7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)

Select from:

2023

#### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

- No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

## Row 11

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

- Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

67859.29

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

- GO

**(7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

**(7.30.17.12) Comment**

N/A

**Row 12**

**(7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

United States of America

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Wind

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

8661

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

I-REC

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

United States of America

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

Select from:

No

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

2023

### (7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)

Select from:

2023

### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

## Row 13

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Germany

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Wind



**(7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

445.42

**(7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

GO

**(7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

Germany

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

Select from:

No

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

2022

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

### Row 14

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Canada

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

588.96

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Contract

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Canada

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

Select from:

No

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

2023

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2022

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

**(7.30.17.12) Comment**

N/A

## Row 15

**(7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

China

### **(7.30.17.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

- Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

### **(7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

- Solar

### **(7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

2330.18

### **(7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

- GO

### **(7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

- China

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

Select from:

- No

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

2023

### **(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2022

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

## Row 17

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Japan

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2.75

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

I-REC

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Japan

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

Select from:

No

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

2023

### (7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)

Select from:

2023

### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2022

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

N/A

### Row 18

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Finland

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Wind

### (7.30.17.4) Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2033.29

### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

Finland

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

Select from:

No

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

2018

**(7.30.17.9) Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

Select from:

2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2022

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

No additional, voluntary label

**(7.30.17.12) Comment**

N/A

[Add row]

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

**Row 1**

**(7.30.18.1) Sourcing method**



Select from:

Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

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

Select from:

Finland

### (7.30.18.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Heat

### (7.30.18.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Low-carbon energy mix

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

1995.44

### (7.30.18.6) Comment

N/A

## Row 2

### (7.30.18.1) Sourcing method

Select from:

Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

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

Select from:

Sweden

### (7.30.18.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Heat

### (7.30.18.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Low-carbon energy mix

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

4415

### (7.30.18.6) Comment

N/A

[Add row]

**(7.30.19) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity generation by country/area in the reporting year.**

#### Row 1

### (7.30.19.1) Country/area of generation

Select from:

Australia

### (7.30.19.2) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Solar

**(7.30.19.3) Facility capacity (MW)**

4.1

**(7.30.19.4) Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

2189.11

**(7.30.19.5) Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

1810.12

**(7.30.19.6) Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation**

Select from:

Yes

**(7.30.19.7) Type of energy attribute certificate**

Select from:

Australian LGC

**(7.30.19.8) Comment**

N/A

**Row 2**

**(7.30.19.1) Country/area of generation**

Select from:

Spain

**(7.30.19.2) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

Geothermal

**(7.30.19.3) Facility capacity (MW)**

0.2

**(7.30.19.4) Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

678.14

**(7.30.19.5) Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

678.14

**(7.30.19.6) Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.19.8) Comment**

N/A

**Row 3**

**(7.30.19.1) Country/area of generation**

Select from:

India

**(7.30.19.2) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

Solar

**(7.30.19.3) Facility capacity (MW)**

1.75

**(7.30.19.4) Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

1512.18

**(7.30.19.5) Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

1280.91

**(7.30.19.6) Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation**

Select from:

Yes

**(7.30.19.7) Type of energy attribute certificate**

Select from:

Indian REC

**(7.30.19.8) Comment**

N/A

**Row 4**

**(7.30.19.1) Country/area of generation**

Select from:

Mexico

**(7.30.19.2) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

Solar

**(7.30.19.3) Facility capacity (MW)**

0.5

**(7.30.19.4) Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

859.77

**(7.30.19.5) Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

859.77

**(7.30.19.6) Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.19.8) Comment**

N/A

**Row 5**

**(7.30.19.1) Country/area of generation**

Select from:

Cuba

**(7.30.19.2) Renewable electricity technology type**

Select from:

Solar

**(7.30.19.3) Facility capacity (MW)**

0.2

**(7.30.19.4) Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

221.2

**(7.30.19.5) Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**

221.2

**(7.30.19.6) Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation**

Select from:

Yes

**(7.30.19.7) Type of energy attribute certificate**

Select from:

I-REC

**(7.30.19.8) Comment**

N/A

**Row 6**

**(7.30.19.1) Country/area of generation**

Select from:

France

### (7.30.19.2) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

Solar

### (7.30.19.3) Facility capacity (MW)

0.2

### (7.30.19.4) Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)

6.93

### (7.30.19.5) Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)

6.93

### (7.30.19.6) Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation

Select from:

Yes

### (7.30.19.7) Type of energy attribute certificate

Select from:

I-REC

### (7.30.19.8) Comment

N/A

[Add row]

**(7.30.20) Describe how your organization's renewable electricity sourcing strategy directly or indirectly contributes to bringing new capacity into the grid in the countries/areas in which you operate.**



Pernod Ricard's renewable electricity sourcing strategy is focusing on four options:- Green Tariffs (bundled EACs);- Unbundled EACs;- On-site solar panels;- PPA (Power Purchased Agreement). The current strategy is a mix between the first three options. The affiliates are investigating on-site solar panel options where it makes sense. Besides, the Group is currently investigating PPA opportunities. These initiatives will contribute to bring new capacity into the grid in the countries in which we will develop the project. The objective of the Group is to cover the majority of our consumption load with PPA and on-site options.

**(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**

0.00002169

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

263223

**(7.45.3) Metric denominator**

Select from:

unit total revenue

**(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total**

12137000000

**(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used**

Select from:

Market-based

**(7.45.6) % change from previous year**

23

### (7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

Change in renewable energy consumption

### (7.45.9) Please explain

*The carbon scope 1&2 intensity has decreased by 23% compared to last year due to an increase in renewable electricity sourcing and improvements in energy efficiency. Our guidelines to reach RE100 commitment by 2025 led to encouraging initiatives in all affiliates to source more electricity through renewable supply (Green tariffs, EACs procurement mainly for now).*

[Add row]

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

### Row 1

#### (7.52.1) Description

Select from:

Energy usage

#### (7.52.2) Metric value

5.4

#### (7.52.3) Metric numerator

*Total energy consumption (MWh)*

**(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)**

*Total volume of distilled alcohol (kLAA)*

**(7.52.5) % change from previous year**

3

**(7.52.6) Direction of change**

Select from:

Decreased

**(7.52.7) Please explain**

*In FY23 the consolidated energy consumption intensity remained stable compared to FY22.*

**Row 2**

**(7.52.1) Description**

Select from:

Waste

**(7.52.2) Metric value**

119

**(7.52.3) Metric numerator**

*Tons of waste*

**(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)**

N/A

### (7.52.5) % change from previous year

6

### (7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

Increased

### (7.52.7) Please explain

*In FY23, the amount of total non-hazardous waste landfilled slightly increased compared to FY22, due to newly integrated acquisitions. Overall, 77 industrial sites out of 93 have achieved zero waste to landfill. It remains a significant reduction from the 10,253 tonnes in FY10, and the result of the Group's zero-waste-to-landfill policy implemented across all production sites.*

## Row 3

### (7.52.1) Description

Select from:

Other, please specify :Water Efficiency

### (7.52.2) Metric value

22.98

### (7.52.3) Metric numerator

*Total volume of water consumed (m3)*

### (7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

*Total volume of distilled alcohol (kLAA)*

### (7.52.5) % change from previous year

**(7.52.6) Direction of change**

Select from:

Increased

**(7.52.7) Please explain**

*In FY23, there is a slight increase of overall water intensity, mainly due to the integration of new sites in the reporting, the last sites integrated having a higher water intensity than the Group average.*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

Absolute target

**(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.****Row 1****(7.53.1.1) Target reference number**

Select from:

Abs 1

**(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?**

Select from:

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

**(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

#### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

#### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

05/05/2024

#### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

#### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH4)
- Nitrous oxide (N2O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

#### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

#### (7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

Market-based

**(7.53.1.11) End date of base year**

06/30/2022

**(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

300906

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

37105

**(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)**

338011.000

**(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**

83

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

54

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

155485.060

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

261174

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

39952

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

301126.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

20.21

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway



### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The Group submitted a greenhouse gas emission reduction target to the Science-Based Targets (SBT) initiative. In May 2024, the SBT initiative approved our targets, which are aligned with a 1,5C scenario for our Scope 1 and 2 emission, meaning a 54% scope 1 and 2 absolute emission reduction by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050. This KPI covers the absolute value of the GHG emissions of the production sites operated by the Group: Scope 1 emissions (direct emissions from own activities) and Scope 2 emissions (indirect emissions from consumption of purchased electricity, heat or steam). It does not include the following activities: ageing sites with no production or no staff, production facilities shut down for an indefinite period, external co-packing sites not belonging to Pernod Ricard and not located on production sites, distribution sites and other buildings not located on production sites, owned vineyards, commercial fleet.

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

- 54% scope 1 and 2 absolute emission reduction by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050

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

The Group is working on two fronts for scope 1&2: i) improving energy efficiency ii) using less and less carbon-intensive energy To encourage such transitions, the Group has introduced an internal carbon price of 80 per ton of CO2 equivalent for investments. The Group has the objective to replace fossil fuel energy sources and plans to only use renewable electricity by 2025. This year, as part of the acceleration of our carbon reduction roadmap, the Group consolidated projects and reduction opportunities with projected investments to achieve our scope 1 and 2 target. The main actions and levers identified are: energy efficiency boiler, steam recycling through MVR (mechanical vapor recompression), stop drying, methanization, biofuels usage at distilleries and renewable electricity procurement (PPA, solar panels, EACs). This year, scope 1&2 emissions decreased by 12% compared to last year, which shows a significant improvement.

### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

## Row 2

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 2

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

*Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf*

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

05/05/2024

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>)

### (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**

06/29/2022

**(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

300907

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

37105

**(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)**

338012.000

**(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**

83

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/29/2050

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

90

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

33801.200

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

261174

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

39952

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

301126.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

 Underway**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*The Group submitted a greenhouse gas emission reduction target to the Science-Based Targets (SBT) initiative. In May 2024, the SBT initiative approved our targets, which are aligned with a 1,5C scenario for our Scope 1 and 2 emission, meaning a 54% scope 1 and 2 absolute emission reduction by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050. This KPI covers the absolute value of the GHG emissions of the production sites operated by the Group: Scope 1 emissions (direct emissions from own activities) and Scope 2 emissions (indirect emissions from consumption of purchased electricity, heat or steam). It does not include the following activities: ageing sites with no production or no staff, production facilities shut down for an indefinite period, external co-packing sites not belonging to Pernod Ricard and not located on production sites, distribution sites and other buildings not located on production sites, owned vineyards, commercial fleet.*

**(7.53.1.83) Target objective**

*- 54% scope 1 and 2 absolute emission reduction by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050*

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

*The Group is working on two fronts for scope 1&2: i) improving energy efficiency ii) using less and less carbon-intensive energy To encourage such transitions, the Group has introduced an internal carbon price of 80 per ton of CO2 equivalent for investments. The Group has the objective to replace fossil fuel energy sources and plans to only use renewable electricity by 2025. This year, as part of the acceleration of our carbon reduction roadmap, the Group consolidated projects and reduction opportunities with projected investments to achieve our scope 1 and 2 target. The main actions and levers identified are: energy efficiency boiler, steam recycling through MVR (mechanical vapor recompression), stop drying, methanization, biofuels usage at distilleries and renewable electricity procurement (PPA, solar panels, EACs). This year, scope 1&2 emissions decreased by 12% compared to last year, which shows a significant improvement.*

**(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach**

Select from:

 No**Row 3**

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

- Abs 3

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

*Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf*

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

*05/05/2024*

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>)

Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

### **(7.53.1.8) Scopes**

*Select all that apply*

Scope 3

### **(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories**

*Select all that apply*

Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

### **(7.53.1.11) End date of base year**

06/29/2022

### **(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

3410974

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

373174

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

3784148.000

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

3784148.000

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

93

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

100

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

84

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

83

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/29/2030

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

25

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

2838111.000

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



3396614

**(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

377515

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

3774129.000

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

3774129.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

1.06

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Our targets also include scope 3 and deforestation: - reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions covering purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution 25.0% by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050 - reduce absolute scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 30.3% by FY2030 and 72% by FY2050 - no deforestation across our primary deforestation-linked commodities, target in FY25 Scope 3 emissions represent the vast majority of Pernod Ricard's GHG emissions, 92% in FY23, therefore it provides a focus to reduce overall emissions. The target covers 86% of the Scope 3, which represents those categories: "Purchased Goods and Services" (Raw Agricultural Materials and Dry Goods) and "Upstream Transportation and distribution". This KPI covers the intensity of indirect GHG emissions associated with*

Group's activities (Scope 3 emissions). It does not include the following activities: Capital goods, fuel and energy-related activities, waste generated in operations, business travel, employee commuting, upstream leased assets, downstream transportation and distribution, downstream leased assets, end-of-life sold products, processing of sold products, use of sold products, franchises, investments. Scope 3 is defined and calculated as set out in the GHG Protocol. Carbon offsets and avoided emissions are not included in the calculation.

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

- reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions covering purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution 25.0% by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050 - reduce absolute scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 30.3% by FY2030 and 72% by FY2050 - no deforestation across our primary deforestation-linked commodities, target in FY25

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

To help reduce Scope 3, the Group follows a two-step approach consisting of: • assessing its carbon footprint throughout the supply chain to identify priorities; • implementing relevant measures to reduce direct and indirect emissions, working with production sites, farmers and suppliers. Agriculture is the most carbon-intensive activity in Pernod Ricard's value chain. Pernod Ricard's products inherently rely on agriculture. Establishing and helping improve agricultural practices is therefore a strategic priority for the Group. On its own land, the Group promotes regenerative agriculture, which can help capture carbon in the soil. Moreover, the Group works with agricultural suppliers to establish preferred standards for each crop. The goal is to identify the best way of reducing greenhouse gas emissions for each crop. Packaging and POS materials are the second most carbon-intensive activity in Pernod Ricard's value chain. To reduce their carbon impact, the Group focuses on enhancing the eco-design of its packaging (reducing its weight and increasing recycled content) and working with suppliers to reduce CO2 emissions generated during their manufacturing process. Pernod Ricard seeks to optimise land transport by improving vehicle loading, adjusting schedules and using more efficient vehicles. In the US, the Group is also a member of Smartways Association, which aims to reduce land transportation emissions. In Europe, the Absolut Company is a member of the Clean Shipping Project.

### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

## Row 4

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 4

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

*Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf*

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

05/05/2024

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>)

### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 3

### **(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories**

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

### **(7.53.1.11) End date of base year**

06/29/2022

### **(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

3410974

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

373174

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

3784148.000

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

3784148.000

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

93

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

100

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

84

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

83

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/29/2050

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

90

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

378414.800

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

3396614

**(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

377515

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

3774129.000

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

3774129.000

### (7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

### (7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.29

### (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Our targets also include scope 3 and deforestation: - reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions covering purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution 25.0% by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050 - reduce absolute scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 30.3% by FY2030 and 72% by FY2050 - no deforestation across our primary deforestation-linked commodities, target in FY25 Scope 3 emissions represent the vast majority of Pernod Ricard's GHG emissions, 92% in FY23, therefore it provides a focus to reduce overall emissions. The target covers 86% of the Scope 3, which represents those categories: "Purchased Goods and Services" (Raw Agricultural Materials and Dry Goods) and "Upstream Transportation and distribution". This KPI covers the intensity of indirect GHG emissions associated with Group's activities (Scope 3 emissions). It does not include the following activities: Capital goods, fuel and energy-related activities, waste generated in operations, business travel, employee commuting, upstream leased assets, downstream transportation and distribution, downstream leased assets, end-of-life sold products, processing of sold products, use of sold products, franchises, investments. Scope 3 is defined and calculated as set out in the GHG Protocol. Carbon offsets and avoided emissions are not included in the calculation.*

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*- reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions covering purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution 25.0% by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050 - reduce absolute scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 30.3% by FY2030 and 72% by FY2050 - no deforestation across our primary deforestation-linked commodities, target in FY25*

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

To help reduce Scope 3, the Group follows a two-step approach consisting of: • assessing its carbon footprint throughout the supply chain to identify priorities; • implementing relevant measures to reduce direct and indirect emissions, working with production sites, farmers and suppliers. Agriculture is the most carbon-intensive activity in Pernod Ricard's value chain. Pernod Ricard's products inherently rely on agriculture. Establishing and helping improve agricultural practices is therefore a strategic priority for the Group. On its own land, the Group promotes regenerative agriculture, which can help capture carbon in the soil. Moreover, the Group works with agricultural suppliers to establish preferred standards for each crop. The goal is to identify the best way of reducing greenhouse gas emissions for each crop. Packaging and POS materials are the second most carbon-intensive activity in Pernod Ricard's value chain. To reduce their carbon impact, the Group focuses on enhancing the eco-design of its packaging (reducing its weight and increasing recycled content) and working with suppliers to reduce CO2 emissions generated during their manufacturing process. Pernod Ricard seeks to optimise land transport by improving vehicle loading, adjusting schedules and using more efficient vehicles. In the US, the Group is also a member of Smartways Association, which aims to reduce land transportation emissions. In Europe, the Absolut Company is a member of the Clean Shipping Project.

### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

[Add row]

### (7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

Net-zero targets

### (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

06/30/2018

### (7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

Consumption

### (7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

Renewable energy source(s) only

### (7.54.1.7) End date of base year

06/29/2019

### (7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

190302

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

67

### (7.54.1.10) End date of target



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

100

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

78.6

**(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year**

35.15

**(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

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

*We aim to cover 100% of our electricity consumption with renewable electricity by 2025. This objective is part of our reduction of SCOPE 1 and 2 emissions (market-based); ID Abs1 & Abs2.*

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

Select all that apply

RE100

**(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*This target covers our production sites as well as all our other buildings. The total renewable electricity consumption is calculated with the part covered by green or renewable energy certificates and the amount of renewable electricity produced and used on site.*

**(7.54.1.20) Target objective**

Cover 100% of our electricity consumption with renewable electricity and EAC by 2025

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

The Group is currently working on its global renewable electricity strategy by investigating several options: PPA (Power Purchase Agreement), Green Tariffs with suppliers, EACs (energy attribute certificates) and on-site self-generation solutions. The Group has reached 80,3% renewable electricity consumption at the end of the reporting year (13,3% compared to base year).

