Cargill

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

.

02/05/2025, 10:12 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Privately owned organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Cargill's 160,000 employees work relentlessly around the globe to achieve our purpose of nourishing the world in a safe, responsible and sustainable way. Every day, we connect farmers with markets, customers with ingredients, and people and animals with the food they need to thrive. We combine over 159 years of experience with new technologies and insights to serve as a trusted partner for food, agriculture, financial and industrial customers in 70 countries and 125 markets. Side-by-side, we are building a stronger, sustainable future for agriculture. Cargill's businesses support customers in four different segments: (1) Agriculture: Cargill buys, processes and distributes grain, oilseeds and other commodities to makers of food and animal nutrition products. Cargill also provides crop and livestock producers with products and services. (2) Food: Cargill provides food and beverage manufacturers, foodservice companies and retailers with high-quality ingredients, meat and poultry products, and health-promoting ingredients and ingredient system. (3) Financial: Cargill provides its agricultural, food, financial and energy customers around the world with risk management and financial solutions. (4) Industrial: Cargill serves industrial users of energy, salt, starch and steel products. We also develop and market sustainable products made from agricultural feedstocks. For Water: Reporting Boundary Note: Cargill has set the following reporting threshold for determining if a facility is considered material for reporting: an immaterial facility uses less than 1000 cubic meters of water a month or a non-industrial facility (e.g. warehouse or office) with less than 200 full time equivalent employees. These facilities account for less than 1% of our total water intake. For Climate: Reporting Boundary Note: Cargill has set the following reporting threshold for determining if a facility is considered material for reporting: locations that emits less than 600 MT of CO2e/year or a facility (warehouse or office) with less than 200 Full time equivalent employees.

[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

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

Select from:
☑ No

(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?

177000000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ Ghana
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Jordan
☑ Zambia
☑ Algeria
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Denmark
☑ Nigeria
☑ Romania
☑ Ukraine
☑ Uruguay
☑ Bulgaria
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Kenya
☑ Spain
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Ecuador
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Cameroon
☑ Colombia
☑ Honduras
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan

☑ Paraguay
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Argentina
☑ Singapore
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Netherlands
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Cayman Islands
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Dominican Republic
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Australia
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Mauritius
☑ Nicaragua
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ South Africa
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(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: ☑ No, this is confidential data	*This information is confidential.*

[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]

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

Palm oil

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Produced and sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Production

☑ Processing

☑ Trading

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

5395952

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Refined palm oil

☑ Crude palm oil (CPO)

☑ Palm oil derivatives

☑ Fresh fruit bunches (FFB)

☑ Crude palm kernel oil (CPKO)

☑ Palm kernel oil derivatives

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.19) Please explain

Cargill considers this information proprietary.

Cattle products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Processing

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

Select from:
☑ No, the total volume is confidential

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply
☑ Beef
☑ By-products (e.g. glycerin, gelatin)

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

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Cargill did not source cattle from high risk regions in 2023.

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

Cargill did not source cattle products from high-risk regions in 2023.

Soy

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Processing

☑ Trading

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Mixture of embedded soy and direct soy

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

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is confidential

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soybean meal
☑ Soybean oil
☑ Soy biodiesel
☑ Soy derivatives
☑ Whole soybeans

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.19) Please explain

Cargill considers this information proprietary.

Cocoa

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Processing
☑ Trading
☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is confidential

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Cocoa beans, Cocoa butter, Cocoa liquor, Cocoa powder, Chocolate products

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.19) Please explain

Cargill considers this information proprietary.
[Fixed row]

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

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

Cargill considers % revenue information confidential.

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

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

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders relevant and included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

For Palm, our strategy for achieving our traceability-to-plantation goal is based on: Cargill prioritizes data collection in high-priority landscapes where noncompliance risk is greater. We focus on collecting traceability-to-plantation data in origins where we buy directly from mills (primarily in Malaysia, Brazil, Colombia, % Guatemala). For indirect purchases from traders & refiners, we request plantation-level information from our direct counterparts and support them to collect this data. We collect data using a risk calibrated approach based on the principle that NDPE-related risks vary among production regions & more data is needed on plantation locations where risk is higher. For high-risk areas, palm production should be traceable to the individual production unit (e.g. the farm); for low-risk areas, palm can be traceable to the level of a village/municipality. For Soy, our polygon mapping in Brazil uses two methodologies: for suppliers who own the land, we use automated consultation of the INCRA-SIGEF website. For suppliers who rent land to grow their soy, or do not have the INCRA registration yet, our own internal teams identified them & collected data. In other countries, all the data collection is done by our commercial team. We then validate polygons mapped to ensure accuracy & there is not a lack of polygons in our database. For water, as part of our strategy, Cargill has mapped its supply chain as part of the development of the water resources strategy with the WRI (World Resources Institute). We used supply sheds, states and country sourcing locations for key commodities including barley, cocoa, cotton, nuts, maize, oil palm, rapeseed, soybeans, sugarcane, sunflower, and wheat. These crops include those sourced directly from farmers, processed crops, and crop by-products for livestock and poultry feed. In the case of livestock, we included only the feed components as a primary driver for impact. WRI processed the supply chain data to estimate the volume of each crop sourced by Cargill from each HydroBASINS level 6 catchment, based on the distribution of production volumes available in Aqueduct Food using the International Food Policy Research Institute's (IFPRI's) Spatial Production Allocation Model (SPAM) (WRI Aqueduct Food 2019; IFPRI 2019). These reorganized data facilitated a water risk assessment by crop and by location. The detailed process for supply chain mapping is in the WRI practice note, Developing Enterprise water targets.
[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?

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.5) Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(1.24.1.6) Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain

Cargill is currently in the process of preparing to comply with the EU CSRD and ESRS, which will include mapping plastics in the value chain. Cargill is not required to externally report under CSRD until FY26, and at that point Cargill will disclose the relevant information.
[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

Soy

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

Cocoa

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

[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)

3

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

In line with operational plans reviewed annually.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

4

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

In line with strategic review of the company and capital allocation.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

11

(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

These are considered emerging trends and are evaluated in issue management and risk management.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

☑ Desk-based research

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Jurisdictional/landscape assessment

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

☑ Wildfires

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Soil degradation
☑ Water stress

Policy
☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

Market
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation
☑ Impact on human health
☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

Technology
☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

Liability
☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Cargill's corporate compliance is led by a Board-level audit committee, an Executive-Level ESG committee, & a Global Ethics & Compliance Office (GECO) function. GECO coordinates and manages the compliance risk assessment process, which is completed annually, and which is deployed at a business group level. Part of this process is to classify risks based upon three criteria: risk likelihood, risk impact, and control effectiveness across all time horizons. In addition, Cargill also has an outward-looking process for analyzing issues as they relate to the interest of stakeholders. Stakeholders within Cargill, including our Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) and members of the Sustainability and Environmental Health and Safety (EHS), and Business Operations and Supply Chain functions, stay apprised of climate-related risks & opportunities and in some cases, collaborates with other organizations with relevant expertise, to conduct assessments. The CSO ensures executive level alignment and a coordinated cross-Cargill approach, including evaluating risks and opportunities to ensure appropriate response and resourcing. Members of the Sustainability function then support development and implementation of strategies to respond, including those implemented in pursuit of targets created to address the identified risks. The Executive-Level ESG committee was established in 2022 and ensures that systems are in place to monitor and address ESG risk and opportunities, including climate-related risks. Sustainability has been identified as a priority of Cargill's strategy. The CSO chairs the Executive-Level ESG Committee which the CEO and the CFO are also members along with others. Cargill is aware that climate change poses physical risk to our assets and our ability to operate our business. In order to better understand these risks, we have begun assessing our physical risk exposure utilizing Climanomics, a third-party tool. We have assessed risk at decadal scales through to 2050, covering both medium- and long-term horizons, under two scenarios: RCP 8.5 (4 degree warming) and RCP 2.6 (2 degree warming). Based on the outcomes of the Climanomics assessment, we have prioritized the most at-risk facilities and have begun working with the appropriate business units to build mitigation plans. Cargill faces a variety of potential transitional risks associated with addressing climate change. In order to better understand these risks, we have begun implementing a transition risk evaluation process. As part of that process, we assessed transition risk within our protein business in Asia and Europe. One of the key transition risks identified was the potential for changing customer/consumer expectations for animal protein, in both the short-and medium-term. As we assessed mitigation options for that risk, we identified several existing programs within the business that were mitigating much of that risk by design. Cargill has a significant operational GHG footprint in various global geographies. Recognizing the likelihood that many of our largest-emitting facilities could come under some form of regulation, we have assessed the potential impact of a carbon price on our facilities. Cargill also recognizes that carbon pricing serves as a mechanism to reduce emissions, and therefore an opportunity to deeply decarbonize our operations (beyond our 2025 SBTi goal) as we seek to understand the best way to mitigate our risk exposure to a global price on carbon.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental 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

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ Global Forest Watch

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Soil erosion

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Other commodity users/producers 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

Palm: Cargill has implemented a Due Diligence Process to assess potential new suppliers based on compliance with Cargill's Sustainable Palm Oil Policy. This includes assessing major risks like impacting activity on the status of ecosystems and activities. We assess traceability to plantation to ensure fresh-fruit bunch (FFB) sourcing is not in conservation areas or from suppliers already suspended by Cargill. Cargill's Palm Grievance Process serves as a guide to review, address, and

monitor the outcome of any grievance from any external parties concerning the Palm Policy across Cargill's global palm supply chain. It aims to provide a transparent, open, and predictable process for dealing with grievances, and achieve long-term transformation of our palm oil supply chain and industry. When non-compliance is found to have occurred, we engage and support our suppliers in addressing the specific social and environmental areas of non-compliance through time-bound action plans. To support this effort, Cargill is evaluating new approaches, including mentoring. Data collected by the Radar Alerts for Detecting Deforestation (RADD) system, developed with support from Cargill and 9 other palm oil producers and buyers, is now publicly available on the Global Forest Watch (GFW) platform. Suppliers, governments, NGOs and other stakeholders can access this shared data and take action to halt deforestation. With the help of external consultants, CORE (Daemeter and Proforest), in Malaysia we are also piloting a cloud-based portal that will allow suppliers to submit their traceability-to-plantation data online, consistent with our risk-calibrated approach to collecting data. In addition to improving efficiency, the portal enables comparison of mill volumes with declarations from individual FFB suppliers so discrepancies can be resolved, and supplier GPS locations can be analyzed to check for proximity to mills, position on land/water, and identify suppliers whose reported locations need to be examined further.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ 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:

☑ A specific environmental 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

Commercially/publicly available tools
☑ Water Footprint Network Assessment tool
☑ WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management
☑ Internal company methods
☑ Risk models

International methodologies and standards
☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections
☑ Life Cycle Assessment

Databases
☑ FAO/AQUASTAT
☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

Other
☑ External consultants
☑ Internal company methods
☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Drought
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

Chronic physical

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits

☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit

☑ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

Reputation

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

Technology

☑ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Water utilities at a local level

☑ Other water users at the basin/catchment 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

Our water risk assessment is an integral part of our water strategy and target setting. The World Resources Institute (WRI) and Cargill jointly developed an approach to setting enterprise water targets that strived to balance scientific rigor and pragmatism. Cargill and WRI prioritized two sections of Cargill's global value chain: the upstream agricultural crop supply chain and direct operations. Cargill's agricultural supply chain, as well as our direct operations, were identified as the most essential given the impact and dependency on water resources and ability to drive change in these sections of the value chain. WRI and Cargill assessed risks most important to Cargill's business, people, and agriculture: water availability, water quality, and access to water. Using WRI's Aqueduct suite of tools, we assessed global indicators for these water risks for each catchment in which Cargill operates or from which Cargill sources agricultural crops. Cargill set a combination of outcome- and process-oriented targets for priority regions and facilities, informed by the severity of the water challenge and the water footprint, as well as materiality. A globally applicable threshold for desired conditions was set for each water challenge and compared to current conditions to calculate the change required at a catchment scale. This process has led to the identification of water priority regions and facilities and the associated water challenges in a catchment context. The detailed methodology is described in the practice note published by WRI: Developing Enterprise Water Targets Informed by Local Contexts: Cargill's Approach World Resources Institute (wri.org). Hofste, R., S. Kuzma, S. Walker, E.H. Sutanudjaja, et. al. 2019. "Aqueduct 3.0: Updated DecisionRelevant Global Water Risk Indicators." Technical Note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute. Available online at: https://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-30.

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental 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

☑ Internal company methods

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

Other

☑ External consultants

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Soil erosion

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities
☑ Other commodity users/producers 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

Soy: In August 2019, we published our first risk assessment methodology which incorporated a historical lens of past land conversion and a future lens of examining existing land status on land suitable for future soy cultivation. This methodology was applied to the Amazon, Cerrado & Chaco biomes of Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay & Bolivia. External and recognized data from the University of Maryland was used and processed using our internal company methods from Cargill's Geoanalytics team. In 2021, together with The Nature Conservancy (TNC), we defined a set of 66 municipalities in Brazil's Cerrado biome as our highest-priority areas. Of the hundreds of municipalities within this biome, we started with those that have at least 1% of their land area in the Cerrado and where Cargill sources soy directly, as defined by the Soft Commodities Forum (SCF). We then worked with TNC to validate that list of municipalities to prioritize from a conservation perspective. Additionally, we looked at the areas with the highest conversion of native vegetation to soy in recent years based on Prodes, the national and official database for deforestation, as well as areas with the highest amount of existing native vegetation that would be suitable for soy cultivation. Crucially, this last point allowed us to assess future risk of deforestation, not just historical conversion. We also used TNC's own trend tracking database that tracks municipalities at risk for further land conversion. Finally, we calculated the DCF percentage's using two methodologies – polygon farm boundaries to calculate a precise DCF figure for our soy volumes, and the sectoral average method to estimate our DCF figure for the rest of Brazil and the other countries. For sectoral averages, our team analyzed satellite information from the datasets managed by the USGS and U of Maryland on crop production and land conversion to determine soy production in all five countries that did not take place on converted land since 2008. Those percentages were then multiplied by soy volumes originating from direct suppliers by our local business during the 2021 crop year. We then tallied our estimated DCF soy for each country and divided this figure by our total soy volumes in the country to arrive at Cargill's estimated % for DCF soy. For farms with polygons already mapped, a similar analysis of historical satellite data was used.

Row 5

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ 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:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 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

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ Global Forest Watch

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

Other

☑ Jurisdictional/landscape assessment

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Soil erosion

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Suppliers

☑ Other commodity users/producers 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

Cocoa: Cargill has a strategic action plan called "Protect Our Planet" that details the steps we are taking transform our cocoa supply chain to be deforestation-free. The Protect Our Planet plan provides concrete actions the company is taking to achieve 100% cocoa bean traceability. We map our direct cocoa supply chain to identify the exact location of the farms & accurately assess farm size. 72% of farmers in the global direct Cargill Cocoa Promise sourcing partner network were mapped in 2022-June 2023 and 88% of farmers in 2023-June 2024. In West Africa and Ecuador, we have our GPS polygon mapping data linked to FarmForce, which allowed us to better connect farms maps to active farmers administered in our systems. In the parts of our supply chain where we source cocoa via intermediaries (national exporters, international trade houses) and thus may have less visibility on farm-level origins, we have introduced supplier questionnaires that help us map out sourcing jurisdictions beyond the country level (e.g., regions). We use satellite technology to determine where forests remain and where forest loss has taken

place. We do this by using GIS software tools, as well as geospatial data and analytical methods available in the WRI's Global Forest Watch Pro platform. Global Forest Watch data also helps us assess deforestation-related risks at national or sub-national that informs our indirect supplier engagement. To assess deforestation in our direct supply chain we overlay farm polygon maps with publicly available geospatial forest data from the global forest watch (GFW) to assess any significant forest loss in our supply chain. If a farm shows significant signs of deforestation since 2014, that farmer is directly suspended in our digital system. Local teams are informed and can choose to perform a field verification process and mitigation actions. To enhance our understanding of where deforestation is happening and where forests remain in our direct supply chain, Cargill teamed up with Satelligence. Satelligence deploys anti-deforestation solutions and provide near-real time, satellite-powered deforestation risk across Cargill's supply chains (soy, palm oil and cocoa). Through innovative machine learning we determine which areas are forest, plantation or other land cover types with a 10-meter resolution. Using this more accurate forest baseline allows us to understand if tree cover loss is actually forest loss.
[Add row]

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

	Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed	Primary reason for not assessing interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities	Explain why you do not assess the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities
	Select from: ☑ No	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*Cargill is currently in the process of evaluating dependencies and/or impacts and this is something Cargill will be able to disclose in future years.*

[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 of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Within our facilities, across our supply chains and in our communities, we focus our efforts on improving water availability, quality, and access based on the local water challenges. Within our operations, Cargill has implemented a set of global requirements that address our commitment to enabling a water positive impact by reducing our own footprint, meeting compliance requirements, and understanding and reporting of water usage, impact, and risk. Our priority facilities account for more than 80% of our total operational water use and were selected based on water stress exposure and water usage. Each of these facilities have set site-specific targets for water efficiency. They have focused on measuring and monitoring water use and discharge in their operations to better understand their water dependency and impact. Additionally, they have developed water balances, benchmarked water usage, and completed site risk assessments to more clearly identify shared water challenges in their local context. This information and context are critical to help us move into full implementation of our water stewardship program at all priority facilities by 2025. Our process to identify priority locations for our supply chain is an integral part of our water strategy and target setting, developed in close collaboration with the World Resources Institute (WRI). Using WRI's Aqueduct suite of tools, we assessed global indicators for these water risks for each catchment from which Cargill sources agricultural crops. A globally applicable threshold was applied for water availability, water quality and access to water and sanitation. These thresholds were assessed at a Hydrobasin6 level to identify priority watersheds in our agricultural supply chain and has led to the identification of water priority regions and the associated water challenges in a catchment context. The detailed methodology is described in the practice note published by the WRI: Developing Enterprise Water Targets Informed by Local Contexts: Cargill's Approach World Resources Institute (wri.org). Available online at: https://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-30.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we will be disclosing the list/geospatial map of priority locations

(2.3.6) Provide a list and/or spatial map of priority locations

Cargill Priority Locations - Water.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**AOE - Adjusted Operating Earnings

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Definition of substantive financial or strategic impact: Environmental risk is assessed using the same framework as other types of identified business risk using Cargill's risk rating framework. Cargill's risk rating framework is aligned to our overall risk assessment criteria used for audit and compliance issues. The framework

defines substantive impacts and related risks as those escalated to senior leadership and ultimately the Board e.g, risks rated Important / Significant / Critical get reported to the Audit Committee of the Board. The framework is underscored by a definition of substantive financial or strategic impact based on our values and obligations to deliver to our customers. Quantifiable indicator(s) used to identify substantive impact: We measure strategic impact through the risk of disruptions in our supply chain and possible disruptions to deliver to customers; these are assessed through considering likelihood of occurrence and potential impacts using scales tailored to the impact criteria (e.g. financial, business disruption, reputation). The financial impact calculations below, which are used to identify substantive impact, are based on Cargill Adjusted Operating Earnings (AOE). A substantive impact would be those rated Important / Significant / Critical: · Low: 3% of projected AOE. Thresholds of impact are dependent on the risk type and specific risk criteria. For example, a risk posing over 13.7 million in FY23 in potential impact would be considered Important to Significant based solely on financial criteria aligned to the % AOE outlined above. Should some customers and suppliers be affected by a risk, including possible loss of strategic customers or suppliers and substantial loss of market share, then the risk would be considered significant in terms of business disruption criteria. Assessments of likelihood are aligned with the time horizons which business leaders use to make investment decisions.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**AOE - Adjusted Operating Earnings

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Definition of substantive financial or strategic impact: Environmental opportunity is assessed using the same framework as other types of identified business opportunity using Cargill's opportunity rating framework. Cargill's opportunity rating framework is aligned to our overall opportunity assessment criteria used for audit and compliance issues. The framework defines substantive impacts and related opportunities as those escalated to senior leadership and ultimately the Board e.g, opportunities rated Important / Significant / Critical get reported to the Audit Committee of the Board. The framework is underscored by a definition of substantive financial or strategic impact based on our values and obligations to deliver to our customers. Quantifiable indicator(s) used to identify substantive impact: We measure strategic impact through the opportunity within our supply chain and our ability to deliver to customers; these are assessed through considering likelihood of occurrence and potential impacts using scales tailored to the impact criteria (e.g. financial, business operations, reputation). The financial impact calculations below, which are used to identify substantive impact, are based on Cargill Adjusted Operating Earnings (AOE). A substantive impact would be those rated Important / Significant / Critical: · Low: 3% of projected AOE. Thresholds of impact are dependent on the opportunity type and specific opportunity criteria. For example, a opportunity posing over 13.7 million in FY23 in potential impact would be considered Important to Significant based solely on financial criteria aligned to the % AOE outlined above. Assessments of likelihood are aligned with the time horizons which business leaders use to make investment decisions.
[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

As part of the water resources strategy development target setting approach, we have done a materiality assessment of key contributors to water quality. For example, if the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus in the receiving water bodies is too high, water quality may be impaired. Cargill and WRI focused the water quality assessment on nutrient pollution, specifically that from nitrogen and phosphorous. Agricultural production can result in nutrient pollution from runoff and leaching of

fertilizers. Based on the materiality assessment we included water quality in the supply chain and in operations. Nitrogen, which tends to go hand-in-hand with phosphorus, was selected as the pollutant of concern to represent risk of water quality impacts such as eutrophication for the supply chain. In 2021, Cargill set a target to enable the reduction of 5,000 metric tons of water pollutants in water-stressed regions by 2030. This target is expressed in metric tones of Nitrogen Equivalent (N-eq). For our operations, we comply with legal obligations and permitting process to understand the pollutants in our discharges. This is integrated in our Water requirements and an integral part of the permit review and renewal process.
[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:
☑ Inorganic pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

As part of the work we did with WRI to develop our water sustainability strategy and targets, we identified nutrient pollution from runoff and leaching of fertilizers and pollutant category with potential impact. Excess nutrients can lead to eutrophication and can cause hypoxic conditions in receiving water bodies. Also, high levels of nutrients can result in algae blooms that can cause toxic components to accumulate in freshwater sources that communities rely on for drinking water. Furthermore, leaching of nutrients can contribute to increased level of nitrates in groundwater. Increased levels of nitrates are reported to contribute to adverse health effects.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

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

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply
☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Cargill engages with suppliers and invests in scaling the implementation of regenerative agriculture in our agricultural supply chain. Cargill has set a target to reduce 5000MT of water pollutants, measured as Nitrogen, or Nitrogen Equivalents in our supply chain. Cargill engages with suppliers and invests in scaling the implementation of regenerative agriculture in our agricultural supply chain. Regenerative agricultural practices, like cover crops and conservation tillage result in improved soil health and reduced run-off. A reduction in run-off reduces the amount of excess nutrients ending in receiving water bodies. Also, we engage with farmers and growers in our supply chain on nutrient management. For example, through implementation of the 4R nutrient management we avoid excess nutrients. The 4R is the four areas of nutrient management (source, rate, time and place) that provide the basis of "nutrient stewardship", a science-based framework for the efficient and effective use of plant nutrients. Success is measured when the nutrient pollution from runoff and leaching fertilizers decreases, reducing any potential negative impact. We also engage with our customers to minimize the negative impact on water quality. For example, we provide animal feed solutions that increase the uptake of phosphorous by the animal and therefor reduce the amount of phosphorous in manure and any associated leaching into natural water bodies.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ 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

Cargill is a geographically and operationally diverse company operating in 70 countries across numerous agricultural supply chains. Due to our size and revenues, individual sites exposed to water-related risks are not likely to pose a substantive financial or strategic risk to the company as a whole.

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

Due to our size and revenues, individual Plastic-related risks are not likely to pose a substantive financial or strategic risk to Cargill as a whole.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Cargill has current and potential exposure to carbon pricing mechanisms due to the size of our operational footprint. Cargill is already under regulation in the EU (EU ETS). The US and China (our largest and highest risk regions with a total Scope 1 footprint of 3,236,862 tCO2e for those two countries in 2023) could come directly under regulation that includes a price on carbon in those countries. For example, Cargill's global starches, sweeteners & texturizers business represents approximately half of Cargill's total operational emissions due to a very energy intensive process. This business operates multiple processing facilities in both China and the US, which result in a large Scope 1 & 2 footprint in both countries. We estimate that a carbon pricing mechanism could occur in the next 4-10 years.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Other policies or plans, please specify **:**Scope 1&2 SBT

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

74500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

In 2023, we invested approximately 74.5 million in emissions reducing technology and renewable energy projects; this investment will likely increase overtime as we continue to ramp up our efforts to reduce carbon emissions. For example, we have invested in increasing our contracted renewable energy capacity by 42% after signing five new deals to bring online an additional 300 megawatts of wind and solar capacity, expanding our total offsite renewable energy portfolio to 716

megawatts. Once five additional contracts are fully operational in 2024, Cargill's renewable electricity mix is anticipated to reduce our CO2e emissions by nearly 820,000 metric tons per year – this is the equivalent of removing nearly 200,000 gas-powered vehicles from the road for one year.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our efforts to reduce our scope 1 & 2 GHG emissions will help mitigate the potential impact of a US carbon price. Those investments are already being made in order to meet our GHG reduction commitments. Therefore, there is no incremental risk response cost.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with legislation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Brazil

☑ Guatemala

☑ Colombia
☑ Honduras
☑ Malaysia
☑ Thailand
☑ Indonesia
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Papua New Guinea

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The EU Regulation on Deforestation-free commodities and products (EUDR) entered into force on June 29, 2023, and will require companies, such as Cargill, to comply with its due diligence and reporting requirements from December 30, 2024, forward. The due diligence requirements are focused on preventing certain commodities and products from being placed on the EU market if they are associated with deforestation or if the supplier is not in compliance with other relevant legislation. Cargill must ensure that palm oil being placed on the EU market is deforestation-free and demonstrate that due diligence has been completed; this includes collecting information on geolocations for plots of land and other evidence of compliance and ensuring that product placed on the EU market has no (or only negligible) risk of non-compliance with the EUDR requirements. Cargill owns and operates palm plantations in Indonesia, in addition to sourcing from suppliers, and will be required to provide traceability data for all palm products imported into the EU. We have built a strong foundation and path to achieving traceability to plantations, working with farmers to drive inclusive transformation, through increasing transparency, enhancing monitoring and verification, and prioritizing a multi-stakeholder approach to drive collective action. The magnitude of impact largely will be determined by the framework and approach used by the EU – which is expected to provide additional guidance.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:
☑ Increased compliance costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Short-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:

☑ Unknown

(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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater compliance with regulatory requirements

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cargill is still working to determine the overall impact on our business and the additional costs associated with obtaining geolocation/polygon plot data of all of our suppliers, including indirect and smallholders, and the costs associated with the Information System identified by the European Commission. Potential costs may also include: - costs linked to logistics if a vessel is held up for checks to be done before release into the market, - costs linked to setting up a robust due diligence process and systems that allow for risk assessment and mitigation across entire supply chain, - costs linked to additional administrative tasks imposed on operators to upload data manually unto the information system linked to every shipment and keeping all information collected for at least 5 years, - costs linked to engagement with smallholders to ensure inclusion and compliance with the Regulation.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Cargill is committed to combating deforestation by increasing transparency and traceability in our supply chains. As a signatory of the Agriculture Sector Roadmap to 1.5C, by 2025 we will eliminate deforestation from our soy supply chain in the South American biomes of Amazon, Cerrado and Chaco and be NDPE (No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation) for palm globally. Our policy extends to all parts of our palm supply chain and requires plantations, processing and trading operations and all third-party suppliers to act in environmentally sustainable and socially responsible manner. Our approach is collaborative, holistic and aims to engage multiple stakeholders across our value chain to deliver long-lasting impacts. While we are preparing for compliance with all upcoming legislative requirements, we have been working with farmers to drive inclusive transformation, increasing transparency, enhancing monitoring and verification and prioritizing

multi-stakeholder approach. We are also involved in policy advocacy and engagement via industry associations to shape industry positions, provide input and share best practices in the development of implementation guideline to ensure effective implementation.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

(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

☑ Argentina

☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

☑ Brazil

☑ Paraguay

☑ Uruguay

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The EU Regulation on Deforestation-free commodities & products (EUDR) entered into force on June 29, 2023 and will require companies, such as Cargill, to comply with reporting and due diligence requirements as of December 30, 2024. These due diligence requirements are focused on preventing commodities and products from access the EU market when these are associated with deforestation, forest degradation and human rights risks. Cargill sources Soy from countries in South America, which have their own national forest laws that do not align with the new EUDR. Cargill must ensure and prove that soy products are deforestation-free, and demonstrate the due diligence process, through collecting information on geolocations for the plots of land of production, protection of human rights, and ensuring imported/exported products and products on the EU market have no or negligible risk of non-compliance with the deforestation-free requirement, including an assessment of the risk of mixing with products of unknown origin or where deforestation has occurred. We have built a strong foundation and path to achieving our sustainability commitments, including making efforts in traceability to farms, working with farmers to drive inclusive transformation, increasing transparency, enhancing monitoring and verification, and prioritizing a multi-stakeholder approach to drive collective action. The magnitude of impact largely will be determined by the framework used by the EU.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased compliance costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater compliance with regulatory requirements

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Failure to comply may result in a maximum amount of at least 4% of the operator's or trader's total annual Union-wide turnover in the financial year preceding the fining decision in case of non-compliance. Cargill is still working to develop and understand the financial impact of responding to this risk.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Eliminating deforestation across our agricultural supply chains is a critical priority for Cargill. We are partnering with farmers to protect forests and other important ecosystems, we are promoting regenerative agricultural practices, we are restoring altered land and we are delivering innovation solutions in collaboration with key partners. Over the past years, our efforts have laid a strong foundation, demonstrated what works, and helped establish strong relationships with key partners. Our Policy on Forests lays out our approach for achieving this target globally and is founded on our belief that farming and forests can and must coexist. Our urgency for action is reflected on the many efforts and initiatives championed by Cargill through our new restoration initiative: in 2023, there are 16,516 ha under restoration. We're using advanced satellite technology combined with a dedicated team on the ground to improve traceability across our supply chain. In Brazil, for example, so far, we have mapped more than 100,000 polygons in our supply chain. In South America, we are prioritizing actions that drive progress towards our commitment to eliminate deforestation land conversion from our direct and indirect supply chain of key row crops in Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay by 2025—a key milestone to eliminating deforestation and conversion from our South American soy supply chain by 2030.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Cocoa

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with legislation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ghana
☑ Brazil
☑ Uganda
☑ Ecuador
☑ Nigeria
☑ Cameroon
☑ Indonesia
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Dominican Republic

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The EU Regulation on Deforestation-free commodities and products has entered into force on June 29, 2023 requiring companies, such as Cargill, to comply with reporting & due diligence requirements from December 30, 2024. These due diligence requirements are focused on preventing commodities & products from access the EU market when these are associated with deforestation, forest degradation and human rights risks. Cargill sources cocoa from direct and indirect suppliers, and will be required to provide accurate traceability data for all cocoa products imported into the EU. Cargill must ensure and prove that cocoa products are deforestation-free & demonstrate the due diligence process, through collecting information on geolocations for plot of land production, protection of human rights and ensuring imported/exported products and produces place on the EU market have no or negligible risk of non-compliance with the deforestation-free requirement, including an assessment of the risk of mixing with products of unknown origin or where deforestation has occurred. We have built, a strong foundation and path to achieving our sustainability commitments, including making efforts in traceability to plantations, working with farmers to drive inclusive transformation, increasing transparency,

enhancing monitoring and verification, and prioritizing a multi-stakeholder approach to drive collective action. The magnitude of impact largely will be determined by the framework used by the EU.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased compliance costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-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:

☑ Unknown

(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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater compliance with regulatory requirements

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Failure to comply may result in a maximum amount of at least 4% of the operator's or trader's total annual Union-wide turnover in the financial year preceding the fining decision in case of non-compliance. Cargill is still working to develop and understand the financial impact of responding to this risk.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We are partnering with farmers around the world to protect forests and other important ecosystems, promoting regenerative agricultural practices, restoring altered land and delivering innovation solutions in collaboration with key partners. Over the past years, our efforts have laid a strong foundation, demonstrated what works, and helped establish strong relationships with key partners. Our Policy on Forests lays out our approach for achieving this target globally. Our urgency for action is reflected on the many efforts and initiatives championed by Cargill: We're using advanced satellite technology combined with a dedicated team on the ground to improve traceability across our supply chain. In our cocoa supply chain, for example, we are deploying technology to give us unprecedented visibility, which helps us map farms, increase the traceability of cocoa products, assess deforestation risk, and engage suppliers. We use GPS to map the polygon farm boundaries and have mapped 70% of all farmers participating in the Cargill Cocoa Promise program. This visibility allows us to better trace product and monitor land use. For example, Cargill is partnering with PUR to promote agroforestry adoption in cocoa growing landscapes. This helps cocoa farmers restore depleted areas while diversifying incomes. Cargill helps fund the cost of seedlings, provides expertise on the ground, and offers direct engagement with cocoa growers whose soil for farming improves in quality when nearby forests regenerate.
[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

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Cargill is currently in the process of developing and understanding the proportion of our financial metrics that are vulnerable to substantive impacts of risks.