[Add row]

### (7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

#### Row 1

#### (7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

NZ1

#### (7.54.3.2) Date target was set

05/04/2024

#### (7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

#### (7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

Abs1

Abs2

Abs3

Abs4

### (7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

06/29/2050

### (7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.54.3.7) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

*Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf*

### (7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2
- Scope 3

### (7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>)

### (7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*The Group submitted a greenhouse gas emission reduction target to the Science-Based Targets (SBT) initiative. In May 2024, the SBT initiative approved our targets, which are aligned with a 1,5C scenario for our Scope 1 and 2 emission, meaning a 54% scope 1 and 2 absolute emission reduction by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050. This KPI covers the absolute value of the GHG emissions of the production sites operated by the Group: Scope 1 emissions (direct emissions from own activities) and*

Scope 2 emissions (indirect emissions from consumption of purchased electricity, heat or steam). It does not include the following activities: ageing sites with no production or no staff, production facilities shut down for an indefinite period, external co-packing sites not belonging to Pernod Ricard and not located on production sites, distribution sites and other buildings not located on production sites, owned vineyards, commercial fleet. Our targets also include scope 3 and deforestation: - reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions covering purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution 25.0% by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050 - reduce absolute scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 30.3% by FY2030 and 72% by FY2050 - no deforestation across our primary deforestation-linked commodities, target in FY25 Scope 3 emissions represent the vast majority of Pernod Ricard's GHG emissions, 92% in FY23, therefore it provides a focus to reduce overall emissions. The target covers 86% of the Scope 3, which represents those categories: "Purchased Goods and Services" (Raw Agricultural Materials and Dry Goods) and "Upstream Transportation and distribution". This KPI covers the intensity of indirect GHG emissions associated with Group's activities (Scope 3 emissions). It does not include the following activities: Capital goods, fuel and energy-related activities, waste generated in operations, business travel, employee commuting, upstream leased assets, downstream transportation and distribution, downstream leased assets, end-of-life sold products, processing of sold products, use of sold products, franchises, investments. Scope 3 is defined and calculated as set out in the GHG Protocol. Carbon offsets and avoided emissions are not included in the calculation.

#### **(7.54.3.11) Target objective**

- 54% scope 1 and 2 absolute emission reduction by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050. - reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions covering purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution 25.0% by FY2030 and 90% by FY2050 - reduce absolute scope 3 FLAG GHG emissions 30.3% by FY2030 and 72% by FY2050 - no deforestation across our primary deforestation-linked commodities, target in FY25

#### **(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?**

Select from:

Yes

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

Select from:

Yes, and we have already acted on this in the reporting year

#### **(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?**

Select all that apply

No, we do not plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation

#### **(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target**

Our first investments concern feasibility studies aimed at sizing the potential carbon sinks in our strategic regions. This involves identifying the geographical areas with the highest potential according to the types of permanent carbon removals (mangroves, forests, etc.).

### (7.54.3.16) Describe the actions to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain

As an agricultural business, our Net Zero strategy aims to focus as much of our efforts as possible within our value chain. Mitigation actions will therefore be located first within our terroirs.

### (7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

### (7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Review of the target will be done via environmental reportings, with the SBTi and other audit firms

[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 | 26                    | <i>Numeric input</i>   |

|                          | Number of initiatives | Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| To be implemented        | 24                    | 33611  |
| Implementation commenced | 23                    | 94015  |
| Implemented              | 20                    | 27325  |
| Not to be implemented    | 0                     | <i>Numeric input</i>   |

*[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)

27325

#### (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)

2100000

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

36870000

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

16-20 years

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

Ongoing

#### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*A 332 million euros CAPEX plan over the FY22-FY30 period, was secured. The investment required was calculated by annualising this amount.  
[Add row]*

### (7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

#### Row 1

#### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Internal price on carbon

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*We use an internal carbon price of 80euros/tCO2 in all of our operating investments.*

## Row 3

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Scope 2 reduction emissions due to purchased Green Energy Certificate by some affiliates. In addition to that, affiliates contribute to the global scope 1 reduction roadmap by defining their reduction initiatives and budget planned. As example, Irish Distillers and Chivas Brothers will invest 50 million and 80 million respectively over the next four years to deliver a carbon neutral operation by the end of 2026, using break-through emissions reducing technology (MVR and bio-plants).*

## Row 4

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Energy saving and environmental compliance have been strong drivers of carbon reduction investment projects. Each year, some investments are made in our distilleries for capacity expansion equipment replacement have given the opportunity to improve the energy efficiency of our operations, hence reducing their carbon emissions.*

## Row 5

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:



Employee engagement

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Long-Term Incentive Plan (for Executive Directors and employees): The Board of Directors has decided in 2021 to grant shares free of charge to employees and Executive Directors of the Company and Group companies, and introduced a criterion based on social responsibility in line with its roadmap in this area. The shares to be allocated would be subject notably to an internal performance condition related to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) based on 4 sub-criteria. One of them is related to carbon and related to the implementation of the roadmap to reduce scope 1 and 2 CO2 emissions generated by Pernod Ricard's sites.*  
[Add row]

### **(7.67) Do you implement agriculture or forest management practices on your own land with a climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefit?**

Select from:

Yes

### **(7.67.1) Specify the agricultural or forest management practice(s) implemented on your own land with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits and provide a corresponding emissions figure, if known.**

#### **Row 1**

#### **(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number**

Select from:

MP1

#### **(7.67.1.2) Management practice**

Select from:

Agroforestry

#### **(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice**

*8 ha of vineyard is dedicated to agroforestry on our own lands. A wide variety of trees were planted between the rows and around the plot.*

#### (7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

#### (7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

6

#### (7.67.1.6) Please explain

*Agroforestry in our Cognac vineyard is a pioneering pilot project which aims to increase our resilience to climate change and extreme weather events through the multiple benefits that tree can offer: Wind shield, water retention, decreasing soil erosion and loss, wildlife habitat (to promote biocontrol and biodiversity), heat protection and finally carbon storage.*

### Row 2

#### (7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

- MP2

#### (7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

- Integrated pest management

#### (7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

*As agave growers, the Group is committed to adapt the terroir to climate change, mitigate its impact on climate and reduce its impact on nature. In order to do so, several programs were launched such as the development of a methodology for retention and degradation of pesticides through biobeds, testing organic pesticides and biostimulants, working on crop nutrition and soil health through biofertilizers and finally the development of knowledge linked to regenerative cultivation of agave.*

#### (7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

- Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

#### (7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

440

#### (7.67.1.6) Please explain

*Conservative approach as to CO2 savings. The carbon removals are not accounted for.*

### Row 3

#### (7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

- MP3

#### (7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

- Permanent soil cover (including cover crops)

#### (7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

*Our objective is to make our vineyards adaptable to climate change and to build terroirs that are resilient regarding increasingly extreme climatological events to come. The key factor of this adaptation is to nurture a living soil: fertile and with the capacity to keep humidity. Following a precise mapping of our vine terroirs, we defined a three axis program: - Restoring soils health potential by implementing specific practices, such as selecting appropriate plant cover - Natural nutrition and protection of vines relying either on plant-soil interactions or on natural inputs - Conserving and restoring landscape and biodiversity by working on territorial mosaics or by re-introducing functional biodiversity.*

#### (7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

### (7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

100

### (7.67.1.6) Please explain

*Trial on almost 700 hectares (cover crops low/no tillage compost animal grazing biodiversity areas) Estimated savings 10% less on emission factor (ongoing study - does not incorporate sequestration)*

[Add row]

### (7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:

Yes

### (7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

#### Row 1

### (7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

MP3

### (7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

Agroforestry

### (7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

*Agroforestry is a practice developed within our communities of coffee growers in Mexico in the province of Veracruz. Its purpose is to shade the coffee plants, regulate the water cycle, structure the soil and intervene in the fertility of the plots.*

#### **(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation**

*Select all that apply*

- Financial
- Procurement

#### **(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation**

*Pernod Ricard hires an NGO to carry out the project of tree planting and coffee cultivation. The coffee is then bought by Pernod Ricard as part of its sourcing of agricultural materials.*

#### **(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit**

*Select all that apply*

- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
- Increase carbon sink (mitigation)
- Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

#### **(7.68.1.7) Comment**

*The presence of trees in the plot limits soil erosion and improves its structure. Thanks to the diversification of the present species, the resilience to climatic events is improved. Thus, fertilizer inputs are reduced. Estimated CO2 savings based on carbon sequestration potential for agroforestry (4/1000 study): 207 kg C / Ha / Y. The surface under agroforestry is 30 Ha.*

### **Row 2**

#### **(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number**

*Select from:*

- MP2

#### **(7.68.1.2) Management practice**

Select from:

- Other, please specify :Regenerative agriculture

### (7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

*For Pernod Ricard, Regenerative agriculture is a holistic approach that aims to protect soil life and natural fertility, improve water retention capacity, and protect and enhance biodiversity. In the long term, this model aims to improve the global crop vigor, maximize carbon storage in the soil, ensure quality of the harvest and secure yields. As a result, it improves the overall resilience of the terroir, particularly in the face of climate change, ensures the health and life balance of farming communities as well as long-term economic viability. Through our pilot trials, we seek to combine best practices (crop diversification, rotations, cover crops, low/no tillage, biodiversity areas, agroforestry, livestock introduction, etc.) in order to recreate natural balances, reduce impacts and improve resilience.*

### (7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

- Financial
- Knowledge sharing
- Procurement

### (7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

*Pernod Ricard invests in pilot testings together with suppliers and farmers to test the best combination of practices. Meaning co-investing in inputs and equipments, in training sessions and knowledge promotion.*

### (7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

- Emissions reductions (mitigation)
- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
- Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

### (7.68.1.7) Comment

*The implementation of regenerative agriculture is currently the goal of 17 specific programs, on 13 crops across 11 countries.*

**Row 3**

### (7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

- MP1

### (7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

- Other, please specify :Sustainable sourcing practices

### (7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

*There are two aspects to the Group's actions in respect of agricultural product purchases and to ensure that our suppliers use sustainable agriculture practices:- The application of the sustainable sourcing process for ingredients, that allows us to identify and evaluate terroirs and suppliers at risk in terms of S&R in order to develop suitable action plans. We've developed a terroir risk mapping to identify social and environmental risks- Certification implementation to address environmental and social risks in agricultural activities and collaboration with our suppliers to mitigate risks identified.*