Forests

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Cargill is currently in the process of developing and understanding the proportion of our financial metrics that are vulnerable to substantive impacts of risks.
[Add row]

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

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Fines, but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

Cargill operates a diverse portfolio of facilities in 70 countries. Cargill continues to improve global environmental compliance requirements and associated monitoring and investigations. Our goal is to cause zero harm and adhere to our guiding principle to obey the law. No fine issued in 2023 met the threshold requirements to be considered significant.
[Fixed row]

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

(3.3.1.1) Total number of fines

18

(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines

177000

(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated

2.3

(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(3.3.1.5) Comment

Cargill operates a diverse portfolio of facilities in 70 countries. Cargill continues to improve global environmental compliance requirements and associated monitoring and investigations. Our goal is to cause zero harm and adhere to our guiding principle of obeying the law. This information may not be complete, but provides a summary of water use or quality related fines paid during Cargill's FY24 based on the best available knowledge of Cargill.
[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

☑ Alberta TIER - ETS

☑ EU ETS

☑ UK ETS

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

Alberta TIER - ETS

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

0.71

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

20033

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

45610

(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

No further comment.

EU ETS

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

16

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

685204

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

260000

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

1053160

(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

No further comment.

UK ETS

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

2

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

61606

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

116000

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

142867

(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

No further comment.
[Fixed row]

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

For systems where we have regulatory obligations, we have teams that are accountable for ensuring compliance with those obligations. In some of cases, such as the EU ETS, we have teams that are actively working to optimize our position in those markets on a regular basis. Regarding emerging regulations, our government relations and EHS teams are continually monitoring potential new regulatory systems. These teams give updates to potentially impacted businesses on an ad hoc basis, but those updates happen roughly quarterly. On a global basis, whether involved in trading schemes or not, Cargill invests in people, process and technical solutions to improve energy efficiency and increase renewable energy use to reduce GHG emissions. Many of the operations that participated in the former Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) and European Union Emissions Trading System (ETS) have successfully deployed energy modelling to identify opportunities to conserve energy through capital projects, supporting compliance Cargill's with the schemes. In addition, behavior-based energy management programs have been deployed and are expanding to additional processing locations to optimize current operations. Continuing focus and improvement on energy, management and resource efficiency have let to improvements. Over the last year, Cargill has made strides in our efforts to source additional renewable energy. As one example, we have partnered with PLN, the Indonesian government-owned electric utility company, to supply bundled energy and Tradable Instruments for Global Renewables (TIGRs), which are energy attribute certificates obtained from renewable resources like wind, solar, geothermal, and hydropower. In 2022, Cargill purchased more than 70,000 megawatt hours (MWh) of clean electricity from PLN, supporting seven of our sites in Indonesia. This resulted in a reduction of more than 50,000 metric tons of CO2e. The renewable energy project in Indonesia is one of 15 Cargill projects online in 12 countries. This was accomplished primarily through the procurement of Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) for wind and solar. Cargill has also executed four additional contracts for offtake from projects that will come online in the next two years. Once these projects are fully operational in 2024, we expect Cargill's renewable electricity mix will reduce our CO2e emissions by more than 715,000

metric tons per year. Cargill also uses a shadow-price on carbon to help businesses understand the potential financial impact of regulation of emissions, regardless of whether a facility is currently covered under regulatory scheme.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Development of new products or services through R&D and innovation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ Netherlands

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Cargill created a dedicated global bio-industrial business group, operational in June 2018, to address the growing demand from our customers for bio-based solutions. The bio-industrial group draws on the whole Cargill portfolio of products and services worldwide to create solutions to help our customers increase performance, and lower costs whilst offering an alternative to petroleum-based products. In order to meet customer demands and expand its offering of low emission goods, in December 2021, Cargill announced our agreement with Croda to acquire the majority of its performance technologies and industrial chemicals business for EUR 915,000,000 (1.03bln USD) on a cash-free, debt-free basis, the acquisition closed in 2022. The investment has dramatically expanded Cargill's bio-industrial footprint to better serve industrial manufacturers.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1030000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity is based on the cost of the deal for Cargill to acquire Croda. This price includes the takeover of the Performance Technologies and Industrial Chemicals business with production facilities in Europe and Asia, approximately 1,000 employees worldwide, in addition to gaining Croda's client portfolio.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

To develop and further expand our business offering in low emissions goods, Cargill saw a significant opportunity in acquiring Croda's Performance Technologies and Industrial Chemical's business as it will enable Cargill to gain a strong technology portfolio that supports leading market positions in automotive, polymer and food packaging applications. This will expand Cargill's bio industrial footprint and better serve industrial manufacturers searching for alternative ingredient solutions. More than two thirds of the materials used to manufacture the products to be added to Cargill's bio industrial portfolio are renewable and/or bio-based, aligning to Cargill's commitment to sustainability by sparking a new wave of innovation and broadening its offering of low emission goods. Therefore, this acquisition is advantageous for Cargill as the technology portfolio provides a competitive advantage to serve leading market positions driving increased revenues. For example, the infrastructure in the US poses a sustainability challenge because millions of miles of paved roads are surfaced in asphalt. Making and laying asphalt generates GHG emissions, and much of the American road system requires regular repairs in the form of new layers of asphalt. In response to this challenge, Cargill's bioindustrial group developed its line of Anova Asphalt Solutions for modifying asphalt to enhance the performance and extend the life. The product line includes Anova Rejuvenator that uses modified vegetable oils and other bio-based agricultural components from Cargill's domestic resources to restore oxidized and cracked asphalt surfaces. Anova Rejuvenator reduces the emissions intensity of asphalt by incorporating a biobased material. Road crews can take existing asphalt, grind it up, add Rejuvenator, then lay it back down—in effect recycling up to 60% of road surfaces. The product improves road durability and enables the recycling of old road material, reducing the emissions intensity of the asphalt. The acquisition of Croda completed in 2022, will enable Cargill to spark further innovation and expand its production of biobased products.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased value chain transparency

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Brazil
☑ Colombia
☑ Honduras
☑ Malaysia
☑ Thailand
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Papua New Guinea

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

As the understanding of deforestation grows, many of Cargill's customers are setting targets and commitments to source 100% traceable, Deforestation-Free and/or RSPO-certified palm oil. Given our role in the value chain, Cargill can offer traceable and sustainably sourced palm oil to these customers, positioning Cargill as a trusted supplier, to help customers achieve commitments. We continue to offer and supply RSPO-certified products based on customer demand. As our customers want more customization with respect to traceability for their specific supply chain and despite the complexity, we continue to work to find ways to improve tracking and reporting at origin. Our Sustainable Palm Oil policy is rooted in the Principles and Criteria of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and we believe they serve as the primary global sustainability standards for palm products and encourage all end-users of palm oil and palm oil products in the mature markets. We also promote the use of RSPO certified materials to our existing customers who are either sourcing conventional materials to move to RSPO certified products in order to meet our Shared Responsibility target. Beyond supplying RSPO certified material, our global presence also gives us a unique understanding and insights on how we can work together with supply chain actors and industry experts in designing due diligence approaches that transform the supply chain and enable real transparency and accountability.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cargill considers this proprietary.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We moved forward to increase transparency through verification, certification and greater visibility with our customers. As one of the co-conveners for the creation of the No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation Implementation Reporting Framework (NDPE IRF), Cargill continues to play an active role in the further improvement of the IRF and its wider adoption by palm oil companies throughout the supply chain. To that end, for the second year in a row, Cargill completed NDPE IRF profiles for all of our refineries globally to share with our customers. This year we conducted an independent verification of all profiles and increased transparency by publishing them on Cargill.com for all stakeholders to access.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp7

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Increased resilience to impacts of climate change

(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

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Mississippi River

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

A cornerstone of Cargill's sustainability strategy is to be a connector of the food system. Cargill has the ability to deliver holistic solutions that drive impact at-scale. Water is an essential ingredient for the food system. With on average 70% of freshwater globally being used in agriculture, the positive water impact that we achieve in water priority regions, which include our upstream agricultural crop production across the global supply chain, is an opportunity to address critical shared water challenges in these regions. Our regenerative agriculture strategy provides a portfolio of options and programs that allows Cargill to meet farmers where they are and develop solutions that provide foundational economic and environmental benefits to their operations. The improvement in soil health improves the water-holding capacity of the soil. Our regenerative agriculture strategy incentivizes farmers to increase their resilience. Due to the increased water-holding capacity we see a reduction in water run-off, and reduced need for irrigation, thus reducing the demand for scarce water resources.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cargill considers this proprietary.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

In 2020, we announced a commitment to advance regenerative agriculture practices across 10 million acres of North American agricultural land by 2030. These practices include planting cover crops, reducing tillage, rotational grazing, and optimizing nutrient management. We continue to make progress on scaling up

regenerative agriculture through programs like Cargill RegenConnect, which connects farmers to the growing environmental marketplace by paying them for improved soil health and positive environmental outcomes. In 2023, we expanded the program in the United States from 15 to 24 states, providing farmers with payments for additional commodities, including cotton, and improved ease and access to enrollment via mobile devices. We also announced the expansion of Cargill RegenConnect in Europe for eligible farmers in Germany, Poland, Romania, and France – building on two years of success in North America. Cargill will offer market-competitive pricing based on each metric ton of carbon sequestered per hectare for primary crops in Cargill's supply chains, including rapeseed, wheat, corn, barley, and sunflower. In recognition of its innovative approach to creating a more resilient and secure food system, Cargill RegenConnect received a prestigious 2023 Edison Award.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Other products and services opportunity, please specify **:**Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Cargill has science-based targets covering our scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions. These targets are driving investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency, and other low-carbon technologies. Specifically, Cargill's global starches, sweeteners & texturizers business represents approximately half of Cargill's total operational

emissions due to a very energy intensive process. The business plans to implement ISO50001 at processing locations that together represent over 80% of its emissions. There are multiple processing facilities in China and the US that account for the majority of Cargill's total GHG emissions. The technologies used in our production processes also pose an opportunity to innovate and reduce the associated environmental impacts, while realizing cost savings.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

10000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Multiple Cargill sites have implemented ISO50001. These sites have identified improvement opportunities that are both behavioral and process control changes by focusing on significant energy users like in-unit operations such as fermentation & distillation, drying and combined heat and power (CHP). This has created value of 3-4Million/year with growing focus on these process systems. Continuing focus and improvement on energy, management and efficiency have led to improvements in 2022 such as a project in Europe where a new control model was implemented to optimize a CHP unit which reduced 12,000 MT CO2e/year of the site's Scope 1 emissions for very little cost. At a facility in England in 2022 a heat recovery project from a fermentation process was implemented which reduced GHG emissions by 2500 MT CO2e/year. The ISO50001 provides standards for effective energy management systems as well as an audit and certification process to drive more formal adoption and continuous improvement. A sizeable opportunity remains as we continue to implement robust energy management systems at more CFB sites. We estimate that the energy performance improvement is 1-2% per year resulting in both cost and GHG reductions. It requires a commitment of resources including employees, consultants and certification audits. In the CFB enterprise, 18 more sites will implement the ISO50001, saving 2- 2.5million/year from reduced energy consumption in addition to the savings already realized. To realize this, we estimate an extra 1.5 million in additional infrastructure (i.e. metering), labor and consulting fees. Extending beyond CFB to the rest of Cargill would require additional people to implement and maintain the management systems along with some additional infrastructure and consulting for certification. If we implement the systems throughout the rest of our priority locations, we estimate a savings of 25 million per year through reduced energy consumption and improved efficiencies. To realize this, we estimate a cost of a 10 million/year in additional personnel, infrastructure and consulting.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Cargill has science-based scope 1, 2 and 3 targets that drive investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency and low-carbon technologies. These targets have been validated by the SBTi (Science-Based Targets initiative). Energy consumption drives the majority of our operational GHG emissions, and energy management systems like ISO50001 allow us to understand how we use energy, manage our performance, and identify improvement opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of low-carbon energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ Ghana
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Jordan
☑ Zambia
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Denmark
☑ Ecuador
☑ Ukraine
☑ Uruguay
☑ Colombia
☑ Honduras
☑ Malaysia
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Guatemala
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Kenya
☑ Spain
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Pakistan
☑ Paraguay
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Singapore
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Costa Rica

☑ Indonesia
☑ Nicaragua
☑ New Zealand
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Netherlands
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Dominican Republic
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United Arab Emirates

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Cargill has science-based targets covering our scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions. These targets are driving investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency, and other low-carbon technologies. Originating renewable electricity allows Cargill to help green the grid and reduce the effects of climate change related to our operations. Additionally, procuring renewable energy allows Cargill to plan for potential future carbon regulation. Our renewable energy strategy includes pursuing electrification opportunities in our manufacturing processes, allowing us to switch some of our non-renewable fuel use to renewable electricity, contractual agreements to bring renewable electricity to our facilities, and the installation of onsite generation of renewable electricity. These efforts are realizing cost savings, while also contributing to our efforts to meet our science-based targets.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term

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

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

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

50000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cargill seeks to identify opportunities to purchase or contract for green power. The two markets we are describing above vary. In one market, the green power is less expensive than traditional power, and in the other market, Cargill pays a premium for the green power. The net of the two transactions is approximately 50,000 per year.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Cargill is committed to reducing its operational emissions by pursuing emissions-reducing technology and investing in renewable energy to power our operations. For example, we signed power purchasing agreements with utilities in Indonesia and China to supply green electricity to our operations. As a result, the renewable electricity will constitute a sizeable portion of the electrical consumption at our locations in Indonesia and China. This effort represents 0.7% reduction in Cargill's overall emissions supporting our 10% reduction target for emissions reductions in our global operations. With this target of reducing our operational emissions by 10% by 2025 from a 2017 baseline, Cargill have already exceeded this target. This project is currently in operation and is beginning to be reflected in our GHG performance.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Regenerative production

(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

☑ Brazil

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Brazil's biomes are critical to the health of the planet and contribute to a more sustainable food supply chain. Mitigating the impact of climate change is crucial to global food security, and protecting these vital ecosystems plays a central role. Cargill is connecting across agriculture, environmental, academic, and business stakeholders to create a collection of programs that provide farmers with resources to implement more sustainable practices. In 2022, we partnered to launch new programs focusing on the environmental regularization of farms achieving 16,516 ha under restoration in 2023, strengthening our commitment to contribute to more sustainable agriculture and to eliminate deforestation and land conversion from our supply chains. In South America, we are prioritizing actions that drive progress towards our commitment to eliminate deforestation land conversion from our direct and indirect supply chain of key row crops in Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay by 2025—a key milestone to eliminating deforestation and conversion from our South American soy supply chain by 2030. The initiatives contribute to build a more

resilient productive system that has an efficient use of natural resources, which contributes to the mitigation of climate change and contributes to food security – aligned with Cargill's purpose.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cargill considers this to be proprietary.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We are continuing to partner with stakeholders and invest on programs that help farmers to protect native vegetation and manage production in a responsible way that meets the world's needs. Farmers are at the core of these initiatives because we know that they are the one who can ultimately drive the transformation we seek and because solutions need to work for them.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp6

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Cocoa

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased availability of products with reduced environmental impact [other than certified products]

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ghana

☑ Cameroon

☑ Brazil
☑ Uganda
☑ Ecuador
☑ Nigeria
☑ Indonesia
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Dominican Republic
☑ Democratic Republic of the Congo

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Product sustainability is becoming an increasing driver for consumers who see their product choices as a reflection of who they are and what they value. Consumers want to see the issues they care about acknowledged in the brands they buy. Providing products that meet and exceed these expectations is an opportunity for Cargill.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

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

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

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

Select from:
☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium

(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

The effect has not been quantified financially.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cargill considers this to be proprietary.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We believe that a prerequisite for making real progress on sustainability is enabling transparency and traceability across the cocoa supply chain. The proliferation of innovative and cost-effective technological solutions is accelerating traceability, real-time data collection and financial transparency. It also allows for greater transparency on how cocoa is grown and sourced from farmers. As the quality of this information improves, consumers have greater confidence, and demand for sustainable cocoa goes up. This cycle will help hold everyone to a higher standard and move our industry forward.
[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

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Cargill is currently in the process of developing and understanding the proportion of our financial metrics that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Forests

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Cargill is currently in the process of developing and understanding the proportion of our financial metrics that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Cargill is currently in the process of developing and understanding the proportion of our financial metrics that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Overall responsibility for sustainability and ESG rests with the CEO, who also serves on Cargill's Board of Directors. The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee is responsible for assessing and finalizing climate targets, risks, opportunities and defining climate-related budgets. This includes setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO and CSO report progress against ESG targets, including climate targets, on a half-yearly cadence.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Overall responsibility for sustainability and ESG rests with the CEO, who also serves on Cargill's Board of Directors. The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee is responsible for assessing and finalizing climate targets, risks, opportunities and defining climate-related budgets. This includes setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO and CSO report progress against ESG targets, including climate targets, on a half-yearly cadence.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Overall responsibility for sustainability and ESG rests with the CEO, who also serves on Cargill's Board of Directors. The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee is responsible for assessing and finalizing climate targets, risks, opportunities and defining climate-related budgets. This includes setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO and CSO report progress against ESG targets, including climate targets, on a half-yearly cadence.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Overall responsibility for sustainability and ESG rests with the CEO, who also serves on Cargill's Board of Directors. The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee is responsible for assessing and finalizing climate targets, risks, opportunities and defining climate-related budgets. This includes setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO and CSO report progress against ESG targets, including climate targets, on a half-yearly cadence.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

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

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. Responsibilities of the CEO include setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO works directly with the CSO to recommend a climate strategy as part of the overall business strategy, which is approved by the Board of the Directors, and includes assessing risks and opportunities related to climate change in both the company's supply chain and operations. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, also monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

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

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. Responsibilities of the CEO include setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO works directly with the CSO to recommend a climate strategy as part of the overall business strategy, which is approved by the Board of the Directors, and includes assessing risks and opportunities related to climate change in both the company's supply chain and operations. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, also monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

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

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

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. Responsibilities of the CEO include setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO works directly with the CSO to recommend a climate strategy as part of the overall business strategy, which is approved by the Board of the Directors, and includes assessing risks and opportunities related to climate change in both the company's supply chain and operations. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, also monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

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

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO collaborates closely with the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to evaluate and address ESG risks, opportunities, and impacts, guiding the company's overarching business strategy and reporting practices. Reporting to the CEO, our CSO is entrusted with leading Cargill's comprehensive ESG strategy and monitoring progress against ESG goals and targets. To fortify ESG governance and accountability, Cargill also has an executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, that monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company. Responsibilities of the CEO include setting annual climate budgets and managing annual capital budgets and annual expenditures related to low-carbon products and services, inclusive of research, development and innovation. The CEO works directly with the CSO to recommend a climate strategy as part of the overall business strategy, which is approved by the Board of the Directors, and includes assessing risks and opportunities related to climate change in both the company's supply chain and operations. The executive-level ESG Governance Committee, chaired by the CSO, also monitors progress and assists in strategic planning and alignment across the company.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.3) Please explain

The % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives is confidential.

Forests

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Progress on select ESG targets is used to determine executive compensation, however these are not specific to Forests. In addition, all executive leaders have unique and specific sustainability goals and objectives related to their business and/or functional responsibility, and a portion of their compensation is tied to the progress made against those targets.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Progress on select ESG targets is used to determine executive compensation, however these are not specific to Water. In addition, all executive leaders have unique and specific sustainability goals and objectives related to their business and/or functional responsibility, and a portion of their compensation is tied to the progress made against those targets.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The Executive Team's compensation is based on a set of financial and performance metrics, and then adjusted based on progress against select ESG targets, including progress against annual Scope 1 and 2, and Scope 3 GHG goals. Progress is measured and evaluated at a company-wide and business group level.

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

Annual ESG targets are aligned to a multi-year plan to achieve Cargill's long-term climate goals.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Deforestation is a global issue, but it is the local context where the work must get done. Our Policy on Forests sets principles to guide Cargill businesses in addressing deforestation risk in their supply chains. Our approach provides practical steps our businesses can take towards policy implementation and our shared goal of ending deforestation by 2030. Oversight for this work lies at the enterprise level with Cargill's ESG Committee.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to no deforestation, to no planting on peatlands, and to no exploitation (NDPE) by target date, please specify :2030

☑ Commitment to no land clearance by burning or clearcutting

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

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of commodities covered by the policy

☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

☑ 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 another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

forest policy sept 2015 na31891866.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Cargill's water stewardship approach, published on our website focuses on improving water availability, access, and quality in supply chains and regions where we can drive positive change, including 2030 goals and activities across operations and communities. Our Water Resources webpage describes our leadership role in driving positive change within the value chain (i.e. Improving WASH accessibility by addressing shared challenges in watershed health). This action is driven through our 2030 goals, managing our operations, supply chain, and communities, going beyond regulatory requirements: (a) Within our operations, we implemented global requirements for water, addressing our commitment to WASH access, compliance and reporting of water usage, impact and risk. By 2025, water stewardship will be implemented at all priority facilities (specified by water stress and use). (b) Cargill is committed to working with farmers and partners to advance sustainable agriculture to improve soil health, water resiliency and quality. (c) Access to clean and safe water is essential for communities to thrive. By 2030, we will enable improved access to safe drinking water and sanitation for 500,000 people in priority communities, in line with UN SDG6. The details of water specific commitments and additional references are described in the Practices Note that is written together with the WRI that is publicly available on Cargill's Water Resources webpage as well as WRI's website.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

☑ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation

☑ Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems

☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

developing-enterprise-water-targets-local-contexts-cargills-approach.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

☑ Soy Moratorium

☑ UN Global Compact

☑ Water Resilience Coalition

☑ New York Declaration on Forests

☑ Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS)

☑ Tropical Forest Alliance 2020 (TFA)

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI)

☑ World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

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

AWS: Cargill is a member of the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) and in addition to prioritizing water in its supply chain and communities, Cargill is working to advance sustainable water management in its operations. The company is implementing a Water Stewardship program, which is a set of best practices and goals informed by the guidance and best practices described in the Alliance for Water Stewardship standard, at priority facilities by 2025. Water Resilience Coalition: As a member of the Water Resilience Coalition, which is an industry-driven initiative. Cargill's CSO joins these initiative sessions. Cargill is committed to working with other companies, governments and communities to reduce global water stress by 2050. Working together across the entire water value chain, the coalition will preserve the world's freshwater resources through collective action and ambitious, quantifiable commitments to create a water resilient future. Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform (SAI Platform): Cargill is an active member of SAI Platform. At the request of downstream customers, we have successfully benchmarked many sustainability projects and programs against the SAI Platform Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) across the world. We are members of the FSA's Steering Committee, as well as the Benchmarking Work Stream. In addition, Cargill is a Founding Member of the SAI Platform Regenerative Agriculture Framework, where we are collaborating to harmonize metrics around regenerative agriculture to meet our own goals and those of our customers. UNGC: Cargill is a proud signatory of the CEO Water Mandate and a member of the Water Resilience Coalition. Both are UN Global Compact initiatives that mobilize business leaders on water, sanitation and the SDGs. WBCSD (World Business Council for Sustainable Development): Cargill has been a member of WBCSD since 2017 and our Chief Sustainability Officer is on the Agriculture & Food Pathway Board. We are engaging in a number of the food & agriculture workstreams across WBCSD, including Nature Positive, Regenerative Agriculture, and Equitable Livelihoods. SBTN: Cargill is an engaged stakeholder in the development process for the SBTN Land draft. New York Declaration on Forests: Cargill endorsed The New York Declaration on Forests, announcing at the United Nations Climate Summit our goal to eliminate deforestation across our entire agricultural supply chain, halving it by 2020 and ending it completely by 2030. Our aim is to be the most trusted source of sustainable products and services and by taking action, and working with our customers, we will help them achieve their own deforestation-free commitments by 2020 or sooner. Soy Moratorium: Our supply chain was audited this year for compliance with the Soy Moratorium and Green Grain Protocol, and no noncompliant soy was found. We collaborate through landscape-level initiatives and platforms, such as the Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA), to address challenges that span physical and political boundaries and involve multiple commodities. Cargill is currently participating in nine palm-related landscape programs around the world.

[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

Cargill ESG Report 2023.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

(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

Cargill's global Government Relations (GR) team engages with government officials and stakeholders in countries where we operate. Where there are opportunities to support policies and regulations consistent with our climate strategy, the GR team will coordinate with our business and sustainability leaders on the appropriate engagement based on the impact of our business. For example, for the EU Renewable Energy Directive, we worked with policy makers to refine the EU Commission proposal in order to strengthen the contribution of crop-based and waste-based biofuels to the dedicated transport target.
[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 Renewable Energy Directive

(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

Energy and renewables

☑ Renewable energy generation

(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

☑ EU27

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

Select from:

☑ Support with minor exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

Cargill supported the overall ambition of the EU Renewable Energy Directive proposal whose objective is to promote the production and market uptake of further renewable energy to reduce fossil fuel imports. Within this framework, we engaged with policy makers to further refine the EU Commission proposal in order to strengthen the contribution of crop-based and waste-based biofuels to the dedicated transport target.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

(4.11.1.11) 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

EU Emissions Trading System

(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

Financial mechanisms (e.g., taxes, subsidies, etc.)

☑ Carbon taxes

☑ Emissions trading schemes

(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

☑ EU27

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

Select from:

☑ Support with minor exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization’s proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

We have engaged on a number of minor elements in order to make sure that the system would fit the reality of the operations in the region across food, feed and industrial uses. Our focus was on making sure that our investments and solutions to further decarbonize and reduce the footprint of our operations would be recognized in the framework of EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS).

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

Select all that apply

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

(4.11.1.11) 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

EU Deforestation Regulation

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Low-impact production and innovation

☑ Deforestation-free products

(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

☑ EU27

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

Select from:

☑ Support with minor exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

We advocated for a 'smart mix' of measures by the EU that would help tackle in a holistic manner the negative impacts on forests associated with the production of forest risk commodities rather than just ensuring clean supply chains. We emphasized the importance of further dialogue and cooperation between producing and consumer countries and advocated for measures adapted to the operational realities of the different supply chains, namely palm, soy and cocoa. We specifically called for a commodity-by-commodity approach rather than one size fits all, offering our expertise and knowledge of the supply chain in order to advance actions that would lead to enhancing forest protection overall as well as promoting our own no-deforestation commitments across forest-risk commodities.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Responding to consultations

(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

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

Row 4

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

US Farm Bill

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

☑ Use of pesticides and agrochemicals

(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

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Support with minor exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization’s proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

Overall, Cargill supports U.S. farmers and ranchers through voluntary incentives to advance regenerative agriculture and research, and investments in food security and we would hope to see a U.S. Farm Bill that enables these priorities. Cargill will engage with lawmakers as the new legislation is drafted over the coming period and evaluate specific provisions once the text is released.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

(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

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

[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

North America

☑ US Chamber of Commerce

(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

From the US Chamber of Commerce website: "Combating climate change requires citizens, governments, and businesses to work together. Inaction is simply not an option. American businesses play a vital role in creating innovative solutions and reducing greenhouse gases to protect our planet. A challenge of this magnitude requires collaboration, not confrontation, to advance the best ideas and policies. Together, we can forge solutions that improve our environment and grow our economy—leaving the world better for generations to come." Cargill supports the US Chamber of Commerce's position on climate, including support for market-based, bipartisan, and durable climate solutions. As a result, we work hand in hand with our customers, NGOs, and other key stakeholders across our supply chains to advance progress. Business can and is playing a vital role in driving progress to reduce GHG emissions, and while Cargill's messaging position on climate change policy is consistent with the US Chamber of Commerce, Cargill is also taking action to implement a science-based solutions approach to tackling climate change. Cargill's GHG reduction strategy requires increased investment in both implementing existing solutions as well as developing new solutions for the future. We believe that efforts to address climate change can both improve our environment and grow our economy, for example by connecting farmers to new markets that reward them for delivering positive environmental outcomes. For example, our Cargill RegenConnect program, BeefUp Sustainability Initiative, and SeaFurther program are examples of ways that Cargill is living our values on sustainability in action, increasing food security, and improving farmer livelihoods. These programs are consistent with the Chamber's advocacy for enabling the development of market-based sustainability programs.