### (7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

- Knowledge sharing
- Procurement

### (7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

*We encourage implementation of agriculture practices by implementing sustainable agriculture standards and sharing good practices between our suppliers. For instance, In France, at Martell, regular working groups are organised with the Grapes growers to share the impact on new sustainable agriculture principles.*

### (7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

- Emissions reductions (mitigation)
- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
- Increase carbon sink (mitigation)
- Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

### **(7.68.1.7) Comment**

*Scaling up.*  
*[Add row]*

**(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?**

*Select from:*

Yes

**(7.69) Do you know if any of the management practices implemented on your own land disclosed in 7.67.1 have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?**

*Select from:*

Yes

**(7.69.1) Provide details on those management practices that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation and on your management response.**

### **Row 1**

#### **(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number**

*Select from:*

MP1

#### **(7.69.1.2) Overall effect**

*Select from:*

Positive

#### **(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?**



Select all that apply

- Biodiversity
- Soil
- Water
- Other, please specify :Cost

#### (7.69.1.4) Description of impact

*We use and promote functional biodiversity (cover crops, flower bands, sheeps, agroforestry...) and mechanical practices to globally reduce agrochemicals use and avoid the more dangerous ones. Moreover, 100% of vineyards (by hectares) are certified according to environmental standards. As a consequence, we expect positive impacts on soil fertility and moisture, natural balance and biodiversity expansion. And this management practice reduces also our costs due to less chemical product usage.*

#### (7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

- No

#### (7.69.1.6) Description of the response

*We have not implemented any response as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.  
[Add row]*

#### **(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?**

Select from:

- Yes

#### **(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.**

**Row 1**

### (7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

MP1

### (7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

Positive

### (7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

Biodiversity

Soil

Water

Other, please specify :Cost

### (7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

*The direct purchasing of agricultural products by affiliates results in a number of partnership initiatives being undertaken with the Group's agricultural suppliers. For example, In Sweden, 100% of the wheat bought by The Absolut Company is produced locally in line with rigorous specifications and monitored in terms of sustainable agriculture. In France, the majority of the fennel used for the production of Ricard is grown by farmers in Provence in accordance with sustainable agriculture principles. Our goal is to improve the crop yield while protecting the environment. Furthermore, it reduces the production cost of our suppliers due to less chemical product usage. Therefore, ours is also reduced.*

### (7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

No

### (7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

*We have not implemented any response as we did not identify any negative impacts caused by this management practice.*

*[Add row]*

**(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?**

*Select from:*

No, I am not providing data

**(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?**

*Select from:*

No

**(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?**

*Select from:*

No

## C9. Environmental performance - Water security

### (9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

##### Row 1

##### (9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

Business activities

##### (9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

*Distribution activities*

##### (9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

Other, please specify :Judged to be unimportant

##### (9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

Less than 1%

##### (9.1.1.8) Please explain

*Affiliates distribution activities consist of transportation, commercial fleet, warehouse management, marketing and packaging development. The amounts of water withdrawn and waste-water discharged in relation to these activities are negligible (less than 1%) compared to the production sites' impact on water resources, representing a total withdrawal of 28, 000 ML.*

## Row 2

### (9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

Facilities

### (9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

*Head offices when not located on industrial sites*

### (9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

Other, please specify :Judged to be unimportant

### (9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (9.1.1.8) Please explain

*Head offices water consumption is negligible compared to the production sites and is therefore not integrated into the reporting. The total head offices water consumption represents less than 1% of the total Group water consumption (estimation based on an average water consumption per employee: 60L/employee/day).*

## Row 3

### (9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

- Business activities

### (9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

*Company-owned vineyards and agave fields*

### (9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

- Other, please specify :Judged to be irrelevant

### (9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

- 100%

### (9.1.1.8) Please explain

*Water consumption related to cultivation of grapes and agave on company-owned farms is not included in this reporting, which is limited only to our transformation operations (i.e. winemaking, distillation, ageing and bottling activities). At Pernod Ricard, the environmental impact of our own cultivation of is assessed along with other agricultural goods procurement, as part of Pernod Ricard Nurturing Terroir program, i.e. part of our supply chain risk assessment.*

*[Add row]*

## (9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

### Water withdrawals – total volumes

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

- 100%

#### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water meters, calibrated yearly*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Water is an essential component for the products manufactured by Pernod Ricard. On our industrial sites, it is used in distillation process, vinification, spirits blending and formulation. That is why it is crucial to regularly monitor total volumes of water withdrawn from local watersheds in order to maximise water efficiency and ensure that Pernod Ricard operations do not endanger local resources for the surrounding communities. Water withdrawals are monitored daily with on-site water meters and reported in our environmental reporting on a yearly basis. Please note that one of the sites that contribute significantly the group's water consumption has recently been equipped with meters.*

## Water withdrawals – volumes by source

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water meters, calibrated yearly*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Water is an essential component for the products manufactured by Pernod Ricard. On our industrial sites, it is used in distillation process, vinification, spirits blending and formulation. That is why it is crucial to regularly monitor total volumes of water withdrawn from local watersheds in order to ensure that Pernod Ricard operations*

do not endanger local resources, such as groundwater that can be used by local communities, or river water that can be a biodiversity hotspot. Thus, withdrawn water volumes are monitored by source (Public Network Water, Groundwater or Spring, River, Dam, Lake water and other sources) on a daily basis with water meters.

## Water withdrawals quality

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

Sampling

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Pernod Ricard uses water supplies from public networks, surface water or ground water. In general, water quality inspections are conducted by water suppliers or local authorities for these sources. Nevertheless, groundwater or surface water used for distillation is sampled and monitored every day on site. It is also the case for public network water used for bottling and blending activities, especially as water is in direct contact with the product. The parameters monitored are: pH, suspended solids, organics, bug count, etc...*

## Water discharges – total volumes

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:



Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water meters, calibrated yearly*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*As Pernod Ricard's production sites use significant amounts of water to manufacture wine & spirits products, total volumes of wastewater discharged are monitored with water meters. This allows to quantify the amount of water that is effectively consumed, the amount that requires treatment, and the amount that could be recycled. Water discharge is monitored daily with on-site water meters and reported in our environmental reporting on a yearly basis.*

## Water discharges – volumes by destination

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water meters, calibrated yearly*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*As Pernod Ricard's production sites use significant amounts of water to manufacture wine & spirits products, total volumes of wastewater discharged are monitored by destination so as to adapt the required treatment before discharge. For instance, water discharged to a local wastewater treatment plant does not require the same treatment as water discharged to surface water. Different destinations (external network, surface water, irrigation, etc.) are monitored on a daily basis with water meters.*

## Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Several types of processes are used by Pernod Ricard's factories to reduce the water organic load and make it suitable for reuse or for release into the natural environment. These include anaerobic digestion to produce methane (biogas), aerobic lagoon treatment, membrane filtration, or the use of plants to purify water in so-called "filter garden" systems. Although these volumes are monitored locally, as the risk related to our waste water discharges is considered as immaterial, we do not consolidate the volume of wastewater by treatment method at Group level. Pernod Ricard does not have a water treatment objective within its water stewardship strategy, but we consider this parameter as potentially relevant in the future, and will re-evaluate the extent to which it shall be monitored over time.*

## Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Sampling: measuring of the volume of waste water and of the concentration of COD at the same stage of a given process. Sample location is identical for each analysis.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*The majority of waste water generated on Pernod Ricard's production sites contains organic matter. The pollutant load related to that organic matter is expressed in Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD). COD is monitored through monthly sampling after treatment and before discharge to any destination, in order to ensure that effluents meet local water discharge requirements.*

## Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not consolidate emissions to water at Group level as the risk related to these parameters is considered as immaterial, and as the parameters depend on facilities type and special features. Nevertheless, they are monitored locally according to local regulatory compliance requirements. Pernod Ricard does not have an objective related to emissions to water within its water stewardship strategy, but we consider this aspect as potentially relevant in the future, and will re-evaluate the extent to which it shall be monitored over time.*

## Water discharge quality – temperature

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Sampling*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Waste water temperature is measured at site level whenever applicable for local regulation. The frequency of measurement depends on local compliance requirements, and may also vary from site to site. In general, effluents discharged to surface water or sewers are sampled on site on a daily basis. Independent compliance samples can be done by sites' technical centres. Regulatory authorities do their own sampling as well.*

## Water consumption – total volume

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Daily

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water meters, calibrated yearly*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Water is an essential component for the products manufactured by Pernod Ricard. On our industrial sites, it is used in distillation process, vinification, spirits blending and formulation. That is why it is crucial to regularly monitor total volumes of water consumed in order to maximise water efficiency and ensure that Pernod Ricard operations do not endanger local resources for the surrounding communities. Water consumption is monitored daily with on-site water meters and reported in our environmental reporting on a yearly basis.*

## Water recycled/reused

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not consolidate water recycled/reused at Group level yet because of the significant diversity of our many production sites infrastructures and reuse cases, and because some water saving projects are still being trialled. Pernod Ricard does not have an objective related to water recycled/reused within its water stewardship strategy. However, we are aware that this parameter is increasingly relevant for addressing water circularity matters, and will re-evaluate the extent to which it shall be monitored over time.*

## The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Yearly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

Audits

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Pernod Ricard has been a member of the UN CEO Water Mandate since September 2010 with a commitment dedicated to water management in direct operations. In all of Pernod Ricard's production sites, workers must have access to water supply and suitable sanitation and hygiene. ISO 14001 and 45001 certifications cover more than 99 % of production volumes. These standards ensure that the sites address water related aspects such as access, sanitation and hygiene. ISO norms application is verified every year by both internal teams and third parties.*