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

51500

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

Our organization's funding solely goes toward membership fees and therefore does not relate to a specific aim that we hope to be achieved.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify :Corn Refiners Association (CRA)

(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

From Corn Refiners Association (CRA's) website: "CRA advocates for a healthy and prosperous environment that preserves America's ability to innovate and promote economic growth. CRA believes environmental regulations need to be guided by law and rooted in science. As a result, our industry supports policies that are stringent but workable across a range of important environmental issues, including air quality, water quality, pollution prevention, and toxins, as regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)." Cargill supports the CRA's position on climate, including support for market-based, bipartisan, and durable climate solutions. We are collaborating with customers and suppliers to better enable them to meet their GHG emissions reduction goals through the development of innovative new solutions like WindWings, ground-breaking wind technology with the potential to decarbonize cargo vessels up to 30%, and products like feed additives to address methane emissions from cattle. Cargill is taking action to implement a science-based approach to tackling climate change. For example, our Cargill RegenConnect program, BeefUp Sustainability Initiative, and SeaFurther program are examples of ways that Cargill is living our values on sustainability in action. These programs are consistent with the CRA's advocacy for enabling the development of market-based sustainability programs. We are continuing to invest in emerging markets that help to decarbonize food, agriculture, and other sectors. Our bioindustrials business is developing bio-based alternatives to petroleum-based products and chemicals, ranging from beauty products to adhesives to asphalt solutions. And through programs like Cargill RegenConnect, we're connecting farmers to the growing environmental marketplace by paying them for positive environmental outcomes.

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

1500000

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

Our organization's funding solely goes toward membership fees and therefore does not relate to a specific aim that we hope to be achieved.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Plant Based Products Council

(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

From Plant Based Products Council (PBPC's) website: "The impacts of climate change can be felt at almost every level in nature. From rising sea levels to changes in weather patterns and shrinking biodiversity, climate change is altering the way that we live and the global systems that support us. Fortunately, there are many actions that both consumers and companies can do now to help reduce the climate impact of the consumer economy now and in the future. Investments in research for plant-based innovations, manufacturing more circular products, and advocating for improvements in our waste infrastructure to support products derived from renewable resources are critical, practical solutions for a greener future." Cargill supports the PBPC's position on climate, including support for market-based, bipartisan, and durable climate solutions. Cargill is taking action to implement a science-based approach to tackling climate change. For example, our Cargill RegenConnect program is an example of how Cargill is living our values on sustainability in action. This program is consistent with the PBPC's advocacy for enabling the development of market-based sustainability programs. Cargill supports PBPC's advocacy efforts to promote new ways for bio-based products to be used in the marketplace, as well as research and development of those products. Cargill recognizes the role that the bioeconomy and bio-based products can play in the fight against climate change while simultaneously promoting economic growth. We support PBPC's advocacy on behalf of bio-based materials to be used in industrial applications. Our own efforts to mitigate climate change include working across the supply chain to develop new and innovative products that are bio-based that support the bioeconomy.

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

500000

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

Our organization's funding solely goes toward membership fees and therefore does not relate to a specific aim that we hope to be achieved.

(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 other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :public-private partnerships

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

The Sustainable Supply Chain Coalition (SSCC)

(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 Sustainable Supply Chain Coalition (SSCC), is a group of food and agriculture companies and environmental NGOs dedicated to scaling climate-smart agriculture through public-private partnerships. Current coalition members include Cargill, Danone, the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), JBS, McDonald's, PepsiCo, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and Unilever. The Coalition has been focused on engaging individual members of the U.S. House and Senate Ag Committee, as well as other staff, to advocate for climate-smart practices.

(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

☑ Other, please specify :SASB

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Content of environmental policies

☑ Deforestation and conversion footprint

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Strategy, Climate, Land and Water, Appendix

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Cargill ESG Report 2023.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Our ESG report shares how we are delivering impact with purpose and partnership. In it you will see that Cargill is: • Delivering innovative, sustainable solutions for our customers that together drive collective action; • Engaging with farmers around the world to transform agriculture supply chains to be more sustainable; and • Partnering to build resilient, inclusive communities where we do business.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

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

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ No standardized procedure

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

Cargill consider this information proprietary.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Bespoke climate transition scenario

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(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
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Cost of capital
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Cargill's assessment of transition risk is based off of the low warming potential identified from the physical climate scenarios FCP2.6. The primary quantitative metric we assessed is exposure to carbon prices under regulatory schemes, as we are assuming a high level of regulation. We also qualitatively assessed other transition risk such as shifting customer/consumer preferences. Risk has been assessed at decadal intervals through 2050.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Cargill's assessment of transition risk is based off of the low warming potential identified from the physical climate scenarios FCP2.6. The primary quantitative metric we assessed is exposure to carbon prices under regulatory schemes, as we are assuming a high level of regulation. We also qualitatively assessed other transition risk such as shifting customer/consumer preferences. Risk has been assessed at decadal intervals through 2050.

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

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

(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)

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In our scenario analysis we review aqueduct water stress projections. The description of the stress projections as provided by the World Resources Institute states that the Aqueduct Water Stress Projections include indicators of change in water supply, water demand, water stress, and seasonal variability, projected for the coming decades under scenarios of climate and economic growth. The projections for water demand, supply and water stress are calculated for two climate scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5) and two shared socioeconomic pathways, SSP2 and SSP3.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our water strategy prioritizes action based on shared water challenges in the local context. Effects of climate change materialize through changing weather patterns that can cause water stress, which is unfavorable for Cargill, as we are highly reliant on agricultural products. In assessing where to prioritize action and empowering the teams to identify programs that build water resiliency, we include both current water stress levels as well as future projects in the assessment for identifying meaningful water projects that deliver on our ambition to enable water positive impact in operations, supply chains and communities by 2030.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ 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:

☑ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(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

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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario was selected to test exposure to climate-related risk in a low-warming world, particularly transition risks. The primary quantitative metric we assessed is exposure to carbon prices under regulatory schemes. We also qualitatively assessed other transition risks such as shifting customer/consumer preferences. Risk has been assessed at decadal intervals through 2050.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

This scenario was selected to test exposure to climate-related risk in a low-warming world, particularly transition risks. The primary quantitative metric we assessed is exposure to carbon prices under regulatory schemes. We also qualitatively assessed other transition risks such as shifting customer/consumer preferences. Risk has been assessed at decadal intervals through 2050.

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:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ 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

2021

(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

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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario was selected to test exposure to climate-related risk in a much warmer world, particularly physical risks. We assessed the financial impacts of risks including sea-level rise, severe weather events, drought/water stress and excessive heat. Risk assessment was based primarily on asset value. Risk has been assessed at decadal intervals through 2050.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

This scenario was selected to test exposure to climate-related risk in a much warmer world, particularly physical risks. We assessed the financial impacts of risks including sea-level rise, severe weather events, drought/water stress and excessive heat. Risk assessment was based primarily on asset value. Risk has been assessed at decadal intervals through 2050.

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:

☑ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

(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

(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)

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In our scenario analysis we review aqueduct water stress projections. The description of the stress projections as provided by the World Resources Institute states that the Aqueduct Water Stress Projections include indicators of change in water supply, water demand, water stress, and seasonal variability, projected for the coming decades under scenarios of climate and economic growth. The projections for water demand, supply and water stress are calculated for two climate scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5) and two shared socioeconomic pathways, SSP2 and SSP3.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our water strategy prioritises action based on shared water challenges in the local context. Effects of climate change materialize through changing weather patterns that can cause water stress which is unfavorable for Cargill, as we are highly reliant on agricultural products. In assessing where to prioritize action and empowering the teams to identify programs that build water resiliency, we include both current water stress levels as well as future projects in the assessment for identifying meaningful water projects that deliver on our ambition to enable water positive impact in operations, supply chains and communities by 2030.
[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

We are currently using a combination of low-warming and high-warming scenarios through 2050 to better understand both transition and physical risk globally across Cargill's operations. Under both scenarios, water availability is a potentially significant risk for both our operations and our supply chains. Results under a high-warming scenario: extreme weather events and rising sea levels pose a potential risk to our ability to operate our global agricultural logistics network. Through World Resources Institute (WRI) mapping, we saw that water risk in numerous geographies, including Thailand and Poland, is potentially significant under the high warming scenario. Thailand and Poland are strategic geographies for our protein business in Asia and Europe respectively. Results under a low-warming scenario: transition risks play a bigger role in our risk profile. In particular, a price on carbon in the United States and changing customer/consumer demands asking for more sustainable ingredient solutions, particularly observed in the US, Canada and Europe markets, will create both risk and opportunities for Cargill. Conducting the climate-related scenario analysis has enabled Cargill to understand the forces and developments that have the greatest ability to shape future performance. In 2022, Cargill's acquired Croda's Performance Technologies and Chemical's business. The acquisition will expand Cargill's bio industrial footprint and better serve industrial manufacturers searching for alternative ingredient solutions (changing customer/consumer demands), supporting Cargill's ability to shape future performance within the industry by enabling it to adapt to warming scenarios.

Water

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

Select all that apply

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

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

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

Our strategy has been influenced by scenario analysis and the future projections of water stress in that we updated the analysis for identifying priority regions. For example, in origination regions in Europe we see an increase in water stress projected for origination regions like France and Poland. As a result, we expanded the original list of priority watersheds to include broader priority regions to adapt to climate change and empower teams to build strategies focused on building water resiliency and climate adaptation. This has materialized in the expansion of regenerative agriculture programs that build water resilience through improved soil health and increased water-holding capacity, for example in Europe. We currently focus on these priority regions to deliver a water positive impact by 2030.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

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

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

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

While we do not have a formal transition plan that aligns with a 1.5-degree world, we are making decisions with a changing climate landscape in mind. In the meantime, we remain focused on building the necessary internal infrastructure to drive progress against our existing climate commitments (SBTi approved science-based targets aligned to 2-degrees, our targets were established and approved by SBTi prior to IPCC's 1.5-degree report). We are diversifying our product portfolio, including growing our bio-industrial business, investing in decarbonizing the maritime industry, and expanding our biofuels business. We are accelerating actions and progress towards our existing science-based targets to reduce our carbon footprint in our operations and across our supply chains. We are also working beyond our value chain: for example, we are working to help advance the industry's progression of standardized metrics for land-related emissions. Cargill has advised on the development of both SBTi's Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) protocol and the GHG Protocol Land Sector & Removals Guidance. For the latter, Cargill participated as an Advisory Committee Member for two years, including as a pilot test company to provide feedback on the draft protocol. Once the final guidance is published early next year (2025), we will work to incorporate land-related emissions in our Scope 3 footprint. In the past few years, Cargill has invested in programmes and initiatives to build a more resilient and sustainable food system. For example, as part of our BeefUp SustainabilityTM initiative, this year Cargill formed a partnership with Nestlé and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) to advance voluntary conservation practices that combat climate change. With a combined investment of 15 million, this program represents one of the largest corporate commitments to regenerative ranching in the United States.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Cargill considers climate change in product development impact reduction & we innovate to develop products that help reduce environmental impacts. We are seeing risks and opportunities (primarily transition-related) today and expect those to increase. We are assessing physical and transition risk through 2050, under low- and high-warming scenarios. Cargill established a dedicated team to focus on developing nature-based solutions to reduce emissions from our own operations and our shared supply chains with customers. Being in the business of agriculture, we work to ensure that our key sustainability priorities of climate, land & water and people are considered during the agricultural process. Our position in the global food system provides the opportunity & responsibility to work at the intersection of sustainability, food security and nutrition to find practical and scalable solutions for our customers. We consider this impact to be long-term given its ongoing influence on business. Cargill supports the production and use of bio-based products that provide performance and sustainability benefits compared to non-renewable alternatives. The Bioindustrial business group grew in 2022 with the acquisition of Croda reflecting our current and future investment to innovate products and services that address environmental impacts, including emissions reduction. In 2022 Cargill completed construction at its first state-of-the-art advanced biodiesel plant in Ghent, Belgium which converts waste oils and residues into renewable fuel. The advanced biodiesel produced at the facility will be used by the maritime and trucking sectors, enabling customers to lower the carbon footprint associated with transport activities. Cargill provides a suite of decarbonization solutions, including feedstocks for lower-carbon fuels to help customers reduce and remove carbon emissions from their supply chains. That's why Cargill is working with farmers at every level of production, empowering them with the agronomic training, risk management and financial support they need to adopt regenerative agriculture practices that helps them produce food the world depends on while building a more sustainable system. We are also partnering with customers to provide a range of feedstocks for biomass-based diesel, renewable diesel and waste-based solutions.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Cargill recognizes the necessity of reducing emissions and building resilience in our supply chain, so we have adopted a Scope 3 target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in our global supply chains by 30% per ton of product by 2030. We are making progress toward meeting this goal by working with customers and farmers on projects like improving soil health and reducing emissions across our North American beef supply chain. We consider this impact to be long-term given its ongoing influence on the business. Most substantial business decisions to date: Cargill is building on the efficiency of the North American beef industry, which is already 35% more efficient per kg of protein from a GHG perspective than the global average, by establishing programs around grazing management, feed production and food waste reduction (source: The Carbon Footprint of U.S. Beef Compared to Global Beef Oklahoma State University (okstate.edu)). The BeefUp Sustainability initiative aims to achieve a 30% GHG reduction per pound of product produced by 2030. Through the Ranch Systems & Viability Planning Network, Cargill is joining the World Wildlife Fund, the Walmart Foundation and McDonald's to connect and support ranchers with technical expertise, training and tools to help advance grazing practices that improve the health of the land. In 2021, Cargill launched Cargill RegenConnect, a regenerative agriculture program that pays farmers for positive environmental outcomes driven by adoption of regenerative agriculture practices, including of reduced- or no-till and planting of cover crops. This program was expanded to Europe in 2023. Additionally, to help row-crop farmers implement practices with positive environmental benefits, Cargill supported the Iowa Soybean Association and Quantified Ventures to establish/develop the Soil & Water Outcomes Fund (SWOF). The carbon insets generated through SWOF in the state of Iowa are purchased by Cargill. Farmers receive 25-40 an acre for adopting practices like planting cover crops, reducing tillage and optimizing nutrient management. In 2023, Cargill supported the continuation and expansion of 83,933 acres of Iowa farmland in the SWOF program and sequestered almost 69,000 metric tons of CO2e. We aim to scale this up significantly and seek opportunities to bring this type of program to other parts of the world.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Cargill's strategy is underpinned by the role of technology, digitalization and R&D to evolve the food and agricultural industries and change the way we feed the world's growing population while also protecting the planet. Our position within the global food system provides both the opportunity and the responsibility to work at the intersection of sustainability, food security and nutrition to find practical and scalable solutions, which requires continual investment in R&D. Our global research and development team includes more than 1,500 research, development, applications, technical services and intellectual property specialists working in more than 200 locations. Together, they provide a spectrum of services encompassing technical service, applications, development, research, intellectual asset management, and scientific and regulatory affairs. We consider this impact to be long-term given its ongoing influence on the business. Examples include EverSweet and SilvAir: EverSweet is the stevia sweetener offered by Cargill with up to 100% sugar replacement. Our initial evaluation shows that producing our sweetener via fermentation will use significantly less land and emit significantly less CO2 than producing it by growing acres of plants. An internal lifecycle analysis (LCA) study highlights improved environmental performance in key metrics such as carbon footprint, water use and land use impact for EverSweet compared to production from leaf or bioconversion, or traditional sugar. SilvAir is Cargill's nutritional solution to lower enteric methane production by up to 10%, while maintaining cattle performance. When added to animal feed, it stimulates a natural process in the rumen, creating ammonia from hydrogen that would otherwise become methane. For dairy cows, the ammonia can be used to create milk protein, and for beef cattle, it can create more protein for growth.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Cargill has committed to reduce absolute Scope 1 & 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in our operations by 10% by 2025, against a 2017 baseline. Cargill's target is validated by the Science-Based Targets initiative (SBTi) aligned with a 2-degrees Celsius pathway and encompasses our Scope 1 and 2 emissions. This translates to a reduction of about 1.25 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e) annually as our business continues to grow (amount not adjusted for future

changes to the baseline related to mergers, divestitures and acquisitions). To achieve this target, we focused on operating more efficiently, pursuing emissions-reducing technology, and investing in renewable energy to power our operations. We consider this impact to be long-term given its ongoing influence on the business. Most substantial business decisions to date: Using over 15 different renewable energy sources around the world – including wind power– Cargill is reducing its operational emissions. That includes both renewable thermal fuels that reduce emissions coming directly from Cargill operations, and renewable power purchases that reduce emissions from the electricity Cargill purchases from the grid. For example, we are projected to spend over 200 million through to 2024 on capital projects for energy efficiency and GHG emissions reduction alone – a figure that does not include contractual agreements with suppliers. We entered into an agreement with the local Indonesian utility to purchase renewable electricity from a geothermal power plant for 7 of our facilities in the country. For CY22, this will reduce GHG emissions by 55,000 MT CO2e. Cargill is also implementing ISO50001 energy management standards at our largest facilities; 15 sites are certified and realized significant savings as a result. We are aiming for global coverage of our highest energy consuming sites in the coming years. Cargill has also implemented a process to review the GHG impacts of organic growth projects as part of the due diligence process. Depending on the amount of GHG emission increases associated with a project, additional mitigation plans must be identified and proposed as part of the approval process.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Cargill's strategy is directly linked to its purpose of nourishing our world in a safe, responsible and sustainable manner. We are committed to transforming our agricultural supply chains to be deforestation-free by 2030, through prioritized supply chain policies and time-bound action plans. An example of these action plans is the Palm Oil Roadmap (initially launched in 2014, but revised in 2020), which includes specific targets for traceability (100% Traceability to Plantation by 2025) and verification of deforestation free volumes (100% verified by 2030). Cargill's overall commitment is to sourced 100% DF Palm globally by 2025. We also updated our Human Rights Policy in 2023, protecting workers and indigenous people. Asset siting, location, size, and feeder area are assessed based-on land use impact and risk and incorporated into our strategy for long-term objectives.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Our global water ambition is to enable a water positive impact across our operations, supply chains and communities by 2030, with context-based targets addressing water availability, quality, and access. Our supply chain targets are to enable the restoration of 600 billion liters of water and the reduction of 5,000 metric tons of pollutants in water-stressed regions by 2030. We continue to build on our role as connector in the value chain and deliver holistic solutions that positively impact communities and the planet. This materializes in the need to deliver a positive water impact, reduce our footprint and adapt to planetary limits. We analyzed water stress projections up to 2040 to prioritize high-impact actions. Our network of sustainability practitioners is engaged globally, regionally, and locally. Local working groups integrate sustainability strategies with programs such as our North American 10 million acres regenerative agriculture goal and our BeefUp Sustainability initiative, which reduce run-off and improve water resiliency.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Capital allocation

(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

Capital Expenditures & Capital Allocation: Climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced our capital allocation and expenditures; Cargill utilizes a voluntary 40/mtCO2e shadow price of carbon when evaluating new capital expenditures. The internal shadow price of carbon is a mechanism for Cargill to assess the GHG impacts associated with a new capital expenditure in our operations and drive low-carbon and energy efficiency investments. The internal shadow price of carbon supports evaluation of these potential and planned initiatives. Over this same time period, we are projected to invest over an additional 200 million in energy efficiency capital projects. These projects are evaluated using their potential for reducing our emissions, among other metrics. These combined projects could reduce our emissions by over 2 million mtCO2e over time. In addition, we recognize that our business growth places challenges on achieving our Science Based Target (SBT). As a result, all projects over 5MM (across the company globally) are reviewed and rated based on their GHG impacts. This is a requirement in the approval process, and depending on the rating, additional steps are necessary to achieve approval. For example, a project which increases Cargill's GHG emissions by 20,000 MT CO2e or more is rated red, in which case technology alternatives must be reviewed, and a plan to mitigate the project's emissions must be included for approval so that the full impact of the project is considered in the approval process. Direct & Indirect costs: We are projected to spend over 100 million annually through 2024 toward direct and indirect operating including direct farmer payments for regenerative agriculture programs, and other administrative costs. Cargill's long-term renewable energy purchases greater than 2 years in tenure are approved by Cargill's Corporate Commodity Risk Committee (CRC). The CRC's focus is on evaluating market risk of long-term commodity transactions. Additionally, Cargill's Value Guidelines used to evaluate projects does permit a Cost Avoidance (soft savings) to be considered for avoided/reduced carbon on a project.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Assets

(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

☑ Forests

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

Cargill's strategy is directly linked to its purpose of nourishing our world in a safe, responsible and sustainable manner. We are committed to transforming our agricultural supply chains to be deforestation-free by 2030, through prioritized supply chain policies and time-bound action plans. An example of these action plans is the Palm Oil Roadmap (initially launched in 2014, but revised in 2020), which includes specific targets for traceability (100% Traceability to Plantation by 2025) and verification of deforestation free volumes (100% verified by 2030). We also updated our Human Rights Policy in 2023, protecting workers and indigenous people. Asset siting, location, size, and feeder area are assessed based-on land use impact and risk and incorporated into our strategy for long-term objectives.

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Cargill operations exposed to water stress may integrate water-related issues into financial planning to ensure appropriate funding for site operations. To assess and prioritize action and focus on where we can have the most impact, we include both current water stress as well as future water stress projections into 2040. Additionally, Cargill's strategy is underpinned by the role of technology, digitalization and R&D to evolve the food and agricultural industries and change the way we feed the world's growing population while also protecting the planet. Our global Research and Development team provides a spectrum of services encompassing technical service, applications, development, research, intellectual asset management, and scientific and regulatory affairs; these teams look in our operations into technologies that reduce the amount of evaporation and improve water efficiency in our products and consider financial objectives in related decisions. For our supply chain targets, we have developed an impact tracking system that includes both near term and 2030 outlook of forecasted positive impact. The tracking system includes financial planning and monitoring of project management.

[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: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy	*Select from:* ☑ At the organization level only

[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:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Cargill categorizes and allocates financial investments to align with our Scope 1&2 absolute and Scope 3 intensity Science Based Targets.

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**(both CAPEX & OPEX)

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

The financial metric aligned to the reporting year is an understatement of expenses. Cargill categorizes and allocates financial investments and expenditures to align with our climate goals. Cargill allocates funds annually for Virtual Purchase Power Agreements that support progress against our Scope 1&2 targets. We allocate resources to support our scope 3 targets via farmer payments through programs like Cargill RegenConnect. Since funds are allocated annually, we are not able to disclose the financial metrics planned for 2025 and 2030.
[Add row]

(5.4.3) Provide any additional contextual and/or verification/assurance information relevant to your organization's taxonomy alignment.

(5.4.3.2) Additional contextual information relevant to your taxonomy accounting

An example of how Cargill monitors and aligns with our taxonomy is our annual Capital Investment target. Cargill sets an annual capital investment target at the beginning of each fiscal year, those funds are set aside for businesses to invest in Scope 1 & 2 GHG reduction across, and does not cover renewable energy purchase like VPPAs, as those are considered OPEX.

(5.4.3.3) Indicate whether you will be providing verification/assurance information relevant to your taxonomy alignment in question 13.1

Select from:

☑ No

(5.4.3.4) Please explain why you will not be providing verification/assurance information relevant to your taxonomy alignment in question 13.1

This is not seen as a strategic priority for Cargill, however, it is something we will consider in the future if it becomes mandatory.
[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)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

Cargill has a consistent investment in water-related capital and operating expenditures each year. Most of Cargill's CAPEX & OPEX is driven by wastewater treatment and incoming water treatment. This tends to be a consistent year on year spend and what influences this is not the total volume of water treated each year, but the maximum volume that can be treated each year, and any changes in regulatory requirements for water discharge. Through the implementation of the Water Stewardship Program we continue to implement best practices. For example, three facilities near water-stressed areas of Belgium have developed and are testing innovative solutions to optimize and reduce their water use. In Antwerp, the team worked with third-party water consultant Cre@ Aqua to study process enhancements and technologies to increase the reliability of its wastewater treatment plant, resulting in reductions to the content of suspended solids in treated wastewater as well as reduced energy consumption.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Drive energy efficiency

☑ Drive low-carbon investment

☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

☑ Other, please specify :Change internal behavior

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment to scientific guidance

☑ Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme

☑ Benchmarking against peers

☑ Price/cost of voluntary carbon offset credits

☑ Other, please specify :Price is based on a weighted average of regional emissions and multiple carbon market prices from around the world (including EU ETS among others) which is then validated through benchmarking with other industrial companies

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

Cargill took three areas into consideration when setting the internal carbon price. (1) Market information – Cargill reviewed market data from existing carbon markets and analyzed market information weighted by geography comparing to Cargill's GHG footprint. (2) Corporate comparison – Cargill compared other industrial companies who have instituted an internal carbon price. (3) Effect on internal project – Cargill tested prices on internal projects to determine sensitivity and ensure the carbon price did not overwhelm project financials. Cargill's internal carbon price will be reviewed and updated annually.

(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)

40

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

40

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

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Operations

☑ Opportunity management

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

Select from:

☑ No

(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

There are a number of ways in which Cargill's shadow price has contributed to the implementation of climate commitments. As an example, it has enabled Cargill to prioritise GHG reduction activities that are going to have the most significant impact on reaching our reduction targets, in addition to providing guidance on what constitutes a "good" GHG reduction target and enabling the origination of renewable energy source when requiring a premium.
[Add row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

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

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Plastics

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

☑ Forests

☑ Water

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Cargill are focusing on engaging with suppliers, smallholders and customers on environmental issues. In the future, Cargill will start to ensure more frequently with investors, shareholders, and others in the value chain on environmental issues.
[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:

☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

Forests

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

Select from:

☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Dependence on water

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Our supply chain consists of thousands of individual farmers and many different cooperatives, as well as 3rd party suppliers of commodities. We have defined substantive impact on water security based on baseline water depletion greater than 25% and our water footprint in the watershed and ability to drive change based on the share of the total agricultural commodities produced in the region.

(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

5800

Plastics

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

Select from:

☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

[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

☑ Product safety and compliance

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Cargill prioritizes engagement on climate-related issues with suppliers based on their alignment with regulatory and product safety compliance, as well as their strategic connection to Cargill's operations.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Product safety and compliance

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Cargill prioritizes engagement on forest-related issues with suppliers providing our forest-risk commodities. These include Palm Oil, Soy and Cocoa. Product and regulatory compliance is an essential criteria for forest-risk commodities because we engage with Palm suppliers if their product does not comply with our Policy on Sustainable Palm Oil and we support Soy suppliers with Forest Code compliance. Working together with trusted advisors and local stakeholders, we developed our Policy on Sustainable Soy – South American Origins, which captures our commitment to a transparent and sustainable South American soy supply chain. We commit to: - Transform our supply chain to be deforestation free while protecting native vegetation. - Promote responsible production, which benefits farmers and surrounding communities. - Respect and uphold the rights of workers, indigenous peoples and communities. - Uphold high standards of transparency through reporting of key metrics, progress, and grievances. This policy and commitment are in line with our Human Rights Commitment. We treat people with dignity and respect, provide equitable, safe and supportive workplaces, take action to promote human rights in our supply chains and expect our suppliers to do the same, as described in our Supplier Code of Conduct.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Leverage over suppliers

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Cargill has identified priority regions for our agricultural supply chain. In these regions we engage directly with growers for the development of programs and solutions that enable a water positive impact. For example, our Cargill RegenConnect program supports farmers in scaling regenerative agriculture practices started in key states within the Mississippi river basin and include practices that help build resilience, increase water holding capacity and reduce run-off of pollutants to receiving water bodies.

Plastics

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Cargill are in the process of formalising a process to prioritize engagement with suppliers on plastics.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Cargill does not require suppliers to meet specific environmental requirements.

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Policy on Sustainable Palm Oil outlines our approach to compliance monitoring including for existing, potential, and non-compliant suppliers. If, during our monitoring process, deforestation grievances are identified and validated, we immediately suspend suppliers (outlined in Palm Grievance Procedure) and work with them to define an action plan with clear timelines/milestones. For Soy, Cargill is a signatory to the Amazon Soy Moratorium to verify that we do not market or finance soy produced in areas deforested in the Amazon Biome after July 22, 2008. We also don't buy soy from suppliers listed as engaging in illegal deforestation (IBAMA's list, LDI-PA, SEMA-MT list, ICMBio list) or slave labor (Ministry of Employment list), and our automated system consults lists managed by various agencies and organizations: if a farming operation appears on one of these lists, it is blocked and cannot sell soy to us. For cocoa, we monitor non-compliance by prioritizing areas high in deforestation risk to get more granular data from suppliers, and we have risk mapping in place for other chocolate ingredients, on which we base additional actions.

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Water-related requirements are addressed in the Supplier Code of Conduct. Cargill stakeholders can access the Ethics Open Line on www.Cargill.com to raise concerns, including any concerns about complying with the water-related requirements.
[Fixed row]

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

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☑ Ground-based monitoring system

(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%

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

Select from:
☑ Exclude

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Our Policy on Sustainable Palm Oil outlines our approach to compliance monitoring including for existing, potential, and non-compliant suppliers. If, during our monitoring process, deforestation grievances are identified and validated, we immediately suspend suppliers (outlined in Palm Grievance Procedure) and work with them to define an action plan with clear timelines/milestones. For Soy, Cargill is a signatory to the Amazon Soy Moratorium to verify that we do not market or finance soy produced in areas deforested in the Amazon Biome after July 22, 2008. We also don't buy soy from suppliers listed as engaging in illegal deforestation (IBAMA's list, LDI-PA, SEMA-MT list, ICMBio list) or slave labor (Ministry of Employment list), and our automated system consults lists managed by various agencies and organizations: if a farming operation appears on one of these lists, it is blocked and cannot sell soy to us. For cocoa, we monitor non-compliance by prioritizing areas high in deforestation risk to get more granular data from suppliers, and we have risk mapping in place for other chocolate ingredients, on which we base additional actions.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Geospatial monitoring tool
☑ Ground-based monitoring system

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

We engage with our tier 1 suppliers (farmers) to advance regenerative agriculture practices. The monitor the changes in practices and the associated changes in soil characteristics as part of the engagement. We require suppliers enrolled in the program to share information about the farm management system that supports the quantification of the water positive impact.
[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

Financial incentives

☑ Provide financial incentives for environmental performance

(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%

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

Cargill partners with suppliers around the globe on climate-related initiatives. Cargill is ideally positioned to leverage its connectivity and partnerships to help producers implement regenerative agriculture practices that improve soil health—boosting farm productivity and the overall economic resiliency of the farm. Cargill is supporting farmer-led efforts to adopt practices and systems foundational to regenerative agriculture practices across 10 million acres of North American farmland through 2030. Cargill will work with partners and other stakeholders across the supply chain to provide farmers access to technical and agronomic resources that support yield and profit objectives, training opportunities, support with data collection for benchmarking and visibility to the needs of downstream consumer facing companies. Understanding the financial pressures farmers are facing, Cargill will help connect farmers to cost-sharing options and support the development of new market-based solutions to incentivize outcomes that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve and protect water quality, like the Soil and Water Outcomes Fund, of which Cargill is a founding partner. Cargill supported the Iowa Soybean Association and Quantified Ventures to establish/develop the Soil & Water Outcomes Fund (SWOF). Farmers (Tier 1 direct suppliers) were selected for inclusion in the SWOF based on geographic location, farm parameters, and willingness to participate in the program. SWOF is currently engaging farmers across multiple states; Cargill supported SWOF by purchasing carbon insets that are generated in the state of Iowa. Specifically, insets from 83,932 acres of Iowa farmland that sequestered 62,575 metric tons of CO2e. The intent is to scale the SWOF to additional states and regions to realize even greater positive environmental impacts and farmer benefits and drive progress towards our goals. Cargill continues to invest in emerging markets that help to decarbonize food, agriculture, and other sectors. We are providing more farmers with access to environmental markets through the expansion of Cargill RegenConnect, which connects farmers to the growing environmental marketplace by paying them for improved soil health and positive environmental outcomes. In 2023, we expanded the program in the United States from 15 to 24 states, providing farmers with payments per metric ton of carbon sequestered per acre.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Palm oil

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

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

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

Information collection

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

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

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

Issues related to deforestation and social exploitation often are not limited to a single supplier or sector, so we collaborate through landscape-level initiatives and platforms, such as the Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA), to address challenges that span physical and political boundaries and involve multiple commodities. Cargill works through our direct suppliers to engage our indirect suppliers, providing them the training and tools they need to motivate improvements within their own

suppliers while maintaining processes. We have also been actively involved in developing the 'No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation' (NDPE) Implementation Reporting Framework (IRF) together with stakeholders, a standard approach for monitoring a reporting progress on our NDPE commitments; the IRF creates better visibility on performance within our indirect supply chain to enable us to engage for improvement and communicate progress. Cargill supports landscape level projects to address issues achieving sustainable supply sheds on a broader scale. For example, in the Siak and Pelalawan districts of Indonesia, a coalition formed by Cargill and eight other companies working together with CORE (Daemeter and Proforest) continue implementation of activities to advance the Siak and Pelalawan Landscape Programme. To address environmental and social risks associated with districts' mills, SPLP has consolidated an aggregated IRF profile for over 50 mills engaged in palm oil production. This profile is instrumental in guiding these mills towards NDPE production standards.

(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 **:**NDPE Policy

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

Financial incentives

☑ Provide financial incentives to encourage progress against water pollution targets

☑ Provide financial incentives for environmental performance

Information collection

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

We incentivize farmers to improve soil health as part of our RegenConnect program. The impact of the engagement is measured through the volume restored in water stressed regions, in accordance with Volumetric Water Benefit Accounting, water capture method. We are providing more farmers with access to environmental markets through the expansion of Cargill RegenConnect. Our measure of success is to increase the number of farmers involved in the programme each year, increasing the number of acres covered by the programme. Another measure of success is to have positive environmental outcomes. In 2023, we expanded the program in the United States from 15 to 24 states, providing farmers with payments per metric ton of carbon sequestered per acre, and there are 860,000 acres enrolled in regenerative agriculture activities. The program now covers more commodities, including cotton, and provides improved ease and access to enrollment via mobile devices. We also announced the expansion of Cargill RegenConnect in Europe for eligible farmers in Germany, Poland, Romania, and France – building on two years of success in North America. Cargill will offer market-competitive pricing based on each metric ton of carbon sequestered per hectare for primary crops in Cargill's supply chains, including rapeseed, wheat, corn, barley, and sunflower. In recognition of its innovative approach to creating a more resilient and secure food system, Cargill RegenConnect received a prestigious 2023 Edison Award.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Soy

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Cargill is a member of the Soft Commodities Forum (SCF), housed within the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), which ambition is to eliminate soy driven deforestation from the Cerrado biome through three pillars: traceability of supply chain, engagement of supply chain partners in shared solutions, and positive transformation of landscapes in partnership with producers. The SCF has developed a landscapes strategy known as Farmer First Clusters. Launched in late 2022, the Farmer First Clusters focuses on the four states of Brazil's Matopiba region, employing a tailored, smart mix of solutions in different landscapes to address deforestation and conversion and encourage alternative mechanisms for conservation. This includes clusters related to restoring native vegetation; compensation for surplus legal reserve; integrated farming of livestock, crops and forests; incentives for expanding soy in existing pastureland; and technical assistance and extension services for sustainable production and compliance with the Forest Code. The Farmer First Clusters has defined key progress indicators and is signing up implementation partners. Cargill has committed to investing 1.35 million over three years to the initiative, as part of our far-reaching efforts to ensure that farmers have viable economic alternatives to land conversion.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Cocoa

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

Financial incentives

☑ Provide financial incentives for certified products

☑ Provide financial incentives for environmental performance

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

The Cargill Cocoa Promise is one of our key sustainability programs which aims at improving the lives of cocoa farmers and their communities. Our ambition is to accelerate progress towards a transparent global cocoa supply chain, to enable cocoa farmers and their communities to achieve better incomes and living standards, and to deliver a sustainable supply of cocoa and chocolate products - from tree crop to end-product. We will achieve this by leveraging our global reach and experience, and by working together with our vast network of partner organizations and stakeholders. We also work to empower farmers to become true

entrepreneurs who manage their farms as businesses, contributing to their prosperity, through a holistic approach that goes beyond productivity to diversify farmers' incomes and strengthen their resilience. We continue to work with partners on a multitude of agroforestry/reforestation initiatives at the landscape and community levels. We expanded our holistic agroforestry programs with PUR, IMPACTUM, FOA S.A.R.L. and Agromap to support on-farm restoration and forest protection in the buffer zones of important conservation areas by raising awareness, promoting agricultural best practices and engaging communities. In 2023, we developed 28,617 hectares of new agroforestry system by distributing 1,376,122 trees and engaged 16,584 farmers. In addition, we implement our farmer coaching model, where we coach farmers to increase Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) adoption based on annual farm assessments for each plot. The coaching also integrates Cocoa Action criteria to measure GAP adoption rates and promotes the optimal sequencing of inputs, which guides efficient use and stimulates productivity. During the 2022 / 2023 crop year, 128,704 farmers received technical assistance to professionalize and optimize cocoa farming practices in West Africa. One of the examples of collaborative work where Cargill is involved in is the Dassioko project. In April 2022, Cargill and the Ivorian Ministry of Water and Forests (MINEF) signed a memorandum of understanding, agreeing to conserve and restore the classified Dassioko forest. This 12,540-hectare area, in the Gboklè region, holds some of the last remaining tracts of high-conservation-value coastal rainforest in the country.

(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 **:**Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)

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

Select from:

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

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

(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

Shifting from surface irrigation to drip irrigation can result in a reduction of water withdrawal of 30-50%. Enabling this technology for farmers allows them to become less dependent on scarce water resources. The measure of success is measured through progress towards our supply chain water targets. Cargill have a quantitative measure of success to restore 600 billion liters of water and restore 5000 MT of pollutants in water-stressed regions by 2030. In the reporting year, Cargill has restored 92 million litres of water so far. The impact of the engagement will be tracked by monitoring the water withdrawal of the farmers engaged in the program.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Palm oil

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building

☑ Organize capacity building events

Financial incentives

☑ Provide financial support to smallholders to invest in precise fertilization techniques, sustainable agricultural practices and nutrient management

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

36817

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Main strategy of engagement: In accordance with "No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation" (NDPE) practices, Cargill commits to a supply chain that enables smallholders to become successful businesspeople, improving their livelihoods through responsible production, maximizing yields, and improving quality as detailed in our Policy on Sustainable Palm Oil. Cargill works directly with smallholders in communities around our plantations to help them achieve and maintain RSPO certification and NDPE compliance and improve their livelihoods. We do this through awareness raising, capacity building and certification. We work strategically with select mills in our supply chain to help them deliver on their smallholder transformation plans and participate in programs focused on building smallholder capacity and promoting responsible farm development. Cargill's goal is for 60,000 farmers to be supported through services and partnerships by 2030. In 2023 Cargill supported 36,817 farmers. In 2020, Cargill, Nestlé and PepsiCo together with facilitation by Proforest convened the Production and Protection Beyond Concessions (PPBC) Working Group, including 13 companies and 13 technical support organizations working to design and implement new approaches for addressing deforestation and supporting rural livelihoods in Indonesia and Malaysia. We continued our active role in the PPBC by participating in pilots of the PPBC protocol in the Siak/Pelalawan and Sungai Linau landscape programs. Cargill continues to be the co-convenor of the PPBC Working Group.

Row 2

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Soy

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building

☑ Disseminate technical materials

☑ Offer on-site technical assistance and extension services

☑ Organize capacity building events

Financial incentives

☑ Pay higher prices linked to best agricultural practices

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

2232

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Main strategy of engagement: Cargill actively works to help smallholder soy farmers find commercial success. Since 2011, Cargill's family farming program, in partnership with the Instituto Biosistêmico (IBS), has been training and assisting, free of charge, smallholders in the production of soy for the production of biodiesel with the objective of promoting the sustainable development of crops. The program benefited approximately 2,232 farmers in the 2022/2023 harvest. The technical visits correspond to the planning of planting, flowering, graining and harvesting, with the issuance of reports attesting the conditions of the crop in each period and technical guidelines. The steps include soil correction, erosion control, no-tillage, crop rotation, proper use of fertilizers and proper management. In addition, smallholders receive a bonus added to the value of soy, which varies according to the state.

Row 3

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Cocoa

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building

☑ Organize capacity building events

☑ Prioritize support for smallholders in regions at high-risk of deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems

☑ Support smallholders to clarify and secure land tenure rights

Financial incentives

☑ Pay higher prices linked to best agricultural practices

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

222000

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

The Cargill Cocoa Promise is one of our key sustainability programs which aims at improving the lives of cocoa farmers and their communities. Our ambition is to accelerate progress towards a transparent global cocoa supply chain, to enable cocoa farmers and their communities to achieve better incomes and living standards, and to deliver a sustainable supply of cocoa and chocolate products - from tree crop to end-product. We will achieve this by leveraging our global reach and experience, and by working together with our vast network of partner organizations and stakeholders. We also work to empower farmers to become true entrepreneurs who manage their farms as businesses, contributing to their prosperity, through a holistic approach that goes beyond productivity to diversify farmers' incomes and strengthen their resilience. We continue to work with partners on a multitude of agroforestry/reforestation initiatives at the landscape and community levels. We expanded our holistic agroforestry programs with PUR, IMPACTUM, FOA S.A.R.L. and Agromap to support on-farm restoration and forest protection in the buffer zones of important conservation areas by raising awareness, promoting agricultural best practices and engaging communities. We promoted cocoa agroforestry practices to more than 17,500 farmers across Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire and distributed more than 1.4 million multi-purpose trees for on-farm planting. In 2023 we developed 28617 hectares of new agroforestry system by distributing 1376122 trees and engaged 16584 new farmers. In addition we implement our farmer coaching model where we coach farmers to increase Good Agricultural Practices GAP adoption based on annual farm assessments for each plot The coaching also integrates Cocoa Action criteria to measure GAP adoption rates and promotes the optimal sequencing of inputs which guides efficient use and stimulates productivity During the 2022 2023 crop year 128704 farmers received technical assistance to professionalize and optimize cocoa farming practices in West Africa.
[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

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Rationale and scope of engagement: Cargill collaborates with multiple customers to reduce emissions from across the agricultural supply chain, including on-farm interventions for regenerative agricultural practices that result in enhanced soil health and carbon drawdown, as well as reduced emissions through animal feed or transportation. We also develop innovations that allow customers to reduce emissions from their own operations and/or supply chains. Cargill engages with numerous customers on climate-related activities globally. Programs are selected based on proximity to Cargill supply sheds, scale of opportunity, potential for scalability, and value to the farmer/rancher. Customer collaborators are selected by shared strategic objectives and focus on a given geography. Cargill works with customers who have aligned goals and who are looking to invest in regenerative agriculture programs associated with the physical products they purchase from Cargill. Our programs are designed to provide financial incentives to farmers to adopt regenerative agriculture practices, such as no-till, reduced tillage, and cover crops. We quantify outcomes from these projects, which can be shared with our customers in our supply chain who are interested in meeting their environmental sustainability goals, including Scope 3 and regenerative agriculture goals.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Measures of success: The measure of successes for specific projects varies depending on the project goal and design and may include # of acres enrolled or metric tonnes of CO2e sequestered and/or avoided. The projects help Cargill achieve our goal to regenerate 10 million acres in North America. Our overall measure of success for customer engagement is to continually increase and innovate this engagement to promote ongoing environmental impact mitigation and conservation. Impact of engagement according to measures of success: Cargill seeks to provide customers with more sustainable solutions that reduce carbon emissions or sequester carbon in the soil. As one example, Cargill is working together with two customers to drive adoption of cover crops and no-till in animal feed production in Nebraska. Over its lifetime, the project aims to enroll 100,000 acres in regenerative practices and reduce or sequester 50,000 metric tons of CO2e.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Investors and lenders buy Cargill bonds or provide capital to Cargill and companies have their own unique ESG requirements for customers. Our engagement with them on these topics ensure that we are meeting those requirements or have a plan to meet them in order to continue doing business with Cargill.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We've been able to provide this stakeholder group a level of engagement that meets their needs and requirements. As a result, we have not had any institutions discontinue business with Cargill.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Rationale and scope of engagement: Cargill collaborates with multiple farmers and customers to reduce emissions from across the agricultural supply chain, including on-farm interventions for regenerative agricultural practices that result in enhanced soil health and carbon drawdown, as well as reduced emissions through animal feed or transportation. We also develop innovations that allow customers to reduce water pollutants from their own operations and/or supply chains. Cargill engages with numerous farmers and customers on climate-related activities globally. Programs are selected based on proximity to Cargill supply sheds, scale of opportunity, potential for scalability, and value to the farmer/rancher. Customer collaborators are selected by shared strategic objectives and focus on a given geography. Cargill works with customers who have aligned goals and who are looking to invest in regenerative agriculture programs associated with the physical products they purchase from Cargill. Our programs are designed to provide financial incentives to farmers to adopt regenerative agriculture practices, such as no-till, reduced tillage, and cover crops. We quantify outcomes from these projects, which can be shared with our customers in our supply chain who are interested in meeting their environmental sustainability goals, including Water, climate Scope 3 and regenerative agriculture goals. We continue developing and introducing to the market sustainable solutions to accelerate Regenerative Agriculture practices such as planting cover crops, reducing tillage, rotational grazing, and optimizing nutrient management. In 2023, Cargill had advanced regenerative agriculture practices on 880,000 acres of North American farmland since 2020.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Measures of success: The measure of successes for specific projects varies depending on the project goal and design and may include number of acres enrolled or or water benefits achieved. The projects help Cargill advance regenerative agriculture practices across 10 million acres of North American agricultural land by 2030,

and enable restoration of water and reduction of pollutants to water. Our overall measure of success for customer engagement is to continually increase and innovate this engagement to promote ongoing environmental impact mitigation and conservation. Impact of engagement according to measures of success: Cargill seeks to provide customers with more sustainable solutions that help improve watershed health and enable water positive impact.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Investors and lenders buy Cargill bonds or provide capital to Cargill and companies have their own unique ESG requirements for customers. Our engagement with them on these topics ensure that we are meeting those requirements or have a plan to meet them in order to continue doing business with Cargill.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We've been able to provide this stakeholder group a level of engagement that meets their needs and requirements. As a result, we have not had any institutions discontinue business with Cargill.

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

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Investors and lenders buy Cargill bonds or provide capital to Cargill and companies have their own unique ESG requirements for customers. Our engagement with them on these topics ensure that we are meeting those requirements or have a plan to meet them in order to continue doing business with Cargill.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We've been able to provide this stakeholder group a level of engagement that meets their needs and requirements. As a result, we have not had any institutions discontinue business with Cargill.
[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

The Company has selected the operational control approach to account for and report consolidated GHG emissions. These emissions are on an absolute basis and does not include any removals or offsets. Cargill defines operational control as having the ability to directly control operations of facilities or assets, control how the facility or asset is run, and make decisions for how capital is allocated in the facility. This designation includes leased facilities or assets. Cargill evaluates new and existing joint ventures (JVs) for operational control. Any JVs meeting Cargill's operational control standard will be included in the organizational boundary. Joint ventures are assessed for operational control quarterly and assessed semi-annually to determine that the operation is still in service (open/closed). JVs under operational control for the reporting period are all considered in Scope 1 and 2 inventory. Cargill reports 100% of operations in which the Company or one of its subsidiaries exercises operational control. This approach is applied consistently across the inventory at all levels of the organization.

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

The Company has selected the operational control approach to account for and report consolidated GHG emissions. These emissions are on an absolute basis and does not include any removals or offsets. Cargill defines operational control as having the ability to directly control operations of facilities or assets, control how the facility or asset is run, and make decisions for how capital is allocated in the facility. This designation includes leased facilities or assets. Cargill evaluates new and existing joint ventures (JVs) for operational control. Any JVs meeting Cargill's operational control standard will be included in the organizational boundary. Joint

ventures are assessed for operational control quarterly and assessed semi-annually to determine that the operation is still in service (open/closed). JVs under operational control for the reporting period are all considered in Scope 1 and 2 inventory. Cargill reports 100% of operations in which the Company or one of its subsidiaries exercises operational control. This approach is applied consistently across the inventory at all levels of the organization.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

The Company has selected the operational control approach to account for and report consolidated GHG emissions. These emissions are on an absolute basis and does not include any removals or offsets. Cargill defines operational control as having the ability to directly control operations of facilities or assets, control how the facility or asset is run, and make decisions for how capital is allocated in the facility. This designation includes leased facilities or assets. Cargill evaluates new and existing joint ventures (JVs) for operational control. Any JVs meeting Cargill's operational control standard will be included in the organizational boundary. Joint ventures are assessed for operational control quarterly and assessed semi-annually to determine that the operation is still in service (open/closed). JVs under operational control for the reporting period are all considered in Scope 1 and 2 inventory. Cargill reports 100% of operations in which the Company or one of its subsidiaries exercises operational control. This approach is applied consistently across the inventory at all levels of the organization.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

The Company has selected the operational control approach to account for and report consolidated GHG emissions. These emissions are on an absolute basis and does not include any removals or offsets. Cargill defines operational control as having the ability to directly control operations of facilities or assets, control how the facility or asset is run, and make decisions for how capital is allocated in the facility. This designation includes leased facilities or assets. Cargill evaluates new and existing joint ventures (JVs) for operational control. Any JVs meeting Cargill's operational control standard will be included in the organizational boundary. Joint ventures are assessed for operational control quarterly and assessed semi-annually to determine that the operation is still in service (open/closed). JVs under operational control for the reporting period are all considered in Scope 1 and 2 inventory. Cargill reports 100% of operations in which the Company or one of its subsidiaries exercises operational control. This approach is applied consistently across the inventory at all levels of the organization.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

The Company has selected the operational control approach to account for and report consolidated GHG emissions. These emissions are on an absolute basis and does not include any removals or offsets. Cargill defines operational control as having the ability to directly control operations of facilities or assets, control how the facility or asset is run, and make decisions for how capital is allocated in the facility. This designation includes leased facilities or assets. Cargill evaluates new and existing joint ventures (JVs) for operational control. Any JVs meeting Cargill's operational control standard will be included in the organizational boundary. Joint ventures are assessed for operational control quarterly and assessed semi-annually to determine that the operation is still in service (open/closed). JVs under operational control for the reporting period are all considered in Scope 1 and 2 inventory. Cargill reports 100% of operations in which the Company or one of its subsidiaries exercises operational control. This approach is applied consistently across the inventory at all levels of the organization.
[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
☑ Yes, a merger

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

In 2023, Cargill completed acquisitions, divestitures, and mergers due to the nature of our portfolio of businesses.

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

In line with Cargill's long-term strategy, the portfolio of Cargill's business is constantly changing. Due to the nature of these activities this level of detail is considered confidential.
[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 boundary

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

The base year emissions are recalculated annually due to the Merger, Acquisition, and Divesture activity that happens each year. Many of these are minor changes compared to the total emissions and reporting boundary from the previous year and with a mix of acquisitions and divestitures it is not easy to determine if there has been a change to the boundary, as a result we recalculate the base year emissions annually.
[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

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

The base year emissions are recalculated annually due to the Merger, Acquisition, and Divesture activity that happens each year. Many of these are minor changes compared to the total emissions and reporting boundary from the previous year and with a mix of acquisitions and divestitures it is not easy to determine if there has been a change to the boundary, as a result we recalculate the base year emissions annually. Cargill does not have a defined threshold to determine if a base year needs to be recalculated.

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

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

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

[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

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7289057

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The calculation process for all emissions is based on multiplying activity data by a designated emissions factor sourced from various external organizations (governmental, non-governmental). Emissions from constituent GHGs (CO2, CH4, N2O, etc.) are combined into the aggregate unit of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). Activity data is sourced directly from internal primary data collected within our operations.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4578806

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The calculation process for all emissions is based on multiplying activity data by a designated emissions factor sourced from various external organizations (governmental, non-governmental). Emissions from constituent GHGs (CO2, CH4, N2O, etc.) are combined into the aggregate unit of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). Activity data is sourced directly from internal primary data collected within our operations.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4765719

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The calculation process for all emissions is based on multiplying activity data by a designated emissions factor sourced from various external organizations (governmental, non-governmental). Emissions from constituent GHGs (CO2, CH4, N2O, etc.) are combined into the aggregate unit of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). Activity data is sourced directly from internal primary data collected within our operations.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

126292327

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

56101

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1525696

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10149177

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2499870

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20193

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

140587

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/30/2017

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Any significant leased facilities are included in Scope 1 and 2. Smaller leased assets (e.g., warehouses and offices) are immaterial to our overall footprint and are therefore this category is deemed not relevant due being considered de minimis.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2175839

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11701987

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7108439

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5123328

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/30/2017

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We lease out few, if any, facilities, and therefore this category is not relevant due to being considered as de minimis.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/30/2017

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Cargill does not have any franchises, and therefore this category is not relevant.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1291076

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimated our 2017 baseline based on best available data using improved methods and data sources from more recent years.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/30/2017

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This is not relevant.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

05/30/2017

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This is not relevant.
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

6394038

(7.6.3) Methodological details

The calculation process for all emissions is based on multiplying activity data by a designated emissions factor sourced from various external organizations (governmental, non-governmental). Emissions from constituent GHGs (CO2, CH4, N2O, etc.) are combined into the aggregate unit of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). Activity data is sourced directly from internal primary data collected within our operations. Scope 1 emissions sources are multiple and varied, ranging from natural gas and methane to coal, LPG and biomass

Past year 1

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

6927653

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

The calculation process for all emissions is based on multiplying activity data by a designated emissions factor sourced from various external organizations (governmental, non-governmental). Emissions from constituent GHGs (CO2, CH4, N2O, etc.) are combined into the aggregate unit of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). Activity data is sourced directly from internal primary data collected within our operations. Scope 1 emissions sources are multiple and varied, ranging from natural gas and methane to coal, LPG and biomass
[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)

3920307

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

3751339

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The calculation process for all emissions is based on multiplying activity data by a designated emissions factor sourced from various external organizations (governmental, non-governmental). Emissions from constituent GHGs (CO2, CH4, N2O, etc.) are combined into the aggregate unit of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). Activity data is sourced directly from internal primary data collected within our operations. For our operations, Scope 2 is defined as the emissions resulting from the use of purchased electricity and steam. The same activity data informs both calculation of location- and market-based quantification.

Past year 1

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

3984087

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

3778914

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The calculation process for all emissions is based on multiplying activity data by a designated emissions factor sourced from various external organizations (governmental, non-governmental). Emissions from constituent GHGs (CO2, CH4, N2O, etc.) are combined into the aggregate unit of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). Activity data is sourced directly from internal primary data collected within our operations. For our operations, Scope 2 is defined as the emissions resulting from the use of purchased electricity and steam. The same activity data informs both calculation of location- and market-based quantification.
[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)

172832979

(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

We use average emissions factors multiplied by the volume of product procured. This estimate does not include emissions from land-use change, which we know to be material. We intend to incorporate these emissions when the GHG protocol publishes accounting methodologies. This number was calculated using 12 months of sourcing data and aligns to a calendar year reporting boundary.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

93779

(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

We multiply our annual capital spend in USD by an environmentally extended input-output derived sector-specific value of kg CO2e/USD. We source emission factors from the World Input Output Database latest version (2016).

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)

1955909

(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

Category 3 includes emissions related to fuel production and energy purchased and consumed by Cargill in the reporting year not included in scope 1 or Scope 2. We used UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting (2023) and International Energy Agency (IEA, 2023) emission factors for these two emission types (CO2e/kWh). We quantify well-to-tank emission for all fuel use as reported in Scope 1. We use DEFRA's annual reported fuel-specific emissions factors for each type of fuel use (CO2e/kWh).

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

15634200

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 4 emissions are quantified for contracted bulk ocean transport, ocean container, barge, road, rail, and air transport. For bulk ocean transport, emissions are calculated in accordance with the Global Maritime Forum Sea Cargo Charter which provides a standardized guidance on calculation of GHG emissions from ocean transport. For all modes outside of ocean bulk transport, emissions are calculated using the fuel-based method and distance-based method depending on data availability. Both fuel-based and distance-based emission factors are collected from the Global Logistics Emissions Council (GLEC) Framework 2023. The GLEC Framework is a global recognized methodology to calculate logistics GHG emissions and formed the basis for ISO 14083. It remains the primary industry guideline to support implementation of ISO 14083, and is aligned with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. The fuel-based method is only applied to road transportation modes using fuel efficiency data collected directly from third-party carriers via annual questionnaires. Fuel efficiency data allows us to determine the amount of fuel consumed and then the appropriate emission factor for that fuel is applied. The diesel fuel type is assumed for all road lanes using the fuel-based method unless a carrier specifies an alternative fuel type used by their fleet. For all other modes (rail, air, barge, ocean container), where fuel efficiency data is not collected, the distance-based method is used. For the distance-based method, the mass, distance, and mode of each shipment are collected then the appropriate mass-distance emission factor for the vehicle type is applied. Transportation mode, distance, and weight data are collected internally through Cargill's enterprise resource systems.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3641064

(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

We collect data on both solid waste and wastewater from our operations globally, distributed by disposal method. We calculate GHG emissions using disposal method specific emissions factors as provided by DEFRA.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

31908

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions include both private and commercial air travel. For private jet travel, we receive a total annual fuel use for Cargill's fleet. We multiply this by a jet fuel emissions factor as published by the EPA. For commercial travel, emissions are calculated by our external travel management provider by multiplying miles flown by average per-mile emissions factors as published by DEFRA.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

199263

(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

This figure is based on Cargill's total global workforce of 160,000. We use the following calculation to quantify employee commuting emissions, considering regional transport mode distributions and average commuting distances: (number of employees) x (average commuting distance, distributed by mode) x (emissions factor per transport mode (e.g. bike, car etc). We source emissions factors from WRI's compilation of regionally specific transport emissions factors

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Any significant leased facilities are included in Scope 1 and 2. We do have smaller leased assets (e.g., warehouses and offices), but they are very small relative to our overall footprint and are therefore considered de minimis within the context of Scope 3 reporting.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

5652898

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We estimated downstream transportation emissions by estimating the volume of products transported by vehicles not owned or controlled by Cargill and estimating the transportation mode and distance. We have then applied an average emissions factor for land and ocean transportation.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

15440790

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average product method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have estimated the intermediate sold products volume by analysing our sold products volumes and assuming the percentage of sold products that require further processing. We have applied average emission factors that we sourced from LCA databases or literature reports that describe multiple downstream processing scenarios. We have estimated the volume of intermediate sold products waste at further processing, and we have included the end-of-life emissions of waste from further processing in this category. We will continue to refine our approach on quantifying emissions from processing of sold products in next year's reporting.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

11674100

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average product method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have estimated the use phase emissions by multiplying the volume of sold products with appropriate emissions factors depending on the use scenario by product. We sourced average emission factors from LCA databases or literature reports that describe multiple use case scenarios. We will continue to refine our approach on quantifying emissions from processing of sold products in next year's reporting.