[Fixed row]

**(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?**

#### Total withdrawals

##### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

28099.39

##### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Higher

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. Both business activity and water withdrawal efficiency remained stable in FY23 compared to FY22. In relation to the expected business activity increase, the five-year forecast is higher than current withdrawals volume. However, we expect the water saving measures that will be implemented within five years to drastically reduce the water withdrawal intensity, thus avoiding the five-year forecast to be "much higher".*

## Total discharges

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

26687.26

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

- Higher

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. Both business activity and water withdrawal efficiency remained stable in FY23 compared to FY22. In relation to the expected business activity increase, the five-year forecasted discharges are higher than current discharges volume. However, we expect the water saving measures that will be implemented within five years to drastically reduce the water withdrawal intensity, thus avoiding the five-year forecasted discharges to be "much higher".*

## Total consumption

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

1412.13

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- About the same

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

About the same

#### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. Both business activity and water consumption efficiency remained stable in FY23 compared to FY22. In relation to the expected business activity increase, the five-year forecast is higher than current consumptions volume. However, we expect the water saving measures that will be implemented within five years to drastically reduce the water consumption intensity, thus avoiding the five-year forecast to be "much higher".*

*[Fixed row]*

**(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.**

#### (9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

843



#### (9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- About the same

#### (9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Other, please specify :Business activity is stable compared to previous reporting year

#### (9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

- About the same

#### (9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Investment in water-smart technology/process

#### (9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

3.00

#### (9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

- WRI Aqueduct

#### (9.2.4.9) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. Pernod Ricard uses WRI Aqueduct to assess the water risk level of watersheds in which production sites are located. The assessment method takes into account current overall water risk, current water stress and projected water stress. Although business activity is highly likely to*

increase in the future, Pernod Ricard's investments in water-efficient technology and equipment is expected to maintain a steady proportion of water withdrawn from areas with water stress.

[Fixed row]

## **(9.2.5) What proportion of the produced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?**

### **Other commodity**

#### **(9.2.5.1) The proportion of this commodity produced in areas with water stress is known**

Select from:

Yes

#### **(9.2.5.2) % of total agricultural commodity produced in areas with water stress**

Select from:

26-50

#### **(9.2.5.3) Please explain**

*31% of the grapes produced by Pernod Ricard's own vineyards are grown in water-stressed areas. This proportion is calculated based on the equivalent weight of raw material procured in locations that are identified as water stressed according to the SBTn methodology. This metric will help us prioritize hotspots in our agricultural value chain and own vineyards from a water stress perspective, and define an action plan to reduce our impact on water resources. The TCFD-Climate scenarios analysis conducted by Pernod Ricard in FY23 stipulates that the terroirs where Pernod Ricard has vineyards in Spain and China are likely to become water-stressed by 2040 (scenario RCP4.5), whereas they are not considered as water-stressed today. As it represents 3% of grapes internal production, the proportion of grapes cultivated in water-stressed areas is hence expected to stay the same by then. As grapes are one of Pernod Ricard's key agricultural materials, and based on these results, the company has launched regenerative agriculture pilots on its own vineyards. By 2025, eight wine regions will have a model regenerative farming system to be shared with the wine industry. Regenerative agriculture practices are expected to increase the soil's water retention capacity through landscape design, crop associations and agroforestry. The identification of vineyards located in water-stressed areas contributes to the prioritization and decision-making process related to the conduct of these regenerative agriculture pilots.*

[Fixed row]

## (9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

### Maize/corn

#### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

11-25

#### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*The proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that originate from areas with water stress is calculated using internal procurement data (weight of raw material purchased) and WRI Aqueduct water risk atlas data. It includes the commodities that originate from countries which water stress risk score is defined as high or extremely high (3) by Aqueduct. The TCFD-Climate scenarios analysis conducted by Pernod Ricard in FY23 stipulates that some terroirs on which these cereals are cultivated are likely to become water-stressed by 2040 (scenario RCP4.5), whereas they are not considered as water-stressed today. As it represents 18% of sourced cereals, the proportion of cereals sourced in water-stressed areas is hence expected to increase by then. As cereals is one of Pernod Ricard's key agricultural materials, and based on these results, the company is committed to source 100% cereals certified against a sustainable agriculture standard (that addresses water use among other parameters\*) by 2030 and to launch a project to address this pressing sustainability issue. The proportion of sourced agricultural commodities originating from water-stressed areas contributes to the prioritization of risks and supports the decision-making process for mitigation projects. \*E.g. SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) includes water flows mapping and monitoring as essential criteria of the certification. More advanced levels (e.g. FSA gold) require to develop a water management plan, to use equipments for precision irrigation, to frequently sample water quality, etc.*

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

#### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

11-25

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*The proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that originate from areas with water stress is calculated using internal procurement data (weight of raw material purchased) and WRI Aqueduct water risk atlas data. It includes the commodities that originate from countries which water stress risk score is defined as high or extremely high (3) by Aqueduct. The TCFD-Climate scenarios analysis conducted by Pernod Ricard in FY23 stipulates that some terroirs on which these cereals are cultivated are likely to become water-stressed by 2040 (scenario RCP4.5), whereas they are not considered as water-stressed today. As it represents 18% of sourced cereals, the proportion of cereals sourced in water-stressed areas is hence expected to increase by then. As cereals is one of Pernod Ricard's key agricultural materials, and based on these results, the company is committed to source 100% cereals certified against a sustainable agriculture standard (that addresses water use among other parameters\*) by 2030 and to launch a project to address this pressing sustainability issue. The proportion of sourced agricultural commodities originating from water-stressed areas contributes to the prioritization of risks and supports the decision-making process for mitigation projects. \*E.g. SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) includes water flows mapping and monitoring as essential criteria of the certification. More advanced levels (e.g. FSA gold) require to develop a water management plan, to use equipments for precision irrigation, to frequently sample water quality, etc.*

## Rice

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*The proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that originate from areas with water stress is calculated using internal procurement data (weight of raw material purchased) and WRI Aqueduct water risk atlas data. It includes the commodities that originate from countries which water stress risk score is defined as high or extremely high (3) by Aqueduct. The broken rice sourced by Pernod Ricard fully originates from water stressed regions in India. The TCFD-Climate scenarios analysis conducted by Pernod Ricard in FY23 stipulates that some terroirs on which these cereals are cultivated are likely to become water-stressed by 2040*

(scenario RCP4.5), whereas they are not considered as water-stressed today. As it represents 18% of sourced cereals, the proportion of cereals sourced in water-stressed areas is hence expected to increase by then. As cereals is one of Pernod Ricard's key agricultural materials, and based on these results, the company is committed to source 100% cereals certified against a sustainable agriculture standard (that addresses water use among other parameters\*) by 2030 and to launch a project to address this pressing sustainability issue. The proportion of sourced agricultural commodities originating from water-stressed areas contributes to the prioritization of risks and supports the decision-making process for mitigation projects. \*E.g. SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) includes water flows mapping and monitoring as essential criteria of the certification. More advanced levels (e.g. FSA gold) require to develop a water management plan, to use equipments for precision irrigation, to frequently sample water quality, etc.

## Sugar

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

51-75

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

The proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that originate from areas with water stress is calculated using internal procurement data (weight of raw material purchased) and WRI Aqueduct water risk atlas data. It includes the commodities that originate from countries which water stress risk score is defined as high or extremely high (3) by Aqueduct. Raw materials used to produce sugar purchased by Pernod Ricard which are cultivated in areas with medium to high water availability risk (according to the Terroir Mapping mentioned in W-FB1.2e/W-AC1.2e) represent 39% of the total spend on sourced sugar. The TCFD-Climate scenarios analysis conducted by Pernod Ricard in FY23 stipulates that the terroir on which sugarbeet is cultivated in France is likely to become water-stressed by 2040 (scenario RCP4.5), whereas it is not considered as water-stressed today. As it represents 9% of sourced sugar, the proportion of sugar sourced in water-stressed areas is hence expected to slightly increase by then. As sugar is one of Pernod Ricard's key agricultural materials, and based on these results, the company is committed to source 100% sugar certified against a sustainable agriculture standard (that addresses water use among other parameters\*) by 2030 and to launch a project to address this pressing sustainability issue. The proportion of sourced agricultural commodities originating from water-stressed areas contributes to the prioritization of risks and supports the decision-making process for mitigation projects. \*E.g. SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) includes water flows mapping and monitoring as essential criteria of the certification. More advanced levels (e.g. FSA gold) require to develop a water management plan, to use equipments for precision irrigation, to frequently sample water quality, etc.

## Wheat

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

1-10

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*The proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that originate from areas with water stress is calculated using internal procurement data (weight of raw material purchased) and WRI Aqueduct water risk atlas data. It includes the commodities that originate from countries which water stress risk score is defined as high or extremely high (3) by Aqueduct. Cereals purchased by Pernod Ricard which are cultivated in areas with medium to high water availability risk (according to the Terroir Mapping mentioned in W-FB1.2e/W-AC1.2e) represent 3% of the total spend on sourced cereals. The TCFD-Climate scenarios analysis conducted by Pernod Ricard in FY23 stipulates that some terroirs on which these cereals are cultivated are likely to become water-stressed by 2040 (scenario RCP4.5), whereas they are not considered as water-stressed today. As it represents 18% of sourced cereals, the proportion of cereals sourced in water-stressed areas is hence expected to increase by then. As cereals is one of Pernod Ricard's key agricultural materials, and based on these results, the company is committed to source 100% cereals certified against a sustainable agriculture standard (that addresses water use among other parameters\*) by 2030 and to launch a project to address this pressing sustainability issue. The proportion of sourced agricultural commodities originating from water-stressed areas contributes to the prioritization of risks and supports the decision-making process for mitigation projects. \*E.g. SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) includes water flows mapping and monitoring as essential criteria of the certification. More advanced levels (e.g. FSA gold) require to develop a water management plan, to use equipments for precision irrigation, to frequently sample water quality, etc.*

### Other commodity

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*The proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities (grapes here) that originate from areas with water stress is calculated using internal procurement data (weight of raw material purchased) and WRI Aqueduct water risk atlas data. It includes the commodities that originate from countries which water stress risk score is defined as high or extremely high (3) by Aqueduct. The TCFD-Climate scenarios analysis conducted by Pernod Ricard in FY23 stipulates that the terroirs where Pernod Ricard has vineyards in Spain and China are likely to become water-stressed by 2040 (scenario RCP4.5), whereas they are not considered as water-stressed today. As it represents 62% of sourced grapes, the proportion of grapes cultivated in water-stressed areas is hence expected to significantly increase by then. As grapes is one of Pernod Ricard's key agricultural materials, and based on these results, the company is committed to source 100% grapes certified against a sustainable agriculture standard (that addresses water use among other parameters\*) by 2030 and to launch a project to address this pressing sustainability issue. The proportion of sourced agricultural commodities originating from water-stressed areas contributes to the prioritization of risks and supports the decision-making process for mitigation projects. \*E.g. SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) includes water flows mapping and monitoring as essential criteria of the certification. More advanced levels (e.g. FSA gold) require to develop a water management plan, to use equipments for precision irrigation, to frequently sample water quality, etc. [Fixed row]*

### (9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

#### Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

##### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

##### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

23185.7

##### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

##### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. Both business activity and water withdrawal efficiency remained stable in FY23 compared to FY22.*

## Brackish surface water/Seawater

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

- Not relevant

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*Pernod Ricard sites do not withdraw brackish surface water nor seawater for their operations. In the future, we do not anticipate withdrawing water from this source.*

## Groundwater – renewable

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

- Relevant

### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2749.5

### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- About the same

### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year



Select from:

Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. Both business activity and water withdrawal efficiency remained stable in FY23 compared to FY22.

## Groundwater – non-renewable

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

Pernod Ricard sites do not withdraw non-renewable groundwater for their operations. In the future, we do not anticipate withdrawing water from this source.

## Produced/Entrained water

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

Pernod Ricard sites do not withdraw produced / entrained water for their operations. In the future, we do not anticipate withdrawing water from this source.

## Third party sources

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2164.2

### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Mergers and acquisitions

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. The increase in water withdrawals from third party sources vs FY22 is mainly related to the integration of new acquisitions to the reporting in FY23. This flow represents only 8% of total withdrawals.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

### Fresh surface water

#### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

#### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

**(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Increase/decrease in efficiency

**(9.2.8.5) Please explain**

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. Both business activity and water efficiency remained stable between FY22 and FY23.*

**Brackish surface water/seawater****(9.2.8.1) Relevance**

Select from:

Not relevant

**(9.2.8.5) Please explain**

*Pernod Ricard sites do not discharge water to brackish surface water nor seawater for their operations.*

**Groundwater****(9.2.8.1) Relevance**

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

329.14

### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Other, please specify :Process trials

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" threshold: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. The amount of water discharged to groundwater increased due to process trials or occasional manipulations. This flow represents only % of total discharges.

## Third-party destinations

### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

4393.29

### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

#### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Mergers and acquisitions

#### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. The increase in water discharged to third party destinations vs FY22 is mainly related to the integration of new acquisitions to the reporting in FY23. This flow represents only 16% of total discharges.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

#### Direct operations

#### (9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

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

#### (9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

17

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

Select from:

- 1-25

#### (9.3.4) Please explain

*Pernod Ricard uses WRI Aqueduct to assess the water risk level of watersheds in which production sites are located. The assessment method takes into account current overall water risk, current water stress and projected water stress. We have identified 17 sites operating in high risk water basins, representing 18% of all our production sites and 13% of the Group's total water consumption.*

## Upstream value chain

### (9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

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

### (9.3.4) Please explain

*Our risk mapping in the value chain is conducted on terroirs (ingredient x location) rather than at facility level. This is due to the presence of several potential intermediaries in the procurement value chain and the current lack of visibility on the precise origin of all our ingredients.*

*[Fixed row]*

**(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.**

#### Row 1

##### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 1

##### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Inverroche*

##### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

- Godavari

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.0153

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.7965

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

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

1.01

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

1.01

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

0.01

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**



Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.01

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

0.99

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 2**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 2

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Nashik Distillery*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**India**

Godavari

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.001388

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

281

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

281

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

84

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

84

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

197

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

### Row 3

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

Facility 3

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Nashik Winery*

#### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select from:*

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Godavari

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

20.0153

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

73.7965

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

1.12

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

1.12

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

0.12

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0.12

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

1

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 4**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 4

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*Behror*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

Dependencies



Impacts

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Bangladesh**

Ganges - Brahmaputra

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

27.454594

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

76.234454

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

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

13.9

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

13.9

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

2.22

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

2.22

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

11.64

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 5**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 5

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

Yerevan

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Afghanistan**

- Other, please specify :Sevan Hrazdan

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.18111

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

44.51361

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

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

30.96

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

8.25

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

22.71

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

27.81

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

27.81

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

3.15

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 6**

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 6

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Arandas

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Mexico**

Santiago

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.6862

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

-102.3473

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

98.57

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

98.57

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**



0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

46.33

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much higher

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

46.33

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

52.24

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

- Much lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

## Row 7

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 7

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Kolhapur*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Krishna

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

16.7013

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.252

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

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

7.86

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

7.86

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

2.46

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

2.46

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

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

5.4

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

## Row 8

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 8

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Rocky Punjab*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Afghanistan**

- Other, please specify :Sabarmati

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.5853

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

76.8432

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

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

4.83

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0.92

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

3.9

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

0.75

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much higher

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0.75

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

4.07

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 9**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 9



### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Helan Mountain Winery*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select from:*

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**China**

Huang He (Yellow River)

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

*38.244166*

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

*106.078055*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

11.94

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

11.94

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

8.83

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

8.83

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

3.1

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

### Row 10

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

Facility 10

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Aygavan*

#### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select from:*

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Armenia**

Other, please specify :Caspian Sea, South West Coast

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

39.8259

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

44.7137

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

41.44

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

32.63

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

8.81

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

23.78

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much higher

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

16.34

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

7.44

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

17.66

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 11**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 11

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*Tarsus*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Portugal**

Douro

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.753376

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-3.931955

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

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

0.94

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower



**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0.94

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

0.78

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.78

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

0.16

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 12**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 12

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

Manzanares

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Portugal**

- Guadiana

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.9753

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-3.3403

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

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

60.9

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

60.9

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

23.37

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

23.37

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

37.53

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 13**

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 13

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Vendeville

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

France

- Other, please specify :Scheldt

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.5766

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

3.0824

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

11.5

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

11.5

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

2.95

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much higher

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

2.95

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

8.55

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**



Select from:

- Much lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

## Row 14

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 14

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Mytilene*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Greece

Other, please specify :Adriatic Sea - Greece - Black Sea Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.1177

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

26.5508

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

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

1.6

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

1.6

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

0.74

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.74

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

0.86

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

## Row 15

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 15

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Richmond Grove*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Australia**

- Other, please specify :Australia, South Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

-34.510076

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

138.969024

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

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

24.42

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

24.42

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

36.91

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

36.91

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

-12.49

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

**Row 16**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 16

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Rowland Flat

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Australia**

Other, please specify :Australia, South Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

-34.583022

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

138.927102



**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

117.28

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

117.28

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

93.71

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

93.71

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

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

23.57

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much higher

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower*

### Row 17

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

Facility 17

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Armavir*

#### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select from:*

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

**Armenia**

Other, please specify :Caspian Sea, South West Coast

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

40.144966

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

44.039924

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

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

55.54

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

55.54

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

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

44.98

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

44.98

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

10.56

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower  
[Add row]*

**(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?**

**Water withdrawals – total volumes**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

76-100

**(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used**

*Annual limited assurance third-party verification at site and consolidated level*

**Water withdrawals – volume by source**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*Annual limited assurance third-party verification at site and consolidated level*

## Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Pernod Ricard uses water supplies from public networks, surface water or ground water. In general, water quality inspections are conducted by water suppliers or local authorities for these sources. Nevertheless, groundwater or surface water used for distillation is sampled and monitored every day on site. It is also the case for public network water used for bottling and blending activities, especially as water is in direct contact with the product. The parameters monitored are: pH, suspended solids, organics, bug count, etc... These parameters are not collected and consolidated at Group level.*

## Water discharges – total volumes

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*Annual limited assurance third-party verification at site and consolidated level*

## Water discharges – volume by destination

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*Annual limited assurance third-party verification at site and consolidated level*

## Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Several types of processes are used by Pernod Ricard's factories to reduce the water organic load and make it suitable for reuse or for release into the natural environment. These include anaerobic digestion to produce methane (biogas), aerobic lagoon treatment, membrane filtration, or the use of plants to purify water in so-called "filter garden" systems. Although these volumes are monitored locally, as the risk related to our waste water discharges is considered as immaterial, we do not consolidate the volume of wastewater by treatment method at Group level. Pernod Ricard does not have a water treatment objective within its water stewardship strategy, but we consider this parameter as potentially relevant in the future, and will re-evaluate the extent to which it shall be monitored over time.*

## Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*The majority of waste water generated on Pernod Ricard's production sites contains organic matter. The pollutant load related to that organic matter is expressed in Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD). COD is monitored through monthly sampling after treatment and before discharge to any destination, in order to ensure that effluents meet local water discharge requirements. These parameters are not collected and consolidated at Group level.*

## Water consumption – total volume



### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*Annual limited assurance third-party verification at site and consolidated level*  
*[Fixed row]*

## (9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

Yes, CDP supply chain members buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

### (9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member.

#### Row 1

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 7

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

*Facility in Guadalajara Basin*

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

Potential impact due to potential disruption in production capacity (30 days) and consequent lost sales volume

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

N/A

[Add row]

### (9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

#### (9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

12137000000

#### (9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

431931.08

#### (9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

*We expect our future water withdrawal efficiency value to decrease in line with on-going water stewardship initiatives and with our targets to achieve a 20% further reduction of water consumption intensity by 2030, compared to 2018 baseline.*

[Fixed row]

### (9.8) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you produce.

#### Other commodity

#### (9.8.1) Water intensity information for this produced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

## (9.8.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

177.11

## (9.8.3) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater consumption

## (9.8.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

## (9.8.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

## (9.8.6) Please explain

*Description for "comparison with previous reporting year" and "five-year forecast" thresholds: Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-20% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 20% much higher / lower. The water intensity value of our own production is calculated based on internal specific data. The variation year on year is tightly dependent on weather conditions during the year. This metric will help us prioritize hotspots in our agricultural value chain and own vineyards from a water withdrawal perspective, and define an action plan to reduce our impact on water resources. Other commodity referred to: grapes  
[Fixed row]*

**(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.**

**Maize/corn**

## (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

73.54

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Total water withdrawals

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*In FY24, we conducted a study assessing the impacts on nature of our agricultural supply chain, aligned with the SBTn framework. The water intensity of each commodity represents an average of the water "emission factors" (raw material specific and country level) used to calculate the water footprint of the agricultural materials production.*

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

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

171.98

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Total water withdrawals

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*In FY24, we conducted a study assessing the impacts on nature of our agricultural supply chain, aligned with the SBTn framework. The water intensity of each commodity represents an average of the water "emission factors" (raw material specific and country level) used to calculate the water footprint of the agricultural materials production.*

## Rice

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

513.43

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

- Total water withdrawals

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

- Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- This is our first year of measurement

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*In FY24, we conducted a study assessing the impacts on nature of our agricultural supply chain, aligned with the SBTn framework. The water intensity of each commodity represents an average of the water "emission factors" (raw material specific and country level) used to calculate the water footprint of the agricultural materials production.*

## Sugar

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

- Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

25.36

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Total water withdrawals

#### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

#### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

#### (9.9.6) Please explain

*In FY24, we conducted a study assessing the impacts on nature of our agricultural supply chain, aligned with the SBTn framework. The water intensity of each commodity represents an average of the water "emission factors" (raw material specific and country level) used to calculate the water footprint of the agricultural materials production.*

### Wheat

#### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

9.26

#### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Total water withdrawals

#### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*In FY24, we conducted a study assessing the impacts on nature of our agricultural supply chain, aligned with the SBTn framework. The water intensity of each commodity represents an average of the water "emission factors" (raw material specific and country level) used to calculate the water footprint of the agricultural materials production. This metric will help us prioritize hotspots in our agricultural value chain and own vineyards from a water withdrawal perspective, and define an action plan to reduce our impact on water resources, as a complement of our Biodiversity & Regenerative Agriculture programs (Implement in all direct affiliates a regenerative agriculture or biodiversity programmes (Implement in all direct affiliates a regenerative agriculture or biodiversity programme linked to priority terroirs / Test local models for regenerative farming systems in the Group's vineyards & share knowledge with the industry).*

### Other commodity

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

267.01

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Total water withdrawals

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:



Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*In FY24, we conducted a study assessing the impacts on nature of our agricultural supply chain, aligned with the SBTn framework. The water intensity of each commodity represents an average of the water "emission factors" (raw material specific and country level) used to calculate the water footprint of the agricultural materials production. This metric will help us prioritize hotspots in our agricultural value chain and own vineyards from a water withdrawal perspective, and define an action plan to reduce our impact on water resources. Other commodity referred to: grapes*

[Add row]

## (9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

### Row 1

#### (9.12.1) Product name

*Volume of distilled alcohol*

#### (9.12.2) Water intensity value

18.3

#### (9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Water consumed

#### (9.12.4) Denominator

*kIAA (kilolitres of absolute alcohol)*

### (9.12.5) Comment

The water consumption intensity at distilleries decreased by 4% compared to FY18 thanks to the implementation of water consumption reduction initiatives at key sites.

[Add row]

### (9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

|  | Products contain hazardous substances                  | Comment                                 |
|--|--|---|
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not relevant for the beverage industry. |

[Fixed row]

### (9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

#### (9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

No, but we plan to address this within the next two years

#### (9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

Important but not an immediate business priority

#### (9.14.4) Please explain

Current work is being carried out for conducting life cycle assessments on Pernod Ricard's products. These analysis will take water criteria into account, which, as a first step, will enable us to draw an internal classification of products based on their impact on water.  
[Fixed row]

## **(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?**

Select from:

Yes

### **(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.**

#### **Water pollution**

##### **(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category**

Select from:

No, but we plan to within the next two years

##### **(9.15.1.2) Please explain**

*From FY25, Pernod Ricard will revise its water strategy so as to address the following challenges: Water risk in the agricultural supply chain; Water pollution in operations & supply chain; Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) services.*

#### **Water withdrawals**

##### **(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category**

Select from:

No, but we plan to within the next two years

##### **(9.15.1.2) Please explain**

As part of the 2020-2030 Sustainability and Responsibility, Pernod Ricard set a water efficiency target: to reduce by 20% its overall water consumption per unit of alcohol distilled (target year: 2030, baseline year: 2018). We are aware that water withdrawals indicator is becoming increasingly crucial, and we will reconsider setting a related target during our FY25 water strategy revision.

## Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

No, but we plan to within the next two years

### (9.15.1.2) Please explain

From FY25, Pernod Ricard will revise its water strategy so as to address the following challenges: Water risk in the agricultural supply chain; Water pollution in operations & supply chain; Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) services.

## Other

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

Yes

[Fixed row]

## (9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

### Row 1

#### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 1

#### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide (direct operations only)

### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

#### Watershed remediation and habitat restoration, ecosystem preservation

Increase in watershed remediation and habitat restoration, ecosystem preservation activities

### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

06/29/2018

### (9.15.2.5) End date of base year

06/29/2018

### (9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

### (9.15.2.7) End date of target year

06/29/2030

### (9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

### (9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

58

### (9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

#### (9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

58

#### (9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Sustainable Development Goal 6

#### (9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Pernod Ricard's water replenishment program aims to balance the water consumption of company-owned production sites and dedicated co-packers (bottling process activities with at least 90% of production volume relating to Pernod Ricard) in high and extremely high risk watersheds. This targets excludes Pernod Ricard's offices and owned vineyards. To identify sites located in risky areas, we use WRI's Aqueduct tool to calculate a comprehensive water risk index that takes into account the baseline and projected water stress and the overall water risk of each minor water basin. We use thresholds aligned to Aqueduct's methodology to determine the level of risk of our sites. In FY23, 16 company-owned sites and 7 dedicated co-packers are part of the programme. Among all, 14 have started and/or implemented a water replenishment project in their minor water basin to balance their annual water consumption.*

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

*In order to achieve the target, affiliates with sites located in high or extremely high risk watersheds, and which have not implemented a water replenishment project yet, will continue to investigate local projects to meet the Group's requirements. In FY24, a site at Pernod Ricard Winemakers Australia implemented a project which consists of storing and reusing treated waste water from the winery to irrigate its own vineyards.*

#### (9.15.2.16) Further details of target

*In FY23, we reached 58% of water replenished in water-stressed basins where our sites operate, meaning that 58% of the water consumed annually by our production sites is balanced by water replenishment specifically projects implemented in the same minor or major water basin as the sites concerned. In several situations and especially in India, the volume of water replenished by projects is superior to local consumption. This achievement matches the anticipated progress as affiliates which still have not implemented a water replenishment project continue to investigate local collective initiatives. The baseline was defined at zero when the target was set because no water replenishment project had been implemented at the time. The target is set on 100% as we aim to balance all water consumed by our operations in risky watersheds.*

**Row 2**

### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 2

### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide (direct operations only)

### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

#### **Water use efficiency**

Other water use efficiency, please specify :Water consumption intensity: water consumed (m3) per unit of pure alcohol distilled (kLAA, kL of pure alcohol)

### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

06/29/2018

### (9.15.2.5) End date of base year

07/29/2018

### (9.15.2.6) Base year figure

25

### (9.15.2.7) End date of target year

06/29/2030

### (9.15.2.8) Target year figure

20

### (9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

23

### (9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

### (9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

40

### (9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Sustainable Development Goal 6

### (9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*The ambition to decrease water consumption intensity (water consumed per unit of alcohol distilled in m3/kLAA) concerns all Pernod Ricard's owned production sites. Offices and vineyards are excluded. We also closely monitor the water consumption intensity at distilleries only.*

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

*Pernod Ricard has first achieved its 2020 roadmap goal: water consumption intensity has been reduced by -22% vs FY10 (-20% expected). The company is now pursuing a more aggressive target with an objective to further reduce water use intensity by 20% from FY18 to FY30. In FY23 and since FY18, water consumption per unit of pure alcohol distilled has been reduced by 8%. In order to achieve the target, affiliates have developed water reduction roadmaps that include planned water saving measures and projects. For instance, the installation of MVR (Mechanical Vapor Recompression) process in biggest distilleries is expected to have a significant and positive impact on the Group's water consumption intensity. We also closely monitor the water consumption intensity at distilleries only.*

### (9.15.2.16) Further details of target

*The reduction in water consumption intensity across all operations sites achieved in FY23 matches the year-on-year anticipated progress that we estimate through the consolidation of the water roadmaps that we collect twice a year from our affiliates. The baseline was set based on the base year performance (numerator: Group*



*water consumption, denominator: Group volume of distilled alcohol), and the target was set upon examination of expected water reduction projects up to 2030 and expected growth in production volumes.*

*[Add row]*

## C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

### (10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

#### (10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

Yes

#### (10.1.2) Target type and metric

##### Plastic packaging

- Reduce the total weight of virgin content in plastic packaging
- Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic packaging
- Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale
- Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is reusable

##### Plastic goods/products

- Eliminate single-use plastic products

#### (10.1.3) Please explain

*Pernod Ricard is signatory of the Ellen McArthur "New Plastics Economy Global Commitment". As part of its Circular Making strategy, Pernod Ricard is committed to reach by 2025: - 100% recyclable, reusable or compostable packaging and promotional items - 25% PET post-consumer recycled content in PET packaging - 5% reduction of virgin plastics use in packaging Since 2021, Pernod Ricard has banned 100% single use plastics from its promotional items.*

*[Fixed row]*

### (10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

## Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Non applicable to Pernod Ricard*

## Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Non applicable to Pernod Ricard*

## Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

Yes

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Included here: promotional items made of plastic (reusable ecocup, ice buckets...).*

## Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Non applicable to Pernod Ricard*

## **Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics**

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

Yes

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Included here: PET bottles, bag-in-box, plastic pouches (3L format), plastic caps used on glass bottles.*

## **Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)**

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Non applicable to Pernod Ricard*

## **Provision of waste management and/or water management services**

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Non applicable to Pernod Ricard*

## Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Non applicable to Pernod Ricard*

## Other activities not specified

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Non applicable to Pernod Ricard  
[Fixed row]*

**(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content.**

|   | Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons) | Raw material content percentages available to report              | Please explain   |
|---|--|---|--|
| Durable goods and durable components used | 8005320  | Select all that apply<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None | Our teams are working on the reliability of data before publication. |

[Fixed row]

**(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.**

### Plastic packaging used

#### (10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

3374

#### (10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

% post-consumer recycled content

#### (10.5.6) % post-consumer recycled content

14.8

#### (10.5.7) Please explain

Excludes plastic closures used on glass bottles.

[Fixed row]

**(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.**

## Plastic packaging used

### (10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

*Select all that apply*

% reusable

% recyclable in practice and at scale

### (10.5.1.2) % of plastic packaging that is reusable

0

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

64.9

### (10.5.1.5) Please explain

*As per our reporting to the Plastics Initiative Global Commitment 2023.*

*[Fixed row]*

## C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

**(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?**

### **(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments**

Select from:

Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

### **(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments**

Select all that apply

Land/water management

Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[Fixed row]

**(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?**

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?</b>                                       |
|  | Select from:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, we do not use indicators, but plan to within the next two years |

[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:

Yes (partial assessment)

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*We map all our industrial sites (36 out of 94) which are located close (*

## 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:

Not assessed

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*We do not assess whether our activities are located near a UNESCO World Heritage site*

## 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:

Not assessed

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*We do not assess whether our activities are located near a UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves site*

## **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:*

Not assessed

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*We do not assess whether our activities are located near a Ramsar site*

## **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:*

Not assessed

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*We do not assess whether our activities are located near a key biodiversity area*

## **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:*

Yes (partial assessment)

## (11.4.2) Comment

*We map all our our inustrial sites (36 out of 94) which are located close (  
[Fixed row]*

## (11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

### Row 1

#### (11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

*Select all that apply*

Legally protected areas

#### (11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

*Select from:*

Category IV-VI

#### (11.4.1.4) Country/area

*Select from:*

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### (11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

*Loch Lomond Moray Firth*

#### (11.4.1.6) Proximity

*Select from:*

Adjacent

#### (11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

*At Chivas Brothers we have: - 7 production sites (1 distillery, 1 bottling site and 5 ageing sites) located close (10km) to Loch Lomond site (Emerald site) - 17 production sites (14 distilleries and 3 ageing sites) adjacent to Moray Firth site (Emerald site)*

#### (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

Legally protected areas

#### (11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

Category IV-VI

#### (11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

France

#### (11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

*Médoc*

#### (11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

Adjacent

#### (11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

*At Martell and Pernod Ricard France, we have 3 sites operating distillation, wine-making and bottling adjacent to Médoc site (IUCN category V)*

#### (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 3

#### (11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

Legally protected areas

#### (11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

Category IV-VI

#### (11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

Finland

#### (11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

*Ruissalon lehdot*

#### (11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

- Up to 5 km

**(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area**

*At Pernod Ricard Finland, we have one bottling site located close to a Natura 2000 site*

**(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 4**

**(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity**

Select all that apply

- Legally protected areas

**(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)**

Select from:

- Category IV-VI

**(11.4.1.4) Country/area**

Select from:

- Ireland

**(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity**

*Great Island Channel SAC*

**(11.4.1.6) Proximity**

Select from:

Adjacent

#### (11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

*At Irish Distillers, we have one distillery adjacent to a Natura 2000 site*

#### (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 5

#### (11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

Legally protected areas

#### (11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

Category IV-VI

#### (11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

Sweden

#### (11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

*Äspet Lyngsjön*

#### (11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

Adjacent

#### (11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

*At The Absolut Company, we have one distillery and one bottling site adjacent to Natura 2000 sites.*

#### (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 6

#### (11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

Legally protected areas

#### (11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

Category IV-VI

#### (11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

China

#### (11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

*Sichuan Tangjiahe National Nature Reserve*

#### (11.4.1.6) Proximity



Select from:

Adjacent

**(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area**

*At Pernod Ricard Emeishan, we have one distillery adjacent to a national reserve*

**(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:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes   |

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

#### Row 1

##### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Climate change

##### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

Other data point in module 7, please specify

##### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

## General standards

- ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*Change in scope 1, 2 & 3 emissions against a base year (not target related). Information about scope 1, 2 & 3 verification can be found in our universal registry 2022-2023 (attached), p162-164. Our scope 1, 2 & 3 emissions are verified each year, allowing us to follow our year-on-year evolution, and assessing our roadmap toward emission reduction targets for 2030 and 2050. In case of recalculation needed due to a change in methodology, the recalculated figures are also verified.*

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

*Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf. (1).pdf*

## Row 2

### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

*Select all that apply*

- Water

### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

**Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities**

- Identification of priority locations

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

## General standards

- ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*Qualitative audit of projects set up to replenish water resources.*

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

*URD FY23 English.pdf*

## Row 3

### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

*Select all that apply*

Water

### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

#### **Governance**

Environmental policies

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

#### **General standards**

ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*Global audit of Pernod Ricard NFRD as part of the URD, including environmental pillars.*

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

*URD FY23 English.pdf*

## Row 4

### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Water

### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

#### Environmental performance – Consolidation approach

Consolidation approach

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

#### General standards

ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*KPIs audited: Total volume of wastewater discharged Total volume of water abstracted Total volume of water consumed (production sites & distilleries) Water consumption intensity at production sites Water consumption intensity in distilleries based on a limited assurance.*

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

*URD FY23 English.pdf*

## Row 5

### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Water

### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

#### Environmental performance – Water security

Water consumption– total volume

Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

- Water discharges– total volumes
- Water withdrawals– total volumes
- Water withdrawals – volumes by source
- Water discharges – volumes by destination
- Facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

#### General standards

- ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*KPIs audited: Total volume of wastewater discharged Total volume of water abstracted Total volume of water consumed (production sites & distilleries) Water consumption intensity at production sites Water consumption intensity in distilleries based on a limited assurance.*

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

*URD FY23 English.pdf*

## Row 6

### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

*Select all that apply*

- Climate change

### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

#### Environmental performance – Climate change

- Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption
- Fuel consumption
- Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

- Renewable fuel consumption

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

#### General standards

- ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*Information about energy consumption verification can be found in our universal registry 2022-2023, p162-164. Our energy consumption is verified each year, allowing us to follow our year-on-year evolution, and assessing our roadmap toward our energy-related commitments, such as RE100.*

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

*Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf. (1).pdf*

## Row 8

### (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

- 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

Information about scope 1&2 verification can be found in our universal registry 2022-2023 (attached), p162-164. Our scope 1&2 emissions are verified each year, allowing us to follow our year-on-year evolution, and assessing our roadmap toward emission reduction targets for 2030 and 2050.

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

Universal Registration Document 2023\_VUK pdf. (1).pdf

### Row 9

#### (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

Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 3)

#### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

##### General standards

ISAE 3000

#### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Information about scope 3 verification can be found in our universal registry 2022-2023 (attached), p162-164. Our scope 3 emissions are verified each year, allowing us to follow our year-on-year evolution, and assessing our roadmap toward emission reduction targets for 2030 and 2050.

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



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

**(13.3.1) Job title**

*EVP, Integrated Operations and S&R*

**(13.3.2) Corresponding job category**

*Select from:*

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

[Fixed row]

**(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.**

*Select from:*

Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute