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)

8886865

(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

We have calculated the total waste volume by estimating the waste volume of sold finished products and packaging at the use phase using industry average factors per type of product. We have quantified the relative emissions using waste treatment factors from LCA databases (e.g. Ecoinvent), We have applied regional factors when possible, based on data granularity and data availability, We will continue our efforts to refine this estimate for next year's reporting.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We lease out few, if any, facilities, and therefore this category is considered de minimis.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Cargill does not have any franchises, and therefore this category is not relevant.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1122506

(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

We included emissions from equity investments and business loans and unlisted equity following the GHG protocol and Partnership for Carbon Accounting Financials (PCAF) guidance. We estimated the emissions using emission factors from the environmentally extended input-output database derived sector-specific value of kg CO2e/USD. The source data for the emission factors is World Input Output Database (WIOD) 2016 Release.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

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

172706398

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

76719

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

2086409

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

13879131

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

3418605

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

28000

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

192000

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

2975488

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

16002619

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

9720883

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

7006217

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

1765563

(7.8.1.19) Comment

2022 Scope 3 emissions. Cells not completed are not relevant to Cargill's operations.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Cargill GHG Report.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Page 3

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

(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

Cargill GHG Report.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 3

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

(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: Capital goods

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

☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

(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

Cargill GHG Report.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39471

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

7

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In the case of vPPAs, Cargill applies VPPAs to the Cargill sites surrounding the source of the VPPA. Once an allocation by site is determined, VPPA MWH * - weighted average emission factor for sites in the same grid transmission region - CO2e from VPPAs. The -CO2e from VPPAs are applied against the CO2e emitted by the non-renewable electricity of the particular Cargill site. This is done site by site and aggregated in total. In 2023, Cargill acquired and applied 569,459 MWh of Renewable Energy Credits generated through VPPAs in the US. This VPPA amounts to 267,081 CO2e. The portion of change year over year driven by VPPA is 7% in terms of emissions value compared to last CY. This is derived by taking (CY23 VPPAs - CY22 VPPA)/(CY23 Total S1 S2 Market-Based Emissions - CY22 S1 S2 Market-Based Emissions) * 100. (267,081-227,610)/(10,145,377-10,706,567) * 100 7%*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

521719

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

93

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2023, Cargill implemented numerous energy efficiency and carbon reduction projects across the company during the reporting period, including low carbon installations, electrification, waste heat recovery, energy management systems and more. The change is accumulated at a site-by-site level based on primary fuel type consumption and compared to prior year's consumption at the aggregate level. In CY23, we were able to reduce our emissions by -521,719 metric tons CO2e more than last year. The change year over year driven by Other emissions reduction activity is 93% in terms of emissions value compared to last CY. This is derived by taking (CY23 Emissions Reduction Activities - CY22 Emission Reduction Activities)/(CY23 Total S1 S2 Market-Based Emissions - CY22 S1 S2 Market-Based Emissions) * 100. -521,719 / (10,145,377-10,706,567) * 100 93%*

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

Merger, Acquisition and Divesture activity happens each year, many of these are minor changes compared to the total emissions and reporting boundary from the previous year and with a mix of acquisitions and divestitures it is difficult to determine the cause of change in gross emissions as a result of these transactions. However, Cargill leverages a robust third-party SAAS solution to collect, monitor and report GHG emissions at multiple levels of the organization. Results are shared on a regular basis throughout the year, allowing our leaders to understand trends over time and make investments needed to drive increased reduction across our many sites.

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Merger, Acquisition and Divesture activity happens each year, many of these are minor changes compared to the total emissions and reporting boundary from the previous year and with a mix of acquisitions and divestitures it is difficult to determine the cause of change in gross emissions as a result of these transactions. However, Cargill leverages a robust third-party SAAS solution to collect, monitor and report GHG emissions at multiple levels of the organization. Results are shared on a regular basis throughout the year, allowing our leaders to understand trends over time and make investments needed to drive increased reduction across our many sites.

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

Merger, Acquisition and Divesture activity happens each year, many of these are minor changes compared to the total emissions and reporting boundary from the previous year and with a mix of acquisitions and divestitures it is difficult to determine the cause of change in gross emissions as a result of these transactions. However, Cargill leverages a robust third-party SAAS solution to collect, monitor and report GHG emissions at multiple levels of the organization. Results are shared on a regular basis throughout the year, allowing our leaders to understand trends over time and make investments needed to drive increased reduction across our many sites.

Change in output

(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

Cargill has a diverse mix of businesses across multiple geographies, as a result it is difficult to determine the cause of change in gross emissions as a result of change in output. However, Cargill leverages a robust third-party SAAS solution to collect, monitor and report GHG emissions at multiple levels of the organization. Results are shared on a regular basis throughout the year, allowing our leaders to understand trends over time and make investments needed to drive increased reduction across our many sites

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not applicable.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Changes in boundary as a result of merger, acquisition or divesture happens each year, many of these are minor changes compared to the total emissions and reporting boundary from the previous year and with a mix of acquisitions and divestitures it is difficult to determine the cause of change in gross emissions as a result of change in boundary. However, Cargill leverages a robust third-party SAAS solution to collect, monitor and report GHG emissions at multiple levels of the organization. Results are shared on a regular basis throughout the year, allowing our leaders to understand trends over time and make investments needed to drive increased reduction across our many sites.

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

Cargill has a diverse mix of businesses across multiple geographies, as a result it is difficult to determine the cause of change in gross emissions caused by a change in physical operating conditions. However, Cargill leverages a robust third-party SAAS solution to collect, monitor and report GHG emissions at multiple levels of the organization. Results are shared on a regular basis throughout the year, allowing our leaders to understand trends over time and make investments needed to drive increased reduction across our many sites

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not applicable.

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not applicable.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.13) 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)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify **:**Not relevant

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Cargill considers emissions associated with owned land to be de minimis compared to overall emissions from direct operations.

CO2 removals from land use management

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify **:**Not relevant

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Cargill considers emissions associated with owned land to be de minimis compared to overall emissions from direct operations.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify **:**Not relevant

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Cargill considers emissions associated with owned land to be de minimis compared to overall emissions from direct operations.

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

☑ Other, please specify **:**Not relevant

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Cargill considers emissions associated with owned land to be de minimis compared to overall emissions from direct operations.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

3859092

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Cargill utilizes low-carbon biofuels at many locations around the world. Default emission factors are used where reliable factors exist from a recognized source (e.g. US EPA and others). Cargill often relies on location-specific biomass sources (e.g. coconut shells). Due to the specificity of many of these feedstocks, standard emissions factors for some biomass types are not readily available in public literature. Thus, to quantify the CO2e emitted per unit of fuel, Cargill commissioned a study to combust such feedstocks in laboratory conditions to create bespoke emissions factors.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :Not relevant

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Not relevant.
[Fixed row]

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

Maize/corn

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

52600000

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(7.14.6) Please explain

We estimated the emissions from purchased corn and corn products by multiplying the company-wide volume of corn purchased in Calendar Year 2023, by appropriate emissions factors specific to the country of origin, if available, or region. We sourced the emission factors from LCA databases, for example, the World Food LCA database and Agri-footprint.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CO2

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

6252103

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

24102

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

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

117833

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
[Add row]

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

Algeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

262554

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

24260

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

24260

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21436

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

21557

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

21557

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

131381

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

1330

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

1234

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

61993

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

29551

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

29551

Bulgaria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Cameroon

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

234078

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

120101

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

120101

Cayman Islands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14514

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

0

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

0

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

515692

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

799927

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

799927

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31195

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

12561

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

12561

Costa Rica

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16011

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

94

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

94

Côte d'Ivoire

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10450

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

13606

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

13606

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Dominican Republic

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Ecuador

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10389

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

3151

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

3151

Egypt

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

1217

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

1217

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

120187

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

11743

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

18859

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

314580

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

66421

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

118407

Ghana

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3076

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

8879

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

8879

Guatemala

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4586

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

1600

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

1600

Honduras

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26945

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

22964

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

22968

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1288

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

1894

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

2801

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

185856

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

37405

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

37405

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

496100

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

31989

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

31989

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

133

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

426

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

727

Israel

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

144864

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

10888

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

19360

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Jordan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

438

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

438

Kenya

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Luxembourg

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39104

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

33428

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

33428

Mauritius

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

71786

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

22015

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

22015

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

290268

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

124656

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

160224

Nicaragua

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14350

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

15229

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

15229

Nigeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11464

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

1320

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

51179

Pakistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Paraguay

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17886

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

0

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

0

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

157

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

538

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

538

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5003

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

34203

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

34203

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

86909

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

118486

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

162644

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10057

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

34886

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

34886

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

503

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

905

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

818

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

109812

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

114633

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

114633

Saudi Arabia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

846

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

3092

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

3092

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

343

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

532

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

532

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

98982

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

9060

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

15440

Sri Lanka

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1156

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

3483

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

3483

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

70192

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

126043

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

126043

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

85357

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

14966

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

14966

Ukraine

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

177

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

435

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

435

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

149421

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

79826

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

94093

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2721170

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

1932222

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

1544058

Uruguay

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1170

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

27726

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

28088

Zambia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division

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

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Agricultural Supply Chain*	*1588893*
Row 2	*Protein and Salt*	*869471*
Row 3	*Food Ingredients and Bio-Industrial*	*3750341*
Row 4	*Animal Nutrition*	*183972*
Row 5	*Joint Ventures/Other*	*1361*

[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:
☑ Distribution

(7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:
☑ Mechanical

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

126612

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

An estimate based on road fuel consumption (on-site) and stationary combustion associated with location reporting worldwide. Cargill uses third parties for distribution, but some locations have small distribution capacities.

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 CO2e)

5532589

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Cargill's total Scope 1 emissions separated from agricultural operations and estimated road fuel consumptions.

Row 3

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Agriculture/Forestry

(7.18.2.2) Emissions category

Select from:

☑ Mechanical

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

734838

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Direct emissions associated with fertilizer use on Cargill owned land.
[Add row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Joint Ventures/Other*	*6773*	*4609*

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 2	*Food Ingredients and Bio-Industrial*	*1762806*	*1586497*
Row 3	*Animal Nutrition*	*271390*	*331735*
Row 4	*Agricultural Supply Chain*	*1198956*	*1188315*
Row 5	*Protein and Salt*	*680382*	*640182*

[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)

6394038

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

3920307

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

3751339

(7.22.4) Please explain

Our operational boundaries that determines our Scope 1 and 2 emissions today is in alignment with the boundaries determined by our consolidated accounting groups.

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

Not relevant
[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:
☑ No

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ Doing so would require we disclose business sensitive/proprietary information

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

n/a
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

6124379

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

30476562

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

36600941

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1719089

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

7095443

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

8814531.33

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

163352

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2722948

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

2886300.03

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1988273

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

1988273

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

9995093

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

40294953

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

50290046
[Fixed row]

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
	☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5858019

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

0

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

0

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

5858019

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

All biomass fuels (Corn, hulls, pecan, rice, wood, bagasse) Electricity Produced Renewable

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not applicable.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

497937

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

0

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

0

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

497937

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Other Renewable Fuels include Bio (Chicken) Oil, Biodiesel, Biogas, Flare Biogas, and Landfill Biogas

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

2439328

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

0

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

0

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

2439328

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Coal Bituminous, Coal Sub-Bituminous, Lignite

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

725558

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

725558

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Distillate Oil, Residual Oil, Gasoline, Diesel Process Use (non-transportation)

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

27311676

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

0

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

0

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

27311676

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Natural Gas, LPG-Butane-Propane

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not applicable.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

36832518

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

725558

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

0

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

36106960

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No comment
[Fixed row]

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

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

725558

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

462181

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

408529

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

408080

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)

36106960

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

35409073

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

5858019

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

5858019

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Argentina

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

14360

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ Argentina

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

No comment

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Argentina

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Onsite solar equipment owned by Cargill.

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

15.35

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Argentina

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar equipment owned by Cargill.

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

246

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:
☑ Belgium

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

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

36251

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Belgium

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onshore wind

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Brazilian Incentivized Renewable Power

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

93052

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Brazilian Incentivized Renewable Power

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

62957

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Wind Power PPA

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Canada

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Sustainable Biomass

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Sustainable biomass

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

1221

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:
☑ Canada

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2012

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Steam generator using biomass generated steam

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Chile

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

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

27188

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ Chile

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Wind Power PPA

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Direct line to an off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

54969

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ China

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Direct renewable power purchases

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

2918

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ China

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

No comment

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

586

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ China

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

No comment

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Direct line to an off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

13114

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Colombia

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

No comment

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Guatemala

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

3961

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Guatemala

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Run of the river hydro.

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Honduras

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

468

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Honduras

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

No comment

Row 16

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ India

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Offsite Solar and Wind (Hybrid Project)

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

44872

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ India

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Offsite solar and wind (hybrid project) equity joint venture.

Row 17

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ India

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Wind Solar Hybrid

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

3960

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ India

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Wind Solar Hybrid

Row 18

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Geothermal, Solar, Wind and Biomass Sources

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

133482

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ TIGR

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

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

EAC contract with PLN through CY Q1-2027 (5 year contract signed Q1-2022). Technologies are geothermal, solar, wind and biomass sources.

Row 19

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Jordan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Onsite Solar

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

577

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:
☑ Jordan

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar with panels owned by Cargill

Row 20

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

1407

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar.

Row 21

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

17687

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Netherlands

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

This purchase is reflected in this report for completeness, but is not included in our emissions calculations because internal guidelines do not allow the inclusion of unbundled RECs in our inventory.

Row 22

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Nicaragua

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Onsite Solar

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

215

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Nicaragua

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 23

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Norway

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Project-specific contract with an electricity supplier

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

12064

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Norway

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

No comment

Row 24

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Paraguay

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier) from a grid that is 95% or more low-carbon and where there is no mechanism for specifically allocating low-carbon electricity

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**100% regulated market whose total energy comes from renewable sources (mainly hydro)

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

33207

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Paraguay

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

100% regulated market whose total energy comes from renewable sources (mainly hydro)

Row 25

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Philippines

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Onsite Solar

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

220

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:
☑ Philippines

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 26

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Poland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

116

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Poland

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 27

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Poland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

733

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Poland

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 28

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Onsite Solar

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

227

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Spain

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar panels that are property of Cargill.

Row 29

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

525

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:
☑ Spain

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 30

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Taiwan, China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

136

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Taiwan, China

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 31

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

12639

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Thailand

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

on site solar at multiple sites

Row 32

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Project-specific contract with an electricity supplier

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

5622

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

No comment

Row 33

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

29

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 34

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Ukraine

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

95

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Ukraine

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Onsite solar

Row 35

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

378732

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Virtual Power Purchase Agreement where Cargill is 100% offtaker

Row 36

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

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

190576

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Virtual Power Purchase Agreement where Cargill is 25% offtaker

Row 37

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

303832

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2017

(7.30.14.10) Comment

2017 - 2020 Several wind farms added between 2017 - 2020. RECs are retired by Utility on behalf of Customers in MidAmerican Green Advantage program; Cargill has selected Electing Customer status under this tariff.

Row 38

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Project-specific contract with an electricity supplier

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

51734

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Wind purchased via utility from Soldier Creek Wind Farm through Evergy Kansas DRPS green tariff, RECs retired by utility on NAR on behalf of Cargill

Row 39

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Project-specific contract with an electricity supplier

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

77018

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Cargill purchase of solar power form Misae I Solar Farm sleeved via Electricity Service Provider; RECs retired by ESP on behalf of Cargill

Row 40

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind and Solar Hybrid Mix

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

401690

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Wind and solar mix. Cargill participated in Alliant's Green Tariff program, RECs are retired by the utility in M-RETs on behalf of Cargill

Row 41

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

5572

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

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

Select from:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

This purchase is reflected in this report for completeness, but is not included in our emissions calculations because internal guidelines do not allow the inclusion of unbundled RECs in our inventory.
[Add row]

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

Algeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

80564

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

80564.00

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

25398

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

25398.00

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8432

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

261

(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)

8693.00

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

239960

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

343733

(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)

583693.00

Bulgaria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Cameroon

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

298936

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

2441

(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)

301377.00

Cayman Islands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

428106

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

428106.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

73202

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

3641

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1337035

(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)

1413878.00

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

37513

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

37513.00

Costa Rica

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

21930

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

21930.00

Côte d'Ivoire

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40500

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

40500.00

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Dominican Republic

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Ecuador

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2422

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2422.00

Eygpt

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

205788

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

205788.00

Ghana

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26418

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

26418.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

158195

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

63185

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

65505

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

286885.00

Guatemala

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4608

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4608.00

Honduras

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

76209

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

577

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

76786.00

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9264

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

9264.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

51927

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

51927.00

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

41194

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

16039

(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)

57233.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1416

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1416.00

Israel

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

42371

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

42371.00

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Jordan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Kenya

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Luxembourg

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1098

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1098.00

Mauritius

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

52342

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

52342.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

54565

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

153848

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

208413.00

Nicaragua

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

285740

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

215

(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)

285955.00

Nigeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

54960

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

54960.00

Pakistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Paraguay

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

108434

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

108434.00

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

120

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

120.00

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

49116

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

247

(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)

49363.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

190289

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

949

(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)

191238.00

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

56880

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

22296

(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)

79176.00

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2934

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2934.00

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40380

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

25566

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

459197

(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)

525143.00

Saudi Arabi

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8050

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

8050.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

583

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

583.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

54302

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

238

(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)

54540.00

Sri Lanka

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6166

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

155

(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)

6321.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

268997

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

13471

(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)

282468.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

35038

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

35038.00

Ukraine

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1337

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

191

(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)

1528.00

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

89157

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

747

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

284294

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

44302

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

418500.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3813306

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

403093

(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)

4216399.00

Uruguay

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

46305

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

52968

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

99273.00

Zambia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00
[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.000057319

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

10145377

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

177000000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

12

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply
☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our revenue increased from 165 billion USD in 2022 to 177 billion USD in 2023 while our Scope 1 & 2 emissions decreased from 10,706,567 MT CO2e in 2022 to 10,145,377 MT CO2e in 2023. Cargill implemented numerous energy efficiency and carbon reduction projects, such as the growth of Cargill's low carbon energy consumption, across the company during the reporting period to help achieve these reductions. The decrease in emissions combined with an increase in revenue results in a lower year over year intensity metric.
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

☑ Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi Commitment.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

12/31/2018

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2017

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7221660

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4799665

(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)

12021325.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

10

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

10819192.500

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6394038

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3751339

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

10145377.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

156.05

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Building on nearly 20 years of climate action, Cargill has committed to reduce absolute greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in our operations by a minimum of 10% by 2025, against a 2017 baseline. That means that even as our business grows, our emissions will shrink. Cargill's commitment encompasses emissions in our operations, covering 100% of our total Scope 1 and 2 emissions. The target has been approved by the Science Based Target Initiative. In regards to land-related emissions, Cargill has advised on the development of both SBTi's FLAG protocol and the GHG Protocol Land Sector & Removals Guidance. For the latter, Cargill participated as an Advisory Committee Member for 2 years, including as a pilot test company to provide feedback on the draft protocol. Once the final guidance is published, we will work to incorporate land-related emissions in our footprint.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We are taking action across our operations and supply chains to reduce our Scope 1, 2, and 3 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions against the measurable and time-bound, science-based targets detailed in this report. This includes steps to scale regenerative agriculture in our supply chains, implement process efficiency and technologies in our facilities, expand the use of renewable energy projects at our plants, and decarbonize our ocean transportation business.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.1.86) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Cargill implemented a number of emissions reduction initiatives to achieve its Scope 1 and 2 target to reduce emissions by 10% by 2025 from a 2017 base year. During the reporting period, initiatives included Cargill increasing its low carbon energy consumption through the procurement of energy from solar, wind and geothermal generating assets, therefore reducing Cargill's Scope 2 (market-based) emissions. In addition, Cargill reduced its operational emissions through improving energy efficiency in its production processes by replacing inefficient equipment and improving maintenance reliability processes. For example, at a facility in the United States, we upgraded a steam dryer to a natural gas dryer, leading to an estimated CO2e reduction of 6,749 MT
[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi Commitment.pdf

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:
☑ 2°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

12/31/2019

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2017

(7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0000000000

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0000000000

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

30

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0000000000

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

0

(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0000000000

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0000000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

With a global footprint and presence in major food and agriculture supply chains around the globe, Cargill is committed to protecting the earth's vital natural resources and reducing its environmental impact. In alignment with its climate commitment, Cargill has adopted a company-wide Scope 3 target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in its global supply chains by 30% per ton of product by 2030. The commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from its global supply chain by 30% per ton of product by 2030, in combination with the previously announced operational goal to reduce absolute emissions by 10%, has been approved by the Science Based Target initiative (SBTi), a collaboration between CDP, the United Nations Global Compact, World Resources Institute (WRI) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). In regards to land-related emissions, Cargill has advised on the development of both SBTi's FLAG protocol and the GHG Protocol Land Sector & Removals Guidance. For the latter, Cargill participated as an Advisory Committee Member for 2 years, including as a pilot test company to provide feedback on the draft protocol. Once the final guidance is published, we will work to incorporate land-related emissions in our footprint.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

Our Scope 3 emissions include the footprint of all agriculture commodities we source from farmers, emissions related to the transportation of commodities and products, and emissions related to the use of the products we sell. With an SBTi-approved goal of reducing our global supply chain emissions 30% by 2030, measured per ton of product, we are investing in products, services, and programs that are scalable and measurable. As a partner to farmers and customers, we collaborate to find workable solutions that meet our respective business objectives, such as increased productivity and meeting emissions reductions targets. We prioritize our efforts in supply chains that have the greatest impact and opportunity for change, including animal protein, row crop farming, aquaculture feed, and ocean transportation.

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We are currently on track to meet our Scope 3 climate target. We're currently building programs to reduce emissions in our key supply chains, including: Cargill RegenConnect for row crops, and BeefUp for our beef supply chain. This includes steps to scale regenerative agriculture in our supply chains, implement process efficiency and technologies in our facilities, expand the use of renewable energy projects at our plants, and decarbonize our ocean transportation business. We

promote decarbonization in agriculture, manufacturing, fuel, and energy sourcing, and advocate for public policies that align with our strategies. We support the Paris Climate Agreement and government actions to address climate change. We actively engage in several pre-competitive initiatives to reduce emissions across supply chains, such as the Midwest Row Crop Collaborative (MRCC), MIT Climate Consortium, and the Global Maritime Forum's Decarbonization Task Force. We intend to continue scaling these programs and anticipate our progress to follow an exponential curve, increasing the magnitude of reductions as the target period progresses.

(7.53.2.88) 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
☑ No other climate-related targets

(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	*100*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*50*	*277000*

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Implementation commenced	*51*	*608300*
Implemented	*17*	*249660*
Not to be implemented	*6*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

3800

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

675000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

89000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Deodorizer Optimization

Row 3

(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)

7500

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1800000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1000000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Smart energy dashboard

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1800

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

378000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1239000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Methanol Flash recovery

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Combined heat and power (cogeneration)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1600

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

477000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2500000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Combined heat and power generation

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Electrification

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

900

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

115000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1300000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Heat pump dryer

Row 7

(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)

700

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

180000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

185000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Bulkflow upgrade

Row 8

(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)

560

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

120000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

137000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Miscella cooler

Row 9

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solid biofuels

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

7000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2000000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

12400000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Dryer fuel switch gas to biomass

Row 10

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption
☑ Solar PV

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1600

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

500000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2900000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Onsite solar generation

Row 11

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Combined heat and power (cogeneration)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

46000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

4500000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Stop export of fossil-fuel export of electricity

Row 12

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Combined heat and power (cogeneration)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

31000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

9000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

50000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Stop export of fossil-fuel export of electricity

Row 13

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Combined heat and power (cogeneration)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

12000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

200000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Optimising export electricity generated with CHP

Row 14

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Machine/equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

5000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1000000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

6000000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ >30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

New deodoriser

Row 15

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Other, please specify **:**Wastewater methane capture

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

105000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

617000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

7100000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Biogas project

Row 16

(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)

2400

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

2303000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

3018000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Chilled water vacuum system upgrade

Row 17

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Solar PV

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

2600

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

100000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Solar panel installation

Row 18

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption
☑ Wind

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

5200

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

83000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Wind power generation

Row 19

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

15000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

131000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 1-2 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Hydropower Plant
[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:

☑ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In order to facilitate GHG reduction projects, a dedicated capital pool is established for sustainability projects including both energy efficiency and GHG reduction initiatives specifically. In 2022 Cargill invested over USD 70,000,000 in emissions reduction projects.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Pursuant to Cargill's capital allocation process, projects are evaluated based on energy and carbon market conditions. As a result, emission reduction activities frequently take the form of energy reduction initiatives, which translate into reduced GHG emissions.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

A portion of senior executive incentive compensation is tied to the company's GHG performance targets.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Cargill utilizes a 40/mtCO2e shadow price of carbon when evaluating Capital expenditures. The internal shadow price of carbon is a mechanism for Cargill to assess the GHG impacts associated with a new capital expenditure in our operations and drive low-carbon and energy efficiency investments. Time horizon of influence is 1-20 years or more depending on the lifespan of the capital project.
[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

Cargill's Policy on Sustainable Palm Oil calls for no deforestation of high conservation value (HCV) lands or high carbon stock (HCS) areas, no development on peat, and no exploitation of land or labor rights.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

12740

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

Cargill Tropical Palm is in the process of executing 9 methane capture projects until FY25 to reduce GHG emission significantly by 278,000 MT saving (278% exceeded 2017 baseline target). The estimated savings is total since FY2017 baseline.
[Add row]

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Row 1

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Multiple: Regenerative agriculture, carbon reduction, land use change, permanent soil cover, fire control, etc.

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Our purpose is to nourish the world in a safe, responsible and sustainable way. Our commitment to protect the planet is multifold, addressing priorities such as increasing food security, climate change, water, land use, farmer livelihoods, and more. As one example, Cargill has a goal to advance regenerative agriculture practices across 10 million acres of North American farmland by 2030; our engagement approach and success is therefore centered around this commitment as well as commitments around carbon reduction and water quality. We set targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from our global supply chains (Scope 3) by 30% by 2030, measured per ton of product, as well as ambitious, context-based water goals for priority regions in our agricultural supply chain. Our BeefUp Sustainability initiative in North America is working with ranchers, customers, NGOs and innovators to meet the Scope 3 target for our beef business. Projects are focused on grazing management, feed production, innovation and food waste reduction. In 2021, Cargill launched Cargill RegenConnect, a regenerative agriculture program in North America that pays farmers for positive climate outcomes driven by changes in production practices, including adoption of reduced- or no-till and planting of cover crops. This program was expanded in 2022.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

☑ Procurement

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Suppliers may receive compensation for participating in and reporting through various conservation programs. For example, Cargill is working together with two customers to drive adoption of cover crops and no-till in animal feed production in Nebraska through financial incentives to farmers to support practice adoption. Over its lifetime, the project aims to enroll 100,000 acres in regenerative practices and reduce or sequester 50,000 metric tons of CO2e.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)
☑ Other, please specify **:**Water Stewardship

(7.68.1.7) Comment

No further comment.
[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

☑ Other, please specify **:**Labour and Human Rights

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Cargill has partnered with UNICEF to protect children living on our palm plantations and in surrounding palm growing communities. We participated in an assessment conducted by LINKS in collaboration with the RSPO and trained Cargill palm plantation employees about the UNICEF 10 Business Principles of Children's Rights and mitigation of potential risks. Expectant mothers have full access to a comprehensive suite of healthcare services in our plantations. This service is open to both employees and communities living in the vicinity of our plantations. In 2021, Cargill Tropical Palm (CTP) has successfully extended the scope beyond UNICEF CRBP Target by also adopting Indonesia Regulation of the Minister of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection of the Republic of Indonesia (KemenPPPA) No.1 of 2020. We have launched the RP3 (women worker's safe house) Establishment Program which aims to increase protection for women workers from all forms of violence and discrimination in all industrial sectors. Based on the study and verification of data by KemenPPPA, South Sumatra Provincial Government, Musi Banyuasin Regency Government and GAPKI, Cargill's PT Hindoli plantation has been assessed to have a high commitment to protecting the rights of women workers and recommended to be appointed as the first RP3 in Indonesia for Plantation Sector and also awarded with First Day Care – TARA Certified in Indonesia In its implementation, RP3 is run by the PT Hindoli Gender Committee to protect, support, and prioritize the welfare of all employees, including female workers and ensure a safe work environment from all forms of harassment, discrimination, and violence against women in their daily life which in line with Cargill's Guiding Principles and commitment to treating people with respect and dignity. RP3 Establishment has strengthened and synergized the protocols of workers' rights protection in Cargill's Palm business under various stakeholders' collaboration.

(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

☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Our commitment to protect the planet is multifold, addressing priorities such as climate change, water, land use, farmer livelihoods, and more. As one example, Cargill has a goal to advance regenerative agriculture practices across 10 million acres of North American farmland by 2030. We set targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from our global supply chains (Scope 3) by 30% by 2030, measured per ton of product, as well as ambitious, context-based water goals for priority regions in our agricultural supply chain. To help row crop farmers implement practices with positive environmental benefits, Cargill supported the Iowa Soybean Association and Quantified Ventures to establish/develop the Soil & Water Outcomes Fund (SWOF). The carbon insets generated through SWOF in the state of Iowa are purchased by Cargill. Farmers receive an average of 34 an acre for adopting practices like planting cover crops, reducing tillage and optimizing nutrient management. These techniques have been shown to improve the quality of water, soil and air.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

SWOF provides financial incentives directly to farmers who transition to on-farm conservations practices that yield positive environmental outcomes like carbon sequestration and water quality improvement. Farmers are adopting practices like planting cover crops, reducing tillage and optimizing nutrient management. The program expanded in 2022.
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :GHGP and state-of-the-art deforestation assessment and methodology

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Cocoa Supply Chain

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Promise Cocoa, i.e. cocoa derived through our sustainability program, the Cargill Cocoa Promise. The Promise Cocoa beans are entirely sourced through our direct networks from known and trusted farmers and farmer organizations benefitting from the Cargill Cocoa Promise. Promise Cocoa is always verified sustainable by an independent auditor.Customers can gain visibility into their carbon emission data and insights through the CocoaWise Portal. Using our online Carbon Footprint Calculator, they can calculate their reduction potential and assess how Promise Cocoa can help them reduce their own carbon footprint (Scope 3 emissions).

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Economic Allocation

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

1 metric ton of Promise Cocoa

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

1 metric ton of non-Promise Cocoa has a carbon footprint of 9.9 metric ton CO2e

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

5.5

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

1 metric ton of Promise Cocoa has a carbon footprint of 4.1 metric ton CO2e, 1 metric ton of non-Promise Cocoa has a carbon footprint of 9.6 metric ton CO2e. Therefore, 1 metric ton of promise cocoa uses 5.5 metric tons less of CO2e than non-promise cocoa. These results vary as per the usage of LUC methods. There is a /- 10% uncertainty/ tolerance range from Life Cycle Assessment method used. Promise Cocoa products are likely to have a lower carbon footprint than their non-Promise Cocoa alternatives - from a few percentage points up to 50% lower depending on the cocoa content. This is due to the Land Use Change (LUC) and deforestation risk assessment and mitigation capabilities we have established within the Promise Cocoa sourcing network. The higher the cocoa content in the product, the higher the difference observed in the carbon footprint between Promise Cocoa and non-Promise Cocoa products. In fact, Promise Cocoa liquor, butter, powder and dark chocolate have on average half (50%) the carbon footprint of their non-Promise alternatives.* * assuming non-Promise Cocoa alternatives land use change is best represented at the country-level and similar sourcing for other ingredients.*
[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Cocoa	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Soy

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Geographical area

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Our report covers the soy sourced in the South American region under the agricultural supply chain business. Soy sourced outside this region or business is not included.

(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**We are reporting information from the prioritized region and business.

(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☑ No, the volume excluded is unknown

(8.1.1.10) Please explain

Cargill has only included data from the South American region as it is the most material Soy sourcing region for Cargill as well as being the key deforestation-risk region in Cargill's Soy supply chain. Therefore, the volumes included in this disclosure recognise where Cargill can have the greatest impact.

Soy

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Specific product lines

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

This disclosure does not include embedded soy (i.e., where we source products that do not directly contain soy, but have soy-intensive supply chains).

(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Embedded soy [soy row only]

(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☑ No, the volume excluded is unknown

(8.1.1.10) Please explain

We are excluding embedded soy from our disclosure since the majority of embedded soy occurs outside of the South America supply chain. Any embedded soy in the South America supply chain is immaterial to the total disclosure volume.
[Add row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

Palm oil

(8.2.1) Disclosure volume (metric tons)

5650591

(8.2.2) Volume type

Select all that apply

☑ Produced

☑ Sourced

(8.2.3) Produced volume (metric tons)

2105020

(8.2.4) Sourced volume (metric tons)

3545571

Soy

(8.2.2) Volume type

Select all that apply
☑ Sourced

Cocoa

(8.2.2) Volume type

Select all that apply
☑ Sourced
[Fixed row]

(8.2.1) Provide details on any soy embedded in animal products sourced by your organization.

	Disclosure of embedded soy	Description of embedded soy use and soy tiers
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ All of our embedded soy volume is excluded from our disclosure as reported in 8.1.1	*Cargill's embedded soy arises from feed used in meat products we source as well as feed used for dairy products that we source.*

[Fixed row]

(8.3) Provide details on the land you own, manage and/or control that is used to produce your disclosed commodities.

Palm oil

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

South Sumatera, West Kalimantan

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

83114.24

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

1507317.97

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

84

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply

☑ RSPO producer/grower certification

Palm oil

(8.3.1) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Company-affiliated smallholders

(8.3.2) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.3.3) First-level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.3.4) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

South Sumatera, West Kalimantan

(8.3.6) Area (hectares)

31543.84

(8.3.7) Indicate if you can provide the volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.3.8) Volume produced on land you own, manage and/or control (metric tons)

597702.36

(8.3.9) % area third-party certified

76

(8.3.10) Third-party certification scheme

Select all that apply
☑ RSPO producer/grower certification
[Add row]

(8.4) Indicate if any of the land you own, manage and/or control was not used to produce your disclosed commodities in the reporting year.

Select from:
☑ Some of the land we own, manage and/or control is not used for production

(8.4.1) Provide details on the land you own, manage and/or control that was not used to produce your disclosed commodities in the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.4.1.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.4.1.2) Type of control

Select from:

☑ Own land

(8.4.1.3) Land type

Select from:

☑ Set-aside land for conservation

(8.4.1.4) Area (hectares)

16744

(8.4.1.5) % covered by natural forests and other natural ecosystems

20

(8.4.1.6) Please explain

List types of set-aside land: HCV areas, HCS areas, peatland area We regularly conduct internal audits on NDPE practices in addition to scheduled RSPO audits. We also use the Zoological Society of London's (ZSL's) Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) conservation software to conduct effective, real-time patrolling of the HCV and HCS areas in and around our five plantations in Indonesia. HCV-HCSA assessments have also been conducted to identify set-aside areas. Cargill validates that any new planting is in accordance with RSPO's New Planting Procedure (NPP) and has been approved by RSPO. The NPP requires HCV assessments to be conducted, preparation of implementation plan, verification by certification body and a public notification to be submitted on the RSPO website. Cargill also implements our Standard Operating Procedure for Sustainable Land Clearing and New Planting which must be completed before Cargill can commence land clearing and new planting, which includes following HCSA requirements.
[Add row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Aceh; Bangka; Bangka Belitung; Banten; Banyu Asin; Bengkalis; Bengkulu; Gorontalo; Jambi; Kaliamntan Selatan; Kalimantan Barat; Kalimantan Selatan; Kalimantan Tengah; Kalimantan Timur; Kalimantan Utara; Kepulauan Riau; Lampung; Nunukan; Papua; Papua Barat; Riau; Sulawesi Barat; Sulawesi Selatan; Sulawesi Tengah; Sulawesi Tenggara; Sumatera Barat; Sumatera Selatan; Sumatera Utara

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Buenos Aires; Catamarca; Chaco; Cordoba; Entre Rios; La Pampa; Salta; San Luis; Santa Fe; Santiago del Estero; Paraguay; Alto Paraná; Amambay; Caaguazú; Caazapá; Canindeyú; Central; Concepción; Guairá; Itapúa; Misiones; Paraguarí; San Pedro

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Single contracted producer
☑ Multiple contracted producers
☑ Trader/broker/commodity market
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Para; Bahia

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Cameroon

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Centre; Est; Sud; Sud-Ouest; West

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Colombia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Dominican Republic

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Democratic Republic of the Congo

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Ecuador

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Guayas

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ El Salvador

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Ghana

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Ashanti; Central; Eastern; Western

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Guinea

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Haiti

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Côte d'Ivoire

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Bas-Sassandra; Comoe; Goh-Djiboua; Gôh-Djiboua; Lacs; Lagunes; Montagnes; Sassandra-Marahoue; Woroba; Yamoussoukro

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Liberia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Madagascar

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Nigeria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Peru

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Papua New Guinea

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Sao Tome and Principe

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Sierra Leone

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Solomon Islands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ United Republic of Tanzania

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Togo

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Uganda

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Vanuatu

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Cocoa

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ Not disclosing

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Johor; Kedah; Kelantan; Melaka; Negeri Sembilan; Pahang; Perak; Pulau Pinang; Sabah; Sarawak; Selangor; Trengganu

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Antioquia; Bolívar; Casanare; Cesar; Cundinamarca; Magdalena; Meta; Norte de Santander; Santander

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Chiapas; Tabasco

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Honduras

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Atlántida; Colón; Yoro

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Guatemala

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Alta Verapaz; Escuintla; Izabal; Petén; Quezaltenango; San Marcos

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Pará

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Panama

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Chiriquí

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Cambodia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Kaôh Kong

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Papua New Guinea

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Milne Bay; Morobe; New Ireland; Oro; West New Britain

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Côte d'Ivoire

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Bas-Sassandra

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Chumphon; Krabi; Nakhon Si Thammarat; Phangnga; Phatthalung; Surat Thani; Trang

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Costa Rica

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Puntarenas

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Gabon

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Ngounié

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Nicaragua

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Atlántico Sur

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Peru

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Loreto

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Solomon Islands

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Guadalcanal

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mill

(8.5.7) Please explain

Consumption volume data is considered confidential, but Cargill releases their full Palm Oil Mill list to be publicly available each year. Please see our website: https://www.cargill.com/page/cargill-mill-locations

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Santa Cruz

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Single contracted producer
☑ Multiple contracted producers
☑ Trader/broker/commodity market
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Rio Grande do Sul; Santa Catarina; Paraná; São Paulo; Mato Grosso do Sul; Minas Gerais; Goiás; Mato Grosso; Rondônia; Tocantins; Bahia; Piauí; Maranhão; Pará

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Single contracted producer
☑ Multiple contracted producers
☑ Trader/broker/commodity market
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Paraguay

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Alto Paraná; Amambay; Caaguazú; Caazapá; Canindeyú; Central; Concepción; Guairá; Itapúa; Misiones; Paraguarí; San Pedro

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Single contracted producer
☑ Multiple contracted producers
☑ Trader/broker/commodity market
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Uruguay

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Canelones; Cerro Largo; Colonia; Durazno; Flores; Florida; Lavalleja; Maldonado; Paysandú; Río Negro; Rivera; Rocha; San José; Soriano; Tacuarembó; Treinta y Tres

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Single contracted producer

☑ Multiple contracted producers

☑ Trader/broker/commodity market

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Cargill considers this proprietary.
[Add row]

(8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.6.1) Provide details of how your organization produces or sources palm oil derived biofuel.

	Volume type	First-level administrative division	Comment (optional)
Row 1	*Select from:* ☑ Sourced	*Select from:* ☑ Not disclosing	*All raw material and derivatives sourced for FAME production is ISCC certified. Volumes are considered confidential.*

[Add row]

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Palm oil

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-conversion target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business activity

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

Soy

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

Cocoa

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Product level

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Palm oil

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

Cargill's no-conversion definition aligns with the Tropical Rainforest Alliance's Agriculture Sector Roadmap, where no-conversion refers to produced or sourced commodity volumes which do not cause conversion, which for palm, is interpreted as "no new development on peatlands regardless of depth".

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2019

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ In line with organizational commitments, because no sector- or region-wide cutoff date is available

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:
☑ 2025

Soy

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

Definition is aligned with the Agricultural Roadmap: No-deforestation: volumes not causing conversion of forest according to FAO's definition (native forests with land spanning 0.5 hectares with trees 5 meters and a canopy cover 10%.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:
☑ 2008

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:
☑ Biome, please specify

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:
☑ Sector-wide agreement/recommendation

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:
☑ <2017

Cocoa

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

Cargill's no-deforestation definition aligns to the OECD-FAO Business Handbook on Deforestation Due diligence: Commodity production, sourcing, or financial investments that do not cause or contribute to deforestation. This definition refers to gross deforestation, i.e. any conversion of forests to other land use without regard to compensatory gains in forest cover.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ No cutoff date

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2026-2030

[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

☑ % of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

☑ Production unit

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2014

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2014

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

84

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

84.00

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify **:**Tropical Forest Alliance's Agricultural Sector Roadmap

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Cargill's goal is to have all palm oil volumes we produce, trade and process traceable to plantations. Our own plantations and mills in Indonesia are fully traceable, but most of the palm oil we trade and process comes from third-party refiners, aggregators or mills. We continue making progress in traceability to the plantation level.

(8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Cargill's goal is to have all palm oil volumes we produce, trade and process traceable to plantations in high-risk supply chains. Our own plantations and mills in Indonesia are fully traceable, but most of the palm oil we trade and process comes from third-party refiners, aggregators or mills. We continue making progress in traceability to the plantation level.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Traceability is a key tool for increasing transparency in supply chains. We view traceability as a foundational capability. We map our supply chain in order to better understand our sourcing areas and where suppliers operate; assess the risk of unsustainable practices associated with palm oil production – such as deforestation, peatland clearance and fires – enabling us to prioritize engagement; and monitor deforestation, fires and land development to mitigate risk, demonstrate compliance with NDPE requirements and inform our interventions related to noncompliance. Cargill's goal is to have all palm oil volumes we produce, trade and process traceable to plantations in high-risk supply chains. Our own plantations and mills in Indonesia are fully traceable, but most of the palm oil we trade and process comes from third-party refiners, aggregators or mills. We continue making progress in traceability to the plantation level.

Soy

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 2

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:
☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Country/area/region

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:
☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

☑ % of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

☑ Production unit

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2020

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

83

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2023

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

99.7

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

98.24

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

South America is home to a number of globally important natural landscapes. Many of these landscapes intersect with areas that are favourable for agricultural development. These intersections are the hot spots requiring urgent attention to protect these natural landscapes. Meanwhile, consumer demand for global grain and oilseeds continues to grow. In order to meet this demand, choices will be made on which crops to grow and where, with South American agricultural regions playing a vital role in fulfilling this growing demand. Because of this, South America was the focus of the Sustainable Soy Policy, where we committed to building a deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) supply chain as quickly as possible. Polygon mapping of our direct soy suppliers is crucial to our efforts to build a deforestation-free supply chain because it enables us to monitor land use changes connected to the soy we buy. We will be able to respond to such land use changes on an ongoing basis through direct engagement with the farmers involved. The target of 100% was chosen because robust mapping will give us a clearer picture than ever before of our direct supply chain, enabling us to better monitor for potential land conversion violations and quickly take action. We have a rolling target because new suppliers can be added every year to our database and we want all of them mapped.

(8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

To support our progress towards our traceability target, which we review on an annual basis, includes investments in our mapping tools and capabilities. In addition to appointing a dedicated team focussed on traceability, we will also regularly conduct training of our team to increase capabilities to track our soy supply chain traceability.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

For polygon mapping in Brazil, we use two methodologies. For suppliers who own the land, we use automated consultation of the INCRA-SIGEF website, which is publicly available and official information. For suppliers who rent land to grow their soy, our administrative team identifies them and collects data. In other countries, all the data collection is done by our commercial team. We are pleased to share that we have completed polygon mapping of all our direct soy suppliers in Brazil. From now on, any new direct suppliers will be required to provide polygon information about their farms before they can be registered in our system and sign

commercial agreements. This will enable us to maintain a full registry of our direct suppliers going forward. With our mapping work in Brazil complete, we are focused on finishing gathering polygons for our direct suppliers in the other South American countries where we source soy.

Cocoa

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Other volume, please specify **:**Sustainable volume in direct supply chain

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

☑ % of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

☑ Production unit

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Cocoa & Forests Initiative

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

% mapped: 100% direct sustainable supply chain mapped at farm level by 2025. This target covers our certified volumes that are sourced from our direct supply chain. Certified volumes from our indirect supply chain are excluded for now and conventional volumes from our direct and indirect supply chain.

(8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Traceability is a key enabler to understand the link between our supply chain and deforestation. Each year, we increase our mapping efforts in our supply chain to increase transparency. In crop/year 2022/2023 crop year, the majority of farmers in our Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire direct supply chains were polygon mapped (97% in Côte d'Ivoire and 93% in Ghana). As of crop year 2023/2024, farmers will be required to have all their cocoa plots mapped and pass our deforestation risk area assessment to enter our Cocoa Promise supply chain. To ensure accurate and high-quality data with the polygon mapping, we implemented an internal verification process. Each time a polygon map is uploaded in our digital system, our geospatial team checks size, shape, and overlaps with urban areas and with other cocoa plots. We have setup digital tracing systems allowing us to trace the cocoa that enters our supply chain back to its origination point. This allows us to confirm that the cocoa we sourced comes from the farms we are monitoring. Through our Cargill Cocoa promise program we are supporting farmer organizations to deploy a digital management system that creates a digital link between unique farmer IDs, farm locations, and cocoa bag purchases.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Internal target in order to transparently measure and demonstrate overall progress on Cargill's commitment.

Cocoa

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 4

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Other volume, please specify **:**Sustainable volume direct supply chain

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

☑ % of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

☑ Production unit

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2030

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Cocoa & Forests Initiative

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

% traceability: 100% farm to factory traceability in direct supply chain by 2030. This target covers all volumes from our direct supply chain (certified and conventional). Indirect supply chain is excluded for now.

(8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Traceability is a key enabler to understand the link between our supply chain and deforestation. Each year, we increase our mapping efforts in our supply chain to increase transparency. In crop/year 2022/2023 crop year, the majority of farmers in our Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire direct supply chains were polygon mapped (97% in Côte d'Ivoire and 93% in Ghana). As of crop year 2023/2024, farmers will be required to have all their cocoa plots mapped and pass our deforestation risk area assessment to enter our Cocoa Promise supply chain. To ensure accurate and high-quality data with the polygon mapping, we implemented an internal verification process. Each time a polygon map is uploaded in our digital system, our geospatial team checks size, shape, and overlaps with urban areas and with other cocoa plots. We have setup digital tracing systems allowing us to trace the cocoa that enters our supply chain back to its origination point. This allows us to confirm that the cocoa we sourced comes from the farms we are monitoring. Through our Cargill Cocoa promise program we are supporting farmer organizations to deploy a digital management system that creates a digital link between unique farmer IDs, farm locations, and cocoa bag purchases.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Internal target in order to transparently measure and demonstrate overall progress on Cargill's commitment.
[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Palm oil

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply
☑ Value chain mapping
☑ Supplier engagement/communication
☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

Cargill's trading and oil refining businesses report sourcing information quarterly. When Cargill buys from a third-party supplier, the third party is asked to provide GPS coordinates, among other details, for the source mill. After achieving traceability to mills for third party sourcing, we continued our journey of traceability to plantation by adapting our approach to focus on the areas at highest risk for noncompliance with NDPE commitments. While this change has slowed our progress toward achieving 100% overall traceability to plantation, we believe the risk-calibrated approach we began using in 2019 is an important step toward improving the sustainability of our palm supply chain. The risk-calibrated approach for traceability to plantation focuses on data for areas at higher risk of unsustainable practices, including deforestation, peatland clearance and fires. We continue implementing this targeted approach to collect traceability data and prioritize follow-up engagement using tools for mapping the fresh fruit bunch supply base of palm oil mills. Central to this approach is tracing the fruit back to aggregations of producers in a village or municipality (the smallest administrative unit in a region). With this approach, we can identify areas of higher risk for not meeting NDPE criteria and prioritize those mills for engagement based on the extent of forest, protected areas and uncultivated peat areas surrounding the mill (within a 50 km radius).

Soy

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

☑ Value chain mapping

☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

For direct suppliers in Brazil who own the land, we used automated consultation of the INCRA-SIGEF website and the Federal SICAR website, which is official information that is publicly available. For direct suppliers in Brazil who rent land to grow their soy, as well as for direct suppliers in the other four countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay), our commercial and administrative teams identified them and collected data. New direct suppliers are required to provide polygon information about their farms so they can be registered in our system and sign commercial agreements. Where we can, we buy soy directly from farmers. But farmer cooperatives and other companies are also essential to ensuring we can provide the volumes our customers need. We engage with these indirect suppliers to understand more about the soy they are selling us.

Cocoa

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

☑ Value chain mapping

☑ Supplier engagement/communication

☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

Our direct and indirect supply chain is 100% traceable up to country level. Certified farmers who enter our Cargill Promise Program, our signature sustainability program, require to meet certain traceability requirements. One of them is having all their production plot mapped. We equip farmer organizations and field agents with digital software and with GPS devices to allow them to collect information about farm boundaries and create polygon maps of the farms from which cocoa is sourced. These maps help us understand each farm's precise perimeter and size. Polygon maps and Farm data is stored in our FarmForce system, which allows us to better connect farms maps to active farmers administered. We use geospatial analysis to identify common data quality issues and ensure continuous improvement of our GPS Polygon Mapping data quality. This can include identifying overlapping farms, farms in urban areas, or geometry errors such as polygon self-intersections or spikes. We expanded CocoaWise, our digital customer facing tool, to provide a more accurate reflection of the active farms in our sourcing network to show transparency with our customers.
[Fixed row]

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

Palm oil

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

23.5

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

54.5

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

21.6

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0.4

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00

Soy

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

61.4

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

38.6

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00

Cocoa

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

36

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

29

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

35

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00
[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Palm oil

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

41

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

41

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

0

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ Yes

Soy

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

99.36

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

0

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

62.2

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

38.2

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ No

Cocoa

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation-free (DF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

49

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

12

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

33

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

0

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.

Palm oil

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification
☑ RSPO supply chain certification – Segregated

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

10

(8.9.1.3) Comment

Cargill has been advancing sustainable practices in our palm plantations in Indonesia since joining the RSPO in 2004, including working directly with smallholders in the surrounding communities. In 2023, we maintained the RSPO certification for every mill and palm kernel crush plant in our operations. Our Sustainable Palm Oil policy is rooted in the Principles and Criteria of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and we believe they serve as the primary global sustainability standards for palm products and encourage all end-users of palm oil and palm oil products in the mature markets. We also promote the use of RSPO certified materials to our existing customers whom are either sourcing conventional materials to move to RSPO certified products in order to meet our Shared Responsibility target. Beyond supplying RSPO certified material, our global presence also gives us a unique understanding and insights on how we can work together with supply chain actors and industry experts in designing due diligence approaches that transform the supply chain and enable real transparency and accountability. Cargill's RSPO certification documents are available at the following link: https://rspo.org/members/2-0215-11-000-00/

Cocoa

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RA Sustainable Agriculture standard: Supply chain certificate – Segregated

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

12

(8.9.1.3) Comment

The Cargill Cocoa Promise is our signature sustainability program, i.e. our framework for all sustainability projects, our engine to implement a more sustainable cocoa supply chain. From our Cargill promise network we purchase Certified cocoa, referring to cocoa and chocolate products produced and sourced sustainably according to a set of specifications that are defined and verified by a third-party organization. Rainforest Alliance certification program (2020 Certification Program) prohibits deforestation but also the destruction of all natural ecosystems, including wetlands and peatlands, in line with the approach advocated by the Accountability Framework Initiative—and other leading environmental NGOs. Segregated (SEG) means that the full product content is certified, although it can come from different certified sources/farms, including other countries of origin.

Palm oil

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ RSPO producer/grower certification

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

31

(8.9.1.3) Comment

Cargill has been advancing sustainable practices in our palm plantations in Indonesia since joining the RSPO in 2004, including working directly with smallholders in the surrounding communities. In 2023, we maintained the RSPO certification for every mill and palm kernel crush plant in our operations. Our Sustainable Palm Oil policy is rooted in the Principles and Criteria of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and we believe they serve as the primary global sustainability standards for palm products and encourage all end-users of palm oil and palm oil products in the mature markets. We also promote the use of RSPO certified materials to our existing customers whom are either sourcing conventional materials to move to RSPO certified products in order to meet our Shared Responsibility target. Beyond supplying RSPO certified material, our global presence also gives us a unique understanding and insights on how we can work together with supply chain actors and industry experts in designing due diligence approaches that transform the supply chain and enable real transparency and accountability.
[Add row]

(8.9.2) Provide details of third-party certification schemes not providing full DF/DCF assurance.

Palm oil

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RSPO - Mass Balance

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

5

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ No

(8.9.2.4) Comment

We will continue to offer and supply RSPO certified products based on customer demand. Our customers want more customization with respect to traceability for their specific supply chain and despite the complexity, we continue to work to find ways to improve tracking and reporting at origin. We are committed to a transparent, traceable and sustainable palm supply chain by 2025. Our Sustainable Palm Oil policy is rooted in the Principles and Criteria of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and we believe they serve as the primary global sustainability standards for palm products and encourage all end-users of palm oil and palm oil products

in the mature markets. We also promote the use of RSPO certified materials to our existing customers whom are either sourcing conventional materials to move to RSPO certified products in order to meet our Shared Responsibility target. We had conducted awareness building session with customers regarding RSPO certification in bid to help them to be more aware of RSPO. We also promoting the uptake of Independent Smallholder CSPO with our customer. We participate in NASPON and are members of the Holistic Program along with RSPO, which is an initiative to promote RSPO certification among smallholders and mills in México. Also, in an effort to address growing consumer demand for sustainably sourced goods and our customers own sustainability goals, Cargill's U.S. refineries were 100% RSPO certified as either mass balance or segregated from origin. As of October 2023, Cargill no longer offers conventional palm oils in its U.S. portfolio. However, Cargill has been offering RSPO Segregated palm, palm stearin, palm olein and RSPO Mass Balance palm kernel at its Charlotte, NC facility since 2020. Likewise, we hope to continue sponsoring RSPO events in North America, such as the LATAM conference held in Miami. In North America, Cargill has offered our customers RSPO-certified palm oil at the mass balanced level for more than a decade. Cargill's RSPO certification documents are available at the following link: https://rspo.org/members/2-0215-11-000-00/

Cocoa

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RA Sustainable Agriculture standard: Supply chain certificate – Mass balance

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

38

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ Production unit monitoring

(8.9.2.4) Comment

The Cargill Cocoa Promise is our signature sustainability program, i.e. our framework for all sustainability projects, our engine to implement a more sustainable cocoa supply chain. From our Cargill promise network we purchase Certified cocoa which refers to cocoa and chocolate products produced and sourced sustainably according to a set of specifications that are defined and verified by a third-party organization. Rainforest Alliance certification program (2020 Certification Program) prohibits deforestation but also the destruction of all natural ecosystems, including wetlands and peatlands, in line with the approach advocated by the Accountability Framework Initiative—and other leading environmental NGOs.

Cocoa

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ Other forest management/producer certification, please specify **:**Promise Verified

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

6

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ Production unit monitoring

(8.9.2.4) Comment

Promise Verified – a new assurance approach to independently-verify Promise Cocoa, part of the Promise Solutions. Promise Verified is an alternative to Rainforest Alliance and Fairtrade and uses a different approach to assurance consisting of different layers of on-and-off field verification. Promise Verified is assured against a set of sustainability requirements which are aligned to the Cargill's Theory of Change. It also features external verification for our program performance (performance and financial data linked to the Cargill Cocoa Promise programmatic activities on the ground), and the reporting indicators (shared via the new CocoaWise Portal). External field verification of the sustainability requirements and related data is conducted at origin country level by certification bodies, Bureau Veritas and SGS, while assurance on program performance is carried out by KPMG Dutch Firm as an independent assurer.

Cocoa

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Forest management unit/Producer certification

☑ Other forest management/producer certification, please specify **:**Fairtrade

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

5

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ Production unit monitoring

(8.9.2.4) Comment

The Cargill Cocoa Promise is our signature sustainability program, i.e. our framework for all sustainability projects, our engine to implement a more sustainable cocoa supply chain. From our Cargill promise network we purchase Certified cocoa refers to cocoa and chocolate products produced and sourced sustainably according to a set of specifications that are defined and verified by a third-party organization. Fairtrade Standard for Cocoa requires that members did not cause deforestation or degradation in primary or secondary forests, protected areas and areas of High Conservation Value or High Carbon Storage to convert land into agricultural production area since 31st December 2018. Production does not occur in officially designated buffer zones, except where it complies with applicable law.
[Add row]

(8.9.3) Provide details of production unit monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Soy

(8.9.3.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

62.20

(8.9.3.2) Production unit monitoring approach

Select all that apply

☑ Geospatial monitoring or remote sensing tool

(8.9.3.3) Description of production unit monitoring approach

For our directly sourced supplies in all five South American countries, we used polygon farm boundaries to calculate our DCF percentage. We analyzed historical satellite images from the U.S. Geological Survey and data from the University of Maryland to determine the percentage of soy volumes that came from farms where land had not been converted from native vegetation.

(8.9.3.4) DF/DCF status verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.3.5) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ First party

(8.9.3.6) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit and is verified as DF/DCF

100

(8.9.3.7) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

Verification: KPIs reported externally are validated by an internal audit conducted by an independent assurance team to ensure data reported is and fairly represented based on the underlying source data. Corporate Audit assess the to determine which KPIs should be tested for accuracy. For KPIs selected for testing, Corporate Audit perform sample testing to validate data and calculations. The audit was conducted in May of 2024.

Cocoa

(8.9.3.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

33.00

(8.9.3.2) Production unit monitoring approach

Select all that apply

☑ Geospatial monitoring or remote sensing tool

(8.9.3.3) Description of production unit monitoring approach

Digital technology enables us to provide our customers with fast and transparent sustainability data, helping them measure and report the impact they achieve through the Cargill Cocoa Promise. We continue to expand our digital first mile traceability system in our direct supply chain giving us traceability from farm to factory, with the help of barcoded cocoa bags and digital Cooperative Management Systems. Today, 36% of farmers in our supply chain are GPS polygon mapped and monitored on deforestation risk. In combination with satellite imagery, this enables us to effectively monitor deforestation risks. On our website, we started to disclose all farmer organizations in our direct sustainable sourcing network in Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire and Cameroon, with the other countries to follow. Monitoring occurs annually as new land use change data becomes available.

(8.9.3.4) DF/DCF status verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.3.5) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ Third party

(8.9.3.7) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

We are using digital GPS devices to collect information about farm boundaries and create polygon maps of the farms from which we source cocoa. These maps help us understand each farm's precise perimeter and size. We use geospatial analysis to identify common data quality issues and ensure continuous improvement of our GPS Polygon Mapping data quality. This can include identifying overlapping farms, farms in urban areas, or geometry errors such as polygon self-intersections or spikes. To assess deforestation, we use geospatial data based on satellite imagery to determine where forests remain and where forest loss has taken place. Our approach is built on geographic information systems (GIS) software tools, as well as geospatial data and the analytical methods made available by the World Resources Institute (WRI) in its Global Forest Watch platform. By overlaying farm polygon maps with geospatial satellite data, our teams can detect forest cover changes on our cocoa suppliers' farms, as well as in nearby forests and protected areas. The data also tells us which farms are closest to remaining forests and protected areas boundaries, and thus present higher future deforestation risks
[Fixed row]

(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Soy

(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area

38.20

(8.9.4.2) Monitoring approach used for determining that sourcing areas have no or negligible risk of deforestation or conversion

Select all that apply

☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial data

(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment

For our indirectly sourced soy volumes in all five countries, we used the historical satellite images from the U.S. Geological Survey and data from the University of Maryland to calculate the DCF percentage for the full soy sector in every municipality or region. We then cross-referenced this sectoral average with our market share in the local area to arrive at a DCF percentage for our indirect supply in each municipality. To arrive at a total DCF percentage for each country, we calculated a weighted average for each municipality or region based on our local proportion of direct and indirect supplies using the two methodologies above and then tallied a weighted average for the entire country.

(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin

Select all that apply

☑ Argentina

☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

☑ Brazil

☑ Paraguay

☑ Uruguay

(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas

Cargill are going to increase the level of granularity. In 2023 we are considered Uruguay and biomes different from Amazon, Cerrado and Chaco.

(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.9.4.7) Type of verification

Select all that apply
☑ First party

(8.9.4.8) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through sourcing area monitoring and is verified as DF/DCF

100

(8.9.4.9) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

KPIs reported externally are validated by an internal audit conducted by an independent assurance team to ensure data reported is and fairly represented based on the underlying source data. Corporate Audit assess the to determine which KPIs should be tested for accuracy. For KPIs selected for testing, Corporate Audit perform sample testing to validate data and calculations. The audit was conducted in May of 2024.

(8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

Cargill will develop a risk classification approach in the future. There are currently no criteria identified for this.
[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint
Palm oil	*Select from:*

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint
	☑ Yes
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Cocoa	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint.

Palm oil

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Since a specified cutoff date

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2019

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

To ensure suppliers are adhering to our no deforestation and peat commitments, we use satellite technology to remotely monitor and detect any changes to forested areas. We verify compliance with our Policy on Sustainable Palm Oil using our own guidelines and industry frameworks. Cargill is now working with Earthqualizer and Satelligence to enhance our robust monitoring capabilities in support of our commitment to be deforestation-free in the palm oil supply chain by 2025. Verifying compliance with NDPE commitments We leverage satellite technology combined with precise plantation location data to conduct remote monitoring of palm plantations and their adjacent areas. This ensures there are no indications of deforestation or unauthorized activity on peat or forested lands. For our own operations, we verify continued compliance with our policy, and regularly conduct internal audits on NDPE practices in addition to scheduled RSPO audits. We use the Zoological Society of London's Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool conservation software to conduct patrolling of HCV/HCS areas in our own plantations. We partner with the Natural Resources Conservation Center to monitor the Cagar Alam wildlife reserve boundaries near our Poliplant plantation to protect biodiversity.

Soy

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Since a specified cutoff date

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2020

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

For our directly sourced suppliers in all five South American countries, we used polygon farm boundaries to calculate our DCF percentage. Once farm boundaries were identified, we analyzed historical satellite images from the U.S. Geological Survey and data from the University of Maryland to determine the percentage of soy volumes that came from farms where land had not been converted from native vegetation. For our indirectly sourced soy volumes in all five countries, we used the historical data above to calculate the DCF percentage for the full soy sector in every municipality or region. We then cross-referenced this sectoral average with our market share in the local area to arrive at a DCF percentage for our indirect supply in each municipality. To arrive at a total DCF percentage for each country, we calculated a weighted average for each municipality or region based on our local proportion of direct and indirect supplies using the two methodologies above and then tallied a weighted average for the entire country.

Cocoa

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

33

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Since a specified cutoff date

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2014

(8.10.1.6) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since the specified cutoff date (hectares)

622

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

Cargill uses geospatial data based on satellite imagery to determine where forests remain and where forest loss has taken place. Our approach is built on geographic information systems (GIS) software tools, as well as geospatial data and the analytical methods made available by the World Resources Institute (WRI) in its Global Forest Watch platform. By overlaying farm GPS polygon maps with geospatial satellite data, our teams can detect forest cover changes on our cocoa suppliers' farms, as well as in nearby forests and protected areas. An in-depth deforestation risk assessment using all collected data is done annually as global forest change is updated annually and mapping is done throughout the whole year, and bi-monthly GLAD alerts are also reviewed. On a global average, 33% of the cocoa farms in our direct and indirect supply chain are polygon mapped.

Palm oil

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint on the land we own, manage or control

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ During the last 5 years

(8.10.1.7) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint during the last five years (hectares)

644.32

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

Cargill validates that any land clearing is in accordance with RSPO's New Planting Procedure (NPP) and has been approved by RSPO. The NPP process validates sustainable land clearing and new planting per HCV/HCSA requirements. This includes requiring HCV assessments to be conducted, preparation of implementation

plan, verification by certification body and a public notification to be submitted on the RSPO website. Cargill also implements our Standard Operating Procedure for Sustainable Land Clearing and New Planting which must be completed before Cargill can commence land clearing and new planting, which includes following HCSA requirements.
[Add row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Cocoa	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes.

Palm oil

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:
☑ Working collaboratively in sector initiatives

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Greater supplier awareness/engagement

☑ Involvement in landscape and/or jurisdictional initiatives

☑ Involvement in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

In addition to signing the Agriculture Sector Roadmap to 1.5C, we revised our 2025 palm roadmap to accelerate our commitment to be deforestation-free in our palm oil supply chain by 2025. In 2023, we continued our active role as co-conveners of the Palm Oil Collaboration Group and we advocate for adoption of the NDPE Implementation Reporting Framework (IRF) across the palm industry. Cargill continues our active role in multistakeholder platforms, organizations and working groups, such as representing traders and processors on the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) Board of Governors, participating in the RSPO North America Sustainable Palm Oil Network, and sponsoring the first RSPO Interamerican Conference in May 2023. In Colombia, Cargill has been elected to the steering committee of the Alliance for Sustainable Palm Oil of Colombia (APSCO), the main initiative to produce sustainable palm oil in the region. As a founding member of the Decent Rural Living Initiative, we authentically promote sustainable agricultural and labor practices. This initiative strives to improve the social well-being within supply chain communities through the creation of fair wages, transparency, and worker-centric long-term collaborations. By providing smallholders access to competitive market prices for their produce, we increase profitability and contribute to local economic growth and stability, reducing their dependency on single income sources and mitigating the impact of market fluctuations.

Soy

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Engagement with our stakeholders including WRI, and support for farmers

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

100

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Price premium for certified materials

☑ Improvement in data collection and quality

☑ Involvement in multi-stakeholder initiatives

☑ Greater stakeholder engagement and collaboration

☑ Investment in monitoring tools and traceability systems

☑ Involvement in landscape and/or jurisdictional initiatives

☑ Greater community support to facilitate sustainable agriculture

☑ Increased knowledge on commodity driven deforestation, forest degradation and/or conversion

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

As the bar raises with more regulations and commitments, we continue to improve our traceability, monitoring and reporting systems, and continue to engage with suppliers, sectorial and individually, to support them on this journey with us. Some examples: We have partnered with World Resources Institute (WRI), whose geospatial expertise and other monitoring, reporting and verification capabilities will help ensure we can deliver on our DCF 2025 commitment. We've been supporting farmers to implement regenerative agriculture practices that have the power to sequester greenhouse gas emissions, improve water quality and use, and build up healthy soil for the next generation. We continue the work with the Land Innovation Fund for Sustainable Livelihoods, a fund created by Cargill and managed by Chemonics to foster innovative, farm-focused solutions for a sustainable, climate-smart, DCF soy supply chain in South America's Amazon, Cerrado and Chaco biomes. We increased the 3S certified volume, program that connects farmers to downstream clients that value sustainability and farmers receive a premium for their differentiated product.

Cocoa

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Increasing physical certification

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

9

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Increased knowledge on commodity driven deforestation, forest degradation and/or conversion

☑ Involvement in landscape and/or jurisdictional initiatives

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

We increased our certified volumes from our direct sourcing network, allowing us to do more in-depth deforestation analyses as we require farmers to be polygon mapped if they are part of our direct Promise network. Our Go-to-market team supported customers in the transition from conventional to sustainable volumes, allowing Cargill to answer this demand.
[Add row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

	GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No, but plan to do so in the next two years
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No, but plan to do so in the next two years
Cocoa	*Select from:* ☑ No, but plan to do so in the next two years

[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

☑ Yes, from both suppliers and owned/managed/controlled land

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

☑ Labor rights

☑ Land use rights

☑ Third parties' rights

☑ Environmental protection

☑ Human rights protected under international law

☑ Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ First party audits

☑ Third party audits

☑ Third party databases

☑ Ground-based monitoring

☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial monitoring

(8.14.4) Indicate if you collect data regarding compliance with the Brazilian Forest Code

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.14.5) Please explain

Palm Oil: Cargill's Policy on Sustainable Palm Oil is committed to local, national and international legal compliance. For our own operations, we have improved procedures to verify policy compliance and we conduct internal audits on NDPE practices/RSPO audits. Our mills/estates also comply with ISPO requirements as per the legal requirements for Indonesian palm companies. For our third-party supply chain, we monitor progress of suppliers with self-assessment questionnaires and field verifications. For new suppliers, Cargill implements a new supplier due diligence process where potential suppliers declare that they have legal permits to operate. Based on the risk-calibrated approach to traceability, we prioritize engagement and data collection from suppliers in high-priority landscapes with greater risk of noncompliance with NDPE commitments. The company will carry out on-the-ground field assessments with third parties. As we progress from traceability to supply chain transformation, we will work with mills and third-party suppliers to deepen our smallholder engagement to uphold our policy and implement best practices. Finally, when deforestation grievances are identified and validated, we immediately suspend suppliers (outlined in Palm Grievance Procedure) and work with them to define an action plan with clear timelines/milestones. Cargill takes a multi-layered approach to ensure compliance, from monitoring at a distance, to close engagement with suppliers, to taking accountability should grievances be identified. We believe in prioritizing engagement to drive long-term capability and compliance improvements. These proactive, multi-layered procedures are therefore our preferred and most effective approach to ensure legal compliance. Soy: Cargill is a signatory to the Amazon Soy Moratorium, sectorial agreement signed in 2006, in which companies undertake not to market or finance soy produced in areas that were deforested (even legally) in the Amazon biome after July 2008. Through robust procedures, we verify that we do not market or finance soy produced in areas deforested in the Biome after July 22, 2008, (Forest Code reference date). Furthermore, Cargill does not buy soy from suppliers listed as engaging in illegal deforestation (IBAMA's list, LDI-PA, SEMA-MT list, ICMBio list) or slave labor (Ministry of Employment list). Cargill is a signatory of Pará's Green Grain Protocol. Under this commitment, we check several criteria before purchasing grains in the state: valid CAR, embargo (IBAMA and LDI), illegal deforestation, slave labor list, overlap with conservation units or indigenous territories. Every day, our automated system consults lists managed by various agencies and organizations. When a farming operation appears on one of these lists, it is blocked so it is not eligible to sell soy to us. We also block other farms registered to the same person or entity in the state, as well as those owned by family members and those with whom they have a commercial relationship. These affiliated farms cannot be unblocked until we conduct a thorough analysis to help ensure that soy from the violating farm is not being rerouted and sold to us through the affiliated operation. All these unblocked farms are reevaluated each new crop season to confirm they are still complying. We passed our most recent annual third-party audit to confirm our compliance with the Amazon Soy Moratorium and the Green Grain Protocol. No non-compliant soy was found to have entered our supply chain in these audits. Cocoa: We can achieve our purpose only by working closely with our Supplier Partners. Our Supplier Code of Conduct explains how we expect farmers, producers, manufacturers,

and others to work with us to fulfil that purpose—ethically and in compliance with applicable laws. Variations in local governance, law enforcement limitations, and diverging definitions of what constitutes forest demand a thoughtful and tailored approach. We take guidance from the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. These frameworks are used in our due diligence approach, which we have set up in line with the OECD MNE Guidelines to engage suppliers in our indirect supply chain. Cargill has been taking a risk-based approach to scale up traceability in its indirect supply chain as part of its due diligence system. Based on country and supplier risks, Cargill works with selected countries and suppliers to receive traceability data from suppliers: we currently have more visibility into the regions that our indirect suppliers source from, as well as insight into the processes and procedures that they have in place to evaluate social and environmental risks. This is used to prioritize areas where there is a high-risk of deforestation to get more granular data from suppliers, and we have risk mapping in place for other chocolate ingredients, on which we base additional actions.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Risk of fires
☑ Access to new markets
☑ Response to regulation
☑ Risk of biodiversity loss
☑ Commodity sourcing footprint
☑ Current and future sourcing risk
☑ Risk of supplier non-compliance in area
☑ Opportunity to build resilience at scale
☑ Response to voluntary sectoral agreement
☑ Risk of issues related to land tenure rights

☑ Organization has operational presence in area
☑ Supply of commodities strategically important
☑ Opportunity for increased human well-being in area
☑ Opportunity to protect and restore natural ecosystems
☑ Opportunity to increase market access for smallholders and local communities
☑ Ability to contribute to/ build on existing landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
☑ Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems
☑ Recognized as priority landscape by credible multi-stakeholder groups or industry platforms
☑ Opportunity to participate in new markets or financing mechanisms for the agricultural sector

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

The Farmers First Cluster is an example of a landscape initiative implemented in Brazil within the soy supply chain that places producers at the heart of decision-making about how they manage, farm and conserve their land. The implementation strategy consisted of: 1. Mapping the target landscape and engaging local stakeholders to identify a smart mix of solutions to be leveraged for shifts to more sustainable land use. 2. Identifying best fit strategic solutions for transitions to sustainable land use and apply the finance model in priority municipalities in the Cerrado. 3. Mobilizing resources to support and scale the interventions with support from committed soy value chain partners, financial institutions and investors. 4. Scaling investment measuring progress against metrics that are designed to demonstrate impact and offer a pathway to other organizations wishing to leverage investment to transform land use in commodity production countries. This was in a priority area for us due to the risk of conversion.
[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ1

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Siak Pelalawan Landscape Programme

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Siak and Pelalawan

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

700000

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Funder: Provides full or partial financial resources

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

2018

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Please specify :2025

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

150000

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate
☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored
☑ Forest fires monitored and prevented
☑ Increased and/or maintained protected areas
☑ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

Governance

☑ Governance forums that represent all relevant stakeholders in place and maintained
☑ Promotion of transparency, participation, inclusion, and coordination in landscape policy, planning, and management

Social

☑ Respect, protect, and fulfil human rights
☑ Income diversification amongst producers in area
☑ Improved business models that enable inclusion (including smallholders)
☑ Improved capacity for community engagement in multi-stakeholder processes
☑ Implementation of livelihood activities/practices that reduce pressure on forests
☑ Ensuring local communities and smallholders benefit from the outcomes of landscape/jurisdictional initiative

Production

☑ Increased adoption of sustainable production practices (e.g., input use efficiency and water management practices)
☑ Reliable commodity traceability and landscape monitoring/data collection system
☑ Uptake of regenerative agriculture (e.g., agroforestry) practices

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Co-design and develop goals, strategies and an action plan with timebound targets and milestones for the initiative

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for livelihoods and human well-being

☑ Collaborate on management/land use planning in the landscape/jurisdiction

☑ Identify and map stakeholders (including vulnerable and/or marginalized groups) and encourage their engagement in multi-stakeholder processes

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities

☑ Communicate externally the business case for investing in landscapes/jurisdiction

☑ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation

☑ Support communities and smallholders in gaining access to incentives (e.g. support achieving certification, group formation, getting land title, packaging access to loans, preferential sourcing etc.)

Support and incentivize sustainable production and community land use practices

☑ Capacity building for farmers, smallholders and local communities to implement good agricultural practices (including improved efficiency, crop diversification and adoption of certification)

Link value chain action to landscape/jurisdictional initiative through private sector collaboration

☑ Collaborate on commodity traceability

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Sub-national government

☑ Local communities

☑ NGO and/or civil society

☑ Producers

☑ Private sector

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

Cargill joined the Siak Pelalawan Landscape Programme, a private sector-driven initiative in the districts of Siak and Pelalawan in Riau province, Indonesia, supported and facilitated by Proforest and Daemeter. Established in 2018, the coalition is formed of member companies (Cargill, PepsiCo, Musim Mas, Unilever, Neste and L'Oréal) and supporter companies (Danone and Sinar Mas). The programme supports and builds on existing government led initiatives including the Green Siak Green Growth District plan and the Pelalawan District Action Plan for Sustainable Palm Oil, and has 4 long term goals: 1) Protect and enhance forests,

peatlands and natural ecosystems 2) Empower palm oil smallholders to achieve improved livelihoods 3) Respect of labour and community rights within the palm oil sector 4) Pursue sustainable palm oil production.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is collectively monitored using a shared external framework, please specify **:**Landscape Reporting Framework developed by ISEAL & Proforest and adopted by the Forest Positive Coalition

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

In 2023, through its participation to the Siak Pelalawan landscape program, Cargill has contributed to reach the following progresses concerning natural ecosystems and biodiversity, and also farmers and communities: The Siak Pelalawan Landcsape Programme (SPLP) has trained close to 3,100 oil palm farmers in good agricultural practices (GAP), these practices increase knowledge of plantation registry letters (STD-B) and land titles, crucial for meeting ISPO standards required by 2025. As a result, nearly 200 additional smallholders received STD-B in 2023, bringing the total to close to 600 smallholders in the region since 2020. Understanding the districts' stakeholders and intricate landscape is vital for steering land use toward responsible production and conservation. SPLP has created detailed profiles for 11 villages, laying the groundwork for effective land-use management. Our participatory mapping efforts have covered almost 300,000 hectares, including nearly 10,000 hectares under sustainable management and protection through village land-use plans. Furthermore, SPLP has strengthened the sustainable management of close to 3,500 hectares of village peat forest through paludiculture, which is wet agriculture and forestry on peatlands and supported the forest recovery of nearly 110 hectares within the village forest. To address environmental and social risks associated with districts' mills, SPLP has consolidated an aggregated IRF profile for over 50 mills engaged in palm oil production. This profile is instrumental in guiding these mills towards NDPE production standards. Both Siak and Pelalawan district governments have shown a strong commitment to ecosystem management and no-deforestation plans. They are now establishing conservation regulations in 12 villages, three more than in 2022, and developing district action plans for sustainable palm oil. While 2023 marks the fourth and preparation SPLP's closing of 1st phase by 2024, the program is set to extend into a second phase from 2025 to 2029. Project activities and objectives are being discussed within members, responding to the change of challenges compared to when the initial program was designed in 2018. SPLP will continue to focus on implementing village land-use plans, advancing social forestry, and rewarding efforts to protect forests. Cargill contributes USD 150,000 to this program annually.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are making a claim

(8.15.2.19) Type of claim made

Select from:

☑ Collective claim

(8.15.2.20) Provide further details on your claim

Metrics included in this disclosure are reported to Cargill by the implementing partner and represent collective achievements by all participants in this landscape program.

Row 2

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ2

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Farmer First Clusters

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Cerrado biome

(8.15.2.5) Attach public information about the initiative (optional)

SCF-report_December-2023_EN.pdf

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

144365

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Convener: Leads or facilitates the design, set-up, and high-level management of the initiative

☑ Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

☑ Funder: Provides full or partial financial resources

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

2018

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

1350000

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

☑ Decreased ecosystem degradation rate

☑ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

Governance

☑ Promotion of transparency, participation, inclusion, and coordination in landscape policy, planning, and management

Social

☑ Implementation of livelihood activities/practices that reduce pressure on forests

☑ Income diversification amongst producers in area

Production

☑ Improved and/or maintained soil health

☑ Increased adoption of sustainable production practices (e.g., input use efficiency and water management practices)

☑ Reliable commodity traceability and landscape monitoring/data collection system

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Increased commodity traceability in landscape/jurisdiction

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Co-design and develop goals, strategies and an action plan with timebound targets and milestones for the initiative

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation

☑ Help establish a transparent governance platform responsible for managing the initiative and its activities with clear roles, responsibilities and balanced decision-making

☑ Identify and act on opportunities for pre-competitive collaboration with your sector

☑ Share spatial data and land management plans with other stakeholders in the landscape/jurisdiction

Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities

☑ Communicate externally the business case for investing in landscapes/jurisdiction

☑ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation

☑ Share information on supplier non-compliance, value chain mapping and traceability with other stakeholders in the landscape/jurisdiction

☑ Other actions relating to building community and multi-stakeholder capacities, please specify **:** identifying priority areas, solutions to be fostered, selecting implementing partners, indicating farmers

Support and incentivize sustainable production and community land use practices

☑ Capacity building for farmers, smallholders and local communities to implement good agricultural practices (including improved efficiency, crop diversification and adoption of certification)

Link value chain action to landscape/jurisdictional initiative through private sector collaboration

☑ Collaborate on commodity traceability

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ NGO and/or civil society

☑ Private sector

☑ Other, please specify **:**International civil society organisation(s) / International company(ies)

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

Cargill is one of six companies participating in the Soft Commodities Forum, a pre-competitive partnership among leading soy processors and handlers to help drive systemic transformation in the Cerrado biome. Because no one company can achieve a structural and holistic change alone, this industry-level collaboration is essential, enabling engagement with local and external stakeholders to develop solutions to conserve native vegetation, while increasing soy productivity. The Farmer First Clusters initiative is based on creating a smart-mix of solutions aiming accelerate investments that benefit climate, nature and livelihoods. The implementing partners have begun engaging producers in key Farmer First Clusters landscapes, yielding initial results that align with our core mission of creating a sustainable financial model through innovative solutions.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is collectively monitored using a shared external framework, please specify **:**All companies from SCF aligned on the monitoring framework

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

We have completed polygon mapping for our direct suppliers and we used polygon farm boundaries to calculate a precise deforestation- and conversion-free (CDF) figure for our soy. Cargill has committed more than 1.3 million over three years to the initiative, as part of our far-reaching efforts to provide farmers with viable economic alternatives to land conversion.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are making a claim

(8.15.2.19) Type of claim made

Select from:

☑ Collective claim

(8.15.2.20) Provide further details on your claim

We continue to use the collective action of the Soft Commodities Forum (SCF) to drive sector transformation, including putting the farmer at the center of this effort through the SCF's Farmer First Clusters initiative. Cargill has committed more than 1.3 million over three years to the initiative, as part of our far-reaching efforts to provide farmers with viable economic alternatives to land conversion.
[Add row]

(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.

Row 1

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ1

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

Row 2

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ2

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:
☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

Row 3

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ3

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:
☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data
[Add row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Cargill actively participates in multiple multi-stakeholder initiatives, being members of RSPO since 2004, the European Palm Oil Alliance since 2013, collaborating with Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB) to build Indonesia's first oil palm teaching farm, working with the Indonesian Palm Oil Association (GAPKI) and the Indonesian government to advocate for sustainable palm oil development, among other examples. Cargill is representing the traders & processors on the RSPO Board of Governors for 2022/2023 as an alternate member and participates in the RSPO working groups on Human Rights, and Trade and Traceability and on Communications and Claims. Cargill is also a participant in the Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA), of which Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) is a part, and a participant in a working group which is working towards the implementation of a zero deforestation commitment. Cargill partnered with IDH, Winrock and Costco to develop a protocol for responsible peat management for smallholders, and continue to seek feedback on these protocols from a number of stakeholder initiatives including RSPO and the High Carbon Stock Approach Steering Group. To accelerate effective implementation of NDPE commitments, Cargill and PepsiCo brought together companies from every stage of the palm oil supply chain in November 2019, leading to formation of the Palm Oil Collaboration Group (POCG) and the PPBC Working Group, which focuses on scaling up positive approaches to improving livelihoods and protecting forests outside concessions. In 2020, Cargill, Nestlé and PepsiCo together with facilitation by Proforest convened the PPBC Action Group, including 13 companies and 13 technical support organizations working to implement forest conservation and monitoring activities combined with an outreach group supporting engagement with key stakeholders. As described in our Palm Oil Policy, these engagements support Cargill's commitment to protect environmentally, socially, and economically important resources for the benefit of current and future

generations; transforming the supply chain helps us meet our environmental goals. Cargill continues to be the co-convenor of the PPBC Working Group under the POCG.

Row 2

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

The initiatives are implemented in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil and, Paraguay. Cargill engages in transformational partnerships to help build a sustainable, deforestation-free supply chain. Through membership in ABIOVE (Brazilian Association of Vegetable Oil Industries), Cargill is supporting the Agro Plus Program, which aims to empower rural producers to improve the management of their farms through education and technical assistance. Cargill is a long-time member of the Round Table on Responsible Soy (RTR). Since 2006, Cargill has been part of the Soy Working Group as part of the Brazilian soy industry with other NGOs including Greenpeace, WWF, TNC, Imaflora, and IPAM in the Soy Moratorium, working on reducing deforestation and ensuring sustainable soy production in the Amazon biome. Furthermore, Cargill participates in the Brazilian Coalition on Climate, Forests, and Agriculture, in a working group that helps the government advance the implementation of a low carbon economy and the Forest Code. Since 2021 we have engaged with the Visión Sectorial del Gran Chaco Argentino (ViSeC), which aims to protect native vegetation in the Gran Chaco from Argentina. We are part of both the technical committee and the communications committee within ViSeC. The

former is currently building a common system for tracking soy and deforestation in the biome. We are also working with other members to increase transparency around compliance with Argentina's forest law across the sector. In Paraguay and Bolivia, we are participating of the Sustainable Soy Roundatable, organized by Solidaridad.

Row 3

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Cocoa

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

☑ Engaging with communities

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

To create a more sustainable cocoa supply chain globally, we work with a multitude of stakeholders across the industry, using individual strengths and abilities for lasting and transformational change. We are committed to sharing our insights and work closely with the industry and governments in origin countries through the Cocoa and Forests Initiative (CFI). The Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana and the world's leading cocoa and chocolate companies signed landmark agreements in Nov 2017 to end deforestation and promote forest restoration and protection in the cocoa supply chain. This public-private partnership has been organized by the World Cocoa Foundation (WCF), IDH - the Sustainable Trade Initiative, and The Prince of Wales's International Sustainability Unit (ISU), in partnership with the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana. Cargill is a signatory to a new framework that brings together industry stakeholders to promote a sustainable cocoa sector in Cameroon and protect the third-largest forest range in the Congo Basin. The Roadmap to Deforestation-Free Cocoa in Cameroon is a

commitment to conserve and restore forests while enhancing cocoa productivity in the country. The farmer organizations we work with are increasingly empowered as community-centric development actors, for the benefit of cocoa communities and farmers. We are an active member of the European Cocoa Association and the World Cocoa Foundation and participate in multistakeholder partnerships such as the Living Income Community of Practice and the CFI to advocate for systemic change. We are also a member of the Alliance for eTrade Development initiated by USAID to scale digital tools in Brazil, Indonesia and Cameroon. We celebrated a decade of action with CARE this year. We also participate in CocoaAction Brasil, an initiative that works to find solutions that increase productivity, improve the quality of Brazil's cocoa, including controlling pests and diseases, improve farmers' living and working conditions, strengthen farmers' organizations, and support sustainable forest-positive cocoa production systems. How activity fits within environmental strategy: Industry transformation will in the long-term support Cargill's progress toward reducing Scope 3 GHG emissions in our global supply chain by 30% per ton of product by 2030, against a 2017 baseline.
[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:
☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:
☑ Natural regeneration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with regulation
☑ More inclusive, transparent, and empowering governance processes
☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity
☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:
☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

To drive meaningful change, Cargill joined the Siak Pelalawan Landscape Programme, a private sector-driven initiative in the districts of Siak and Pelalawan in Riau province, Indonesia, supported and facilitated by Proforest and Daemeter. Established in 2018, the coalition is formed of member companies (Cargill, PepsiCo, Musim Mas, Unilever, Neste and L'Oréal) and supporter companies (Danone and Sinar Mas). The programme supports and builds on existing government led initiatives including the Green Siak Green Growth District plan and the Pelalawan District Action Plan for Sustainable Palm Oil, and has 4 long term goals: 1) Protect and enhance forests, peatlands and natural ecosystems 2) Empower palm oil smallholders to achieve improved livelihoods 3) Respect of labour and community rights within the palm oil sector 4) Pursue sustainable palm oil production. Project deliverables are monitored at least annually and publicly reported. Cargill participates in all bi-monthly Coalition meetings to give feedback on the progress and reporting structure, and collaborate with other coalition members, including village support program and T1, T2 and T3 suppliers, among many.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply
☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2018

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:
☑ 2025

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

554438.35

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

700000

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

0.226111

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

102.0925

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

150000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with regulation

☑ More inclusive, transparent, and empowering governance processes

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

In 2022, through its participation to the Siak Pelalawan landscape program, Cargill contributed to reach the following progresses concerning natural ecosystems and biodiversity, farmers and communities: 8 village regulations were issued to regulate conservation activities and/or a natural ecosystem; 23 CSO/NGOs were engaged, continuing engagement since previous years; 1,436 oil palm smallholders were mapped and 53 mills were engaged on the importance of and need for conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation; 77 oil palm smallholders received Plantation Registry Letter by district government ensuring compliance of land with sustainability and business norms in 2022; 153,002 hectares of priority areas for conservation or responsible agriculture in the landscape were mapped through participatory approaches; 149,404 hectares of peatland were mapped; 2 district government committed to a no-deforestation and natural ecosystem management plan; 709 people were trained on good agricultural practices; 3 groups of key stakeholders consisting of 2 plantation agencies of Siak & Pelalawan governments, 2 manpower agencies of Siak & Pelalawan governments, 2 women & children protection agencies of Siak & Pelalawan governments, 2 palm oil associations and 8 trade unions were committed to engaging in social dialogue. Progress of the landscape program is monitored by monthly coordination meeting between Proforest, Daemeter and the field team, including all village facilitators, to be shared with all members of the coalition following the landscape activity reporting framework. The Landscape Activity Reporting Framework has been developed to capture progress made in landscape initiatives. The framework is designed to be applied across landscapes and initially captures 3 thematic areas: 1) Natural ecosystems and biodiversity, 2) Farmers and communities and 3) Partnerships. To provide more insights into the progress being made over time, the framework is structured around 4 phases. These phases are based on the general stages that on-the-ground programmes follow to deliver on agreed goals and outcomes. For each phase as well as thematic area activity metrics are defined, which can be adjusted based on the needs of the landscape initiative. Cargill contributes USD 150,000 to this program annually, totaling 450,000 over three years.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals are reported in a water tracking system at the site-level. Data is sourced from water meters, water bills, and in some cases, calculations are derived from other available water data.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) are required to have a water inventory that includes water intake volumes. All priority water facilities are required to have continuous inline monitoring as part of the implementation of the water stewardship program. They together account for more than 70% of the total volumes of withdrawal. Hence, the majority of water withdrawal data is sourced from continuous water metering. For the remaining facilities, water withdrawal data is mainly sourced from monthly water bills.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals by source are reported in a water tracking system at the site-level. Data is sourced from water meters, water bills, and in some cases, calculations derived from other available water data.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) are required to have a water inventory that includes water intake volumes by source. All priority water facilities are required to have continuous inline monitoring as part of the implementation of the water stewardship program. They together account for more than 70% of the total volumes of withdrawal. Hence, the majority of water withdrawal by source data is sourced from continuous water metering. For the remaining facilities, data is mainly sourced from monthly water bills. For small sites that are immaterial water users, this responsibility is limited to monitoring total water use.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Daily

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The quality of water withdrawals is measured and monitored at site level ranging from inline continuous monitoring to daily sampling, depending on water use and legal requirements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Monitoring coverage applies (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) where water withdrawals quality is relevant (76-99% of total facilities) because of water use and legal requirements and not guaranteed by third party suppliers e.g., in case of direct intake by Cargill operations or due to food safety standards. Cargill has additional requirements in its Global EHS requirements that go beyond legal obligations to measure and monitor access to safe drinking water at the sites.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

All sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) are required to have a water inventory that includes water discharge volumes for direct and indirect discharges. For all sites, the treatment method applied by the facility is captured through the deployment of the EHS policy and Global Water Requirement and differentiates between biological and physical/chemical treatment.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Sites are required to report the water discharge by treatment method in the water tracking system on a monthly basis. For very small sites that are immaterial water users, this responsibility is limited to monitoring total water discharge volume. All sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities)

are required to have a water inventory that includes water discharge volumes. All priority water facilities (accounting for approximately 70% of the overall volume) are required to have continuous inline monitoring as part of the implementation of the water stewardship program;. Hence, the majority of water discharge data is sourced from continuous water metering. For the remaining facilities, data is mainly sourced from monthly water bills. All sites excluding recent acquisitions with a water usages above 100 m3 per day report total discharge volumes.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

All sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) are required to have a water inventory that includes water discharge volumes for direct and indirect discharges. For all sites, the treatment method applied by the facility is captured through the deployment of the EHS policy and Global Water Requirement and differentiates between biological and physical/chemical treatment.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Sites are required to report the water discharge by treatment method in the water tracking system on a monthly basis. For very small sites that are immaterial water users, this responsibility is limited to monitoring total water discharge volume. All sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) are required to have a water inventory that includes water discharge volumes for direct and indirect discharges. For all sites, the treatment method applied by the facility is captured through the deployment of the EHS policy and Global Water Requirement and differentiates between biological and physical/chemical treatment. Sites are required to report the water discharge by treatment method in the water tracking system on a monthly basis.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharges are reported in a water tracking system at the site level and aggregated at the corporate level. At the site-level, water discharges are monitored more frequently, ranging from inline flow meters for large water users to monthly totals for smaller sites. Data is sourced from water meters, water bills, and in some cases, calculations derived from other available water data.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) are required to have a water inventory that includes water discharge volumes for direct and indirect discharges. For all sites, the treatment method applied by the facility is captured through the deployment of the EHS policy and Global Water Requirement and differentiates between biological and physical/chemical treatment. Sites are required to report the water discharge by treatment method in the water tracking system on a monthly basis. For very small sites that are immaterial water users, this responsibility is limited to monitoring total water discharge volume.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Frequency and method of measurement: Water discharge quality is monitored at the site level in accordance with legal requirements. Water discharge quality is reported in a water tracking system monthly at the corporate level for priority sites operating in areas that face water quality challenges. Data may be sourced from onsite monitoring, test, permits or other sources.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Unless otherwise required by regulation, detailed water discharge tracking is required at sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) based on water withdrawal volume and water stress criteria. We permit additional opt-in voluntary reporting by sites based upon local knowledge. Sites are required to report the water discharge quality by standard effluents in the water tracking system on a monthly basis.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge quality – emissions to water is monitored at the site level in accordance with legal requirements. Priority facilities that are identified to have water quality as shared water challenge are required to report the emissions to water for relevant pollutants in the water tracking system on a monthly basis. For most sites this is focused on Total Nitrogen, Total Phosphorous and Organic Matter, reported as Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD).

(9.2.4) Please explain

Onsite inline monitoring as well is sampling is used and may be integrated in operating systems or, if not integrated, detailed in Standard Operating Procedures for monitoring on site. Emissions in water discharged is monitored for all facilities (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) as per legal requirements. Priority facilities that are identified to have water quality as shared water challenge are required to report the emissions to water for relevant pollutants in the water tracking system on a monthly basis.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge quality – temperature is monitored at the site level in accordance with legal requirements. Temperature of water discharged is monitored for all facilities where temperature is relevant, in case of direct discharges. This applies to facilities relying on large volumes of water for cooling purposes, like zero-contact cooling and facilities that might discharge process water at elevated temperatures.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Onsite inline monitoring is used and may be integrated in operating systems or, if not integrated, detailed in Standard Operating Procedures for monitoring on site and documenting in daily report. Water discharge quality - temperature is reported in a water tracking system at the site-level. Data is sourced from water meters, water bills, and in some cases, calculations are derived from other available water data. For small sites that are immaterial water users, the water consumption is estimated based on reported intake and discharge volumes.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water consumption is reported in a water tracking system at the site-level. Data is sourced from water meters, water bills, and in some cases, calculations are derived from other available water data. For small sites that are immaterial water users, the water consumption is estimated based on reported intake and discharge volumes.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water consumption is reported in a water tracking system at the site-level. Data is sourced from water meters, water bills, and in some cases, calculations are derived from other available water data. For small sites that are immaterial water users, the water consumption is estimated based on reported intake and discharge volumes.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water recycled/reused is reported in a water tracking system at the site-level and aggregated at the corporate level. Data is sourced from water meters, water bills, and in some cases, calculations are derived from other available water data. Additionally, site level monitoring exists as part of water management practices, benchmarking, KPI's and regulatory requirements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Coverage applies to sites (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) where water recycle/reuse is relevant, namely as part of water management practices, benchmarking, KPI's and regulatory requirements (51-75% of total facilities). Small sites that are immaterial water users are exempt from this requirement.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**At a minimum of every three years

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

At a site level, control measures are to be identified and effectiveness monitored to ensure access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene at an appropriate level of standard. This can include controls for prevention of cross-contamination between drinking water and other water supplies, as well as periodic testing of drinking water supply aligned with governmental or WHO guidelines at point of use. Also, access to soap, wash basins, method for hand drying & appropriate number of toilets/urinals.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Per Cargill Global EHS Requirement, all facilities (i.e. our different geographic operated manufacturing and processing facilities) are required to monitor access to WASH services, the frequency of monitoring depends on the type of water supply. Small sites that are immaterial water users are exempt from this requirement. [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)

322081

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The facilities with the largest water use are the salt production facilities that rely on ocean water as input material. The volumes that are withdrawn at the salt production are primarily influenced by changes in business activities associated with production capacity at those facilities. The second-largest category is facilities that rely on once-through cooling water. Once-through cooling is primarily driven by temperature and local weather conditions. Cargill operates a diverse portfolio of facilities in more than 70 countries. Due to the diversity of operations and locations, we expect generally stable water withdrawals, discharges, and consumption from year to year.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

256548

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Facility closure

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The difference with previous year is primarily driven by business activity in our salt processing facilities. We have updated the reporting process for a large salt production site which uses solar evaporation. During heavy rainfalls salt facilities discharge rainwater to the ocean. We are now accounting and reporting heavy rainfall discharged to ocean as a discharge to salt water, whereas previously we were not including rainfall discharged to the ocean in our water balance calculations. Including this rainfall discharged to ocean in our reporting is responsible for all the increased volumes associated with discharge to salt water bodies. If you exclude the new volumes now being accounted for, our discharge is 4% less than last year's discharge. Cargill operates a diverse portfolio of facilities in more than 70 countries. Due to the diversity of operations and locations, we expect generally stable water withdrawals, discharges, and consumption from year-to- year. Future changes in volume will primarily be driven by acquisitions and divestitures and changes in business activity of our salt processing plants and the sites using Once-Through Cooling and is not expected to vary significantly.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

65533

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(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 business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The total consumption is based on the aggregation of local measurements and calculations of consumption at individual sites. The method varies per business, based on the specific characteristics of the consumptive use. In our salt business, the aggregated monthly data are summed because of significant water-holding reservoirs that are discharged during certain months. This results in an imbalance of the monthly data that is levelled out over the months. We have updated the reporting process for a large salt production site which uses solar evaporation. During heavy rainfalls salt facilities discharge rainwater to the ocean. We are now accounting and reporting heavy rainfall discharged to ocean as a discharge to salt water, whereas previously we were not including rainfall discharged to the ocean in our water balance calculations. Including this rainfall discharged to ocean in our reporting is responsible for all the higher discharge volumes associated with discharge to salt water bodies. For salt facilities, we calculate consumption based on intake volume minus discharge volume. Because we have increased our discharge volume while our intake volume has remained the same, our total consumption is much lower. Previously the heavy rainfall volumes now classified as discharge were classified as consumption.
[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)

40090

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Facility closure

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

12.45

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Aqueduct Global Maps 3.0 Data was downloaded from https://www.wri.org/aqueduct/data. The shape file which includes baseline water stress by basin was spatially joined to a file containing the geolocations of all Cargill sites (full coverage). The results include a baseline water stress percent for all sites. A 40% threshold, meaning watersheds in which total annual withdrawals represent 40% or more of renewable supply, are deemed a priority due to severity of the water challenge. Cargill updated its reporting system to align with the water inventory accounting. The volume of water withdrawn in water stressed regions has decreased. We are implementing our water stewardship program at priority facilities, including all material water users in water stressed regions. The increased focus on water monitoring has led to a reduction in withdrawal. A large part of this total volume withdrawn in water stressed regions is driven by Once-Through Cooling from facilities that are classified as water stressed according to the World Resources Institute (WRI) Aqueduct maps. These facilities are located next to a large river or rely on saltwater, and have little consumptive use; therefore, the future amount of water withdrawn in water stressed areas is expected to be primarily influenced by acquisitions and divestitures. We have closed or are closing multiple sites in water stressed regions, which will result in lower water withdrawals in water stressed regions in the future. [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 this commodity sourced from water stress areas is known as we mapped our sourcing locations through the World Resources Institute (WRI) Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas and the WRI Aqueduct Food tools (in the context of our enterprise-wide water target setting). These tools have the best available global data on water risks and provide catchment-specific water risk information for more than 16,000 HydroBASINS level 6 catchments globally. We have mapped our supply chain against three factors driving water stress: availability, quality and accessibility. The scoring is reflective of the volume that is exposed to water depletion,

based on baseline water depletion data in Aqueduct Food. Sourcing decisions are unlikely to change in the near future, so any changes will largely be dependent on the methodology used - for example - using Science-Based Targets for Nature (SBTN) dataset instead of the WRI Aqueduct tool.
[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)

105475

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

The availability of water is critical for operations. Most of the facilities that rely on direct fresh surface water are located in regions with abundant water resources. In some cases, alternative sources might not be available, or only available at higher cost. The volumes are reported as part of our water inventory requirements and to help each location understand its impact in the local context. Due to the diversity of operations and locations we expect generally stable water withdraws, discharges, and consumption from year to year. Most of the withdrawal of surface water volume is discharged in the watershed after treatment and is withdrawn in areas that are not facing water stress. These volumes fluctuate but on average stay about the same, the most influential factor is mergers, acquisitions, and closures. The largest reduction in surface water withdrawals is due to decreased water withdrawals at a major US facility.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

72165

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Cargill's water strategy focuses on driving change based on where it is needed most and where we can drive positive change. Cargill's use of brackish water and seawater is not facing depletion. The volumes are reported as part of our water inventory requirements and to help each location understand its impact in the local context. The withdrawal of seawater is primarily driven by our salt production facilities that rely on seawater for salt production. The amount withdrawn depends on the holding capacity in the ponds and is influenced by the amount of rainfall. The influence of rainfall across the area of salt facilities makes salt intakes and discharge fluctuate based on precipitation patterns.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

50596

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Cargill facilities rely on renewable groundwater as they use shallow wells. Only a few sites rely solely on direct withdrawal from ground water. The availability of water is critical for operations and in some cases alternative sources might not be available, or only available at higher cost. Monitoring of groundwater availability is integrated into our water risk assessment. Our use of groundwater has remained the same. Due to the diversity of operations and locations, we expect generally stable water withdraws, discharges, and consumption from year to year. Most of the withdrawal volume from renewable groundwater consist of zero-contact water. These volumes fluctuate but on average stay about the same.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Groundwater - non-renewable is not a relevant water source for Cargill.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2447

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We track produced/entrained water to facilitate sites tracking these volumes to close their water balance in their reporting, for example our corn processing facilities track water entering the process through raw material. At a Cargill-level, this volume is not material for our overall water usage and impact on water resources. Future produced/entrained water is expected to be about the same, although we may see minor changes.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

90592

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Cargill facilities require a secure and reliable water source with consistent good quality to assure food safety standards. Municipal water supply is often used for food processing steps. Due to the diversity of operations and locations we see some changes in water sources that are used and some sites use different sources depending on the quality standard required for the specific process step, thus combining city water with e.g., fresh surface water. We have advanced the implementation of our water stewardship program. As a result, all priority facilities are required to have a closed water balance, resulting in more accurate monitoring of water volumes as part of shared facilities that are reported under third party sources intake. These flows include steam provided, or condensate returned. As a result, the water withdrawn from third parties is reported more consistently. Overall, we see about the same levels of water supply from third party sources and expect little variance.
[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)

138016

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Direct discharge is relevant due to the regulatory requirements that are associated with discharge to surface water. Also, it is important to understand the discharge volumes by destination to understand the environmental impact. Most of the volume is associated with zero contact water, which has the same composition as the withdrawal and only a change in temperature. This number is expected to be relatively stable unless there is influence by acquisitions, divestments, or reporting changes. Cargill operates a diverse portfolio of facilities in 70 countries. Due to the diversity of operations and locations, we expect generally stable water withdrawals, discharges, and consumption from year to year.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

61075

(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:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Several facilities are located close to the sea. The discharge volumes to saltwater are important to understand the site footprint in the local context & have an accurate calculation of the consumptive use of a facility. An update was made to the reporting scheme to aggregate the data globally. The difference with previous year is primarily driven by business activity in our salt processing facilities. We updated the reporting process for a large salt production site that uses solar evaporation. During heavy rainfalls salt facilities discharge rainwater to the ocean. We are now accounting & reporting heavy rainfall discharged to ocean as a discharge to salt water, previously rainfall discharged to the ocean was not included in our calculations. Including this rainfall discharged to ocean is responsible for all the increased volumes associated with discharge to saltwater bodies. If you exclude the new volumes now being accounted, our discharge is 4% less than last year's discharge.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

9690

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

This volume is tracked to ensure that we understand the impact of the facility on groundwater and can calculate the consumptive use of the facility. For example, our Tropical Palm facilities in Indonesia discharge to land to keep the water available in the local watershed. This number is expected to be relatively stable unless there is influence by acquisitions, divestments, or reporting changes. Cargill operates a diverse portfolio of facilities in 70 countries. Due to the diversity of operations and locations, we expect generally stable water withdrawals, discharges, and consumption from year to year.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

66363

(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

This volume is tracked and reported by facilities to ensure that we understand the impact of the facility on municipal, water, and wastewater utilities, and so we can calculate the consumptive use of the facility. We have acquired a new facility in a location with low water stress location. The facility is at sea level and sits above a high groundwater table – the facility is required by local regulators to extract and discharge groundwater to limit groundwater table rise. This groundwater is not used for Cargill operational processes, it is immediately discharged by the facility without use, however we have tracked and reported this additional discharge since acquisition. Excluding this facility our discharge to third party is about the same as last year.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

58321

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Cargill's Global Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) requirements for water ensure that Cargill facilities that discharge process wastewater adhere to applicable permit and regulatory requirements under Federal, State/Provincial, and/or Local wastewater discharge regulations. Cargill's EHS audits review compliance programs at a minimum every three years and more often if water risk exposure has been identified. The audit includes performance against Federal, State/Provincial, and/or Local regulatory compliance and overall governance of the water compliance systems requirements. For example, in the state of Iowa, Cargill operates several facilities that have a State-issued NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit and that are subject to these regulations. To identify volume of

tertiary treatment, we use total discharge excluding once through cooling and direct discharge to salt water. We now distinguish between tertiary treatment by Cargill and pre-treatment as captured under other. The sum of the two volumes is about the same as reported in previous year.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Due to the nature of our business, our wastewater streams often include nutrients. In the design of the wastewater treatment plants, we optimize for both nutrient removal and removal for organic matter; therefore, we do not differentiate between tertiary treatment and secondary treatment. Additionally, we are currently not aggregating if volumes have pre-treatment before discharge to a third-party. As we plan to combine EHS (Environmental Health and Safety) datasets on treatment methods with reported discharge volumes in the coming year, the % primary treatment and secondary treatment is expected to shift.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Due to the nature of our business, our wastewater streams often include nutrients. In the design of the wastewater treatment plants, we optimize for both nutrient removal and removal for organic matter; therefore, we do not differentiate between tertiary treatment and primary treatment. Additionally, we are currently not aggregating if volumes have pre-treatment before discharge to a third-party. As we plan to combine EHS (Environmental Health and Safety) datasets on treatment methods with reported discharge volumes in the coming year, the % primary treatment and secondary treatment is expected to shift.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

150459

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Water discharged directly, without treatment is either once-through cooling water or salt facility discharges to salt water bodies. Once-through cooling volumes of water are not in contact with product and are discharged to the same source at the water was withdrawn from. Environmental impact studies have been conducted to ensure that the volumes have no adverse effect on water quality. Outside of the once-through cooling, we have no untreated discharge directly to the environment. This is part of our Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) Water requirements and water commitments to eliminate all discharge to the natural environment without treatment. Cargill's Global EHS requirements for water ensures that Cargill meets or exceeds applicable national, state, and local water-related laws and regulations; this includes discharge to the natural environment without treatment. For example, Cargill operates several facilities in the State of Iowa and is subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulatory and Permitting requirements. Our internal EHS audits review compliance programs at a minimum every three years and more often if water risk exposure has been identified. The audit includes performance against regulatory compliance and overall governance of the water compliance systems requirements. The difference with previous year is driven by business activity in our salt processing facilities. We have updated the reporting process for a large salt production site which uses solar evaporation. During heavy rainfalls salt facilities discharge rainwater to the ocean. We are now accounting and reporting heavy rainfall discharged to ocean as a discharge to salt water, whereas previously we were not including rainfall discharged to the ocean in our water balance calculations. Including this rainfall discharged to ocean in our reporting is responsible for all the increased volumes associated with discharge to salt water bodies.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

26042

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

As part of our updated water strategy, we focus on shared water challenges and our contribution to these challenges. In the case of sites operating in regions that face water quality challenges, sites are required to monitor their monthly pollutant loads after final discharge. Cargill's wastewater treatment streams often contain easily degradable organic matter that is an essential component for the optimized treatment and nutrient removal of a wastewater treatment plant. For example, in Bergen op Zoom, Netherlands, we align with the receiving municipal treatment plant on the actual load, as well as the ratio of organic matter to other nutrients and suspended solids to optimize the treatment for all stakeholders. Previously, it was challenging for us to aggregate water volumes which had some form of pre-treatment, therefore we were over-reporting our water discharge which fell into this category. We have now aggregated the volumes discharged to third parties which have some form of pre-treatment and can better identify the volumes discharged to third parties without any form of pre-treatment. Last year, we reported this volume

was expected to shift with improved data and reporting, and improved data and reporting now shows that 39% of our volumes discharged to third parties have no form of pre-treatment.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

21725

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This volume consists of water discharged to a 3rd party with pre-treatment. Due to the nature of our business the nutrients in our discharges are pre-treated based on the requirements of the 3rd party treatment works.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization’s emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

1008

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☑ Nitrates

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

We aggregate the total discharged load to receiving water bodies for priority facilities that have identified water quality as the shared water challenge for the watershed where they operate. This is done using global models as well as local knowledge on water challenges. Cargill monitors the discharge leaving the facilities and calculated the final load based on treatment levels by third-party treatment if applicable for the specific facility. Other pollutants and pollutants that are from facilities that are not priority for water quality are monitored at the site level, per legal requirements. These pollutants are not aggregated at the global level and therefore are not included in the reported number. Total load is aggregated and reported out as Total Nitrogen. Most of our facilities in facing water quality challenges are based in Western Europe and have stringent discharge requirements. Additionally, some of our NA sites are reporting water quality. These facilities are not upstream of vulnerable populations. Our water stewardship program includes an assessment to optimize wastewater treatment, including identification of industrial streams for nutrient recycle and/or by-product use.
[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:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

Cargill's risk rating framework is aligned to our overall risk assessment criteria used for audit and compliance issues. The framework defines substantive impacts and related risks as those escalated to senior leadership and ultimately the Board, e.g. risks rated Important / Significant / Critical gets reported to the Audit Committee of the Board. The framework is underscored by a definition of substantive financial or strategic impact based on our values and obligations to deliver to our customers. Our threshold for determining risk level is as follows: Low: 3% of projected AOE. We measure strategic impact through the risk of disruptions in our supply chain and possible disruptions to deliver to customers; these are assessed through considering likelihood of occurrence and potential impacts using scales tailored to the impact criteria (e.g. financial, business disruption, reputation). A substantive impact would be those rated Important / Significant / Critical. Thresholds of impact are dependent on the risk type and specific risk criteria. For example, a risk posing over 50 million in potential impact would be considered Important to Significant based solely on financial criteria. Should some customers and suppliers be affected by a risk, including possible loss of strategic customers or suppliers and substantial loss to market share, then the risk would be considered significant in terms of business disruption criteria. Assessments of likelihood are aligned with the time horizons which business leaders use to make investment decisions. Our definition and metrics apply to our operations, supply chain and communities.

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, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

Cargill's risk rating framework is aligned to our overall risk assessment criteria used for audit and compliance issues. The framework defines substantive impacts and related risks as those escalated to senior leadership and ultimately the Board, e.g. risks rated Important / Significant / Critical gets reported to the Audit Committee of the Board. The framework is underscored by a definition of substantive financial or strategic impact based on our values and obligations to deliver to our customers. Our threshold for determining risk level is as follows: Low: 3% of projected AOE. We measure strategic impact through the risk of disruptions in our supply chain and possible disruptions to deliver to customers; these are assessed through considering likelihood of occurrence and potential impacts using scales tailored to the impact criteria (e.g. financial, business disruption, reputation). A substantive impact would be those rated Important / Significant / Critical. Thresholds of impact are dependent on the risk type and specific risk criteria. For example, a risk posing over 50 million in potential impact would be considered Important to Significant based solely on financial criteria. Should some customers and suppliers be affected by a risk, including possible loss of strategic customers or suppliers and substantial loss to market share, then the risk would be considered significant in terms of business disruption criteria. Assessments of likelihood are aligned with the time horizons which business leaders use to make investment decisions. Our definition and metrics apply to our operations, supply chain and communities.
[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:
☑ This is confidential

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	177000000000	*549551.20*	*Expected to stay the same as our revenue and our operational water use are not explicitly coupled.*

[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)

57

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Freshwater consumption

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.9.6) Please explain

We have calculated the water intensity for all key commodities in our supply chain at a watershed level (HYDROBASIN6). This is done based by using gridded data and aggregating these data at watershed level based on the weighted distribution of our origination footprint. This is described in detail in the practice note published by WRI. (Developing Enterprise Water Targets Informed by Local Contexts: Cargill's Approach World Resources Institute (wri.org)): WRI converted each crop's blue water footprint by catchment into Cargill's blue water footprint. We multiplied the amount sourced by Cargill for each crop by the crop blue water footprint. Then, the crop blue water footprints for each watershed were summed to estimate Cargill's total blue water footprint per watershed. The result is a Cargill specific water intensity based on the best available data for water consumption from irrigation, also known as the blue water footprint. Cargill has assessed anticipated future trends for maize sourcing locations, for example in the United States, all watersheds are expected to maintain current status. This data is based on WRI's Aqueduct 2015 future projections dataset. Water is a complex global issue that requires a local approach. Water challenges and issues vary across the regions where we operate and source raw materials. We regularly review our sourcing regions to understand water challenges and issues. We have calculated the water intensity for all key commodities in our supply chain. We have used the Water Footprint Network dataset and applied the footprints at watershed level to calculate the water intensity. The number is lower than previous year because we have found anomalies in the calculation because some transboundary watersheds can cause small volumes in countries to have large footprints. This has been corrected in the updated calculation. Water intensity is monitored through aggregated data across our supply chain. Our strategy to reduce water intensity is focused on changes in origination regions to avoid high water footprints as well as projects to improve irrigation efficiency in water stressed regions.

[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Annex XVII of EU REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Fewer than 20 Cargill products contain substances that are classified as a Cat 1B carcinogen or reproductive toxin. Cargill considers product-level revenue data to be confidential.
[Add 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:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Reliable methods to quantify impact in a consistent way that align with customers expectation and awareness is lacking.

(9.14.4) Please explain

We mapped our agricultural supply chain data and calculated the impact of these agricultural commodities. The effect of a crop depends on the local context; a crop with a similar footprint grown in a water-stressed region has a different environmental impact. This is why we prioritize action where it's needed most across our supply chain, operations, and the communities we operate and source from, based on the local water challenges. Cargill is actively contributing to aligning terminology and methods to quantify the impact consistently related to positive water impact, which is currently lacking. We will continue to investigate how terminology and methodologies apply to agricultural supply chains and will align and classify accordingly.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water pollution	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*
Water withdrawals	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*

	Target set in this category	Please explain
	☑ Yes	
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*
Other	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	*Not applicable*

[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 (including suppliers)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Other water pollution, please specify :Reduction in pollutant load

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

05/31/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

05/30/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

5000

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

129

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

3

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Water Resilience Coalition

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target is to reduce 5000 MT of water pollutants in priority regions in our supply chain. We express our target in Metric Tons of Nitrogen or Nitrogen Equivalents. The target is set based on the mapping of our supply chain against the key shared water challenges of water availability, water quality and access to WASH. More specifically, for water quality we assessed our footprint against the shared water challenge of excess nutrients from agriculture. In areas where our footprint overlaps with a shared water challenge for water quality, we have assessed the desired change in the basin context. We determined the target based on our footprint multiplied by the desired change in the basin context for those watersheds that face shared water challenges related to water quality. The target applies to water stressed regions where we originate that face shared water challenges related to water quality.

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We will meet this target guided by the AR3T Framework, prioritizing actions to avoid, reduce, restore and regenerate on agricultural lands inside the value chain. Additionally, we will enact action following this hierarchy: Avoidance & reduction of pollutants in our value chain through changes to agricultural practices (e.g., nutrient management), changes to footprint outside the value chain to avoid pollutants, or reduced nutrient load to water; and restore & regenerate agricultural land in our value chain and watersheds around our value chain to address water quality pressures. Progress made by the end of the reporting year is 129 MT of Nitrogen or Nitrogen equivalent reduced. As of end of calendar 2023, we have 9 active projects with qualifying contributions, and 1 completed project for water quality.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Our target is to reduce 5000 MT of water pollutants in priority regions in our supply chain. We determined the target based on our footprint multiplied by the desired change in the basin context for those watersheds that face shared water challenges related to water quality. Our targets for water pollution sum of all these watershed targets, based on our 2020 supply chain and best available datasets at that time. The target applies to water stressed regions where we originate that face shared water challenges related to water quality. The approach has been published by the World Resources Institute in a practice note and a map of identified priority regions is available at cargill.com. The target is set because water is of critical importance to secure our supply chain. Aligned with SDG 6, we recognize that water challenges have multiple aspects including water quality. We focus where we have the most impact.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Other water withdrawals, please specify **:**Volume of water restored

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

05/31/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

05/30/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

600000000000

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

9200000000

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

2

(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

Our target is to enable the restoration of 600 billion liters of water priority regions in our supply chain. We express our target liter of water restored, aligned with Volumetric Water Benefit accounting. The target is set based on the mapping of our supply chain against the key shared water challenges of water availability, water quality and access to WASH. More specifically, for water availability we assessed our footprint against the shared water challenge of water depletion. In areas where our footprint overlaps with a shared water challenge for water availability, we have assessed the desired change in the basin context. Our targets for water restoration are the sum of all these watershed targets, based on our 2020 supply chain and best available datasets at that time. The target applies to water stressed regions where we originate that face shared water challenges related to water availability.

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We will meet this target guided by the AR3T Framework, prioritizing actions to avoid, reduce, restore and regenerate on agricultural lands inside the value chain. Additionally, we will enact action following this hierarchy: Reduction of water consumption and withdrawal in regions facing challenges related to water availability and resiliency through optimization of irrigation practices and increased irrigation efficiency and changes to our origination footprint to avoid water intense raw materials and/or water stressed regions, secondly we restore & regenerate agricultural land in our value chain and watersheds around our value chain to address water availability pressures. For example, through our BeefUp program we work NGO partners and ranchers to implement sustainable grazing practices that help restore grassland and we work with growers to implement regenerative agriculture practices through our RegenConnect program.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

As of end of calendar 2022, we had 8 active projects and 2 completed projects with qualifying contributions. A project qualifies as contributing to our targets to restore water in water stressed regions and enable water positive impact depends if a shared water challenges related to water availability has been identified and documented. We rely on global datasets as well as local documentation of shared water challenges for this assessment. The largest contributions in water volumes come from our projects on regenerative agriculture in the US. For impact quantification we work closely with expert consultants and trusted NGO partners to quantify and review the methodologies applied for quantification. A project counts as a qualifying project if the project has a quantifiable volumetric water benefit in a water priority region, or in a region that is facing local shared water challenges. We follow the widely accepted volumetric water benefit accounting (VWBA) as well as

impact calculation models like SWAT and NTT-APEX if data are available and in scope of the project. We apply appropriate VWBA methods to quantify volumetric water benefits, for example the CurveNumber and Volume captured method using appropriate metrics for the types of practice changes in our supply chain, for example reduced runoff, reduced withdrawal or increased water holding capacity. We aim to align with the updated Volumetric water benefit Accounting 2.0, once the document is published.

Row 3

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Basin level

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Other WASH, please specify **:**Priority regions with improved access to water and sanitation

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

05/31/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

05/30/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0.0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

500000

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

108000

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

22

(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

Our target is to enable improved access to safe drinking water and sanitation, reaching 500,000 people in priority communities. We express our target in number of people reached. The target is set based on the mapping of our supply chain against the key shared water challenges of water availability, water quality and access to WASH. More specifically, for WASH we assessed our footprint against the shared water challenge of unimproved drinking water and unimproved sanitation per the risk indicators in the WRI Aqueduct water risk atlas. Our targets for improved WASH are informed by the percentage of the population without access to drinking water or sanitation and our footprint in the regions, based on our 2020 supply chain and best available datasets at that time.

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Cargill is working to drive positive change, tailoring the specific needs of target communities in priority regions around the world. In partnership with global NGOs like CARE and Global Water Challenge, we're working to enable improved access to safe drinking water and sanitation for 500,000 people. We have continued the

collaborations for access to safe drinking water in the priority water regions of Ivory Coast, Ghana, Cameroon and Indonesia and reached new communities to improve access to water, sanitation and hygiene and build community resilience. We announced these targets in June 2020 and began collecting data at that time. As part of the strategy review and updated guidance on WASH accounting, we have decided to change the metric we use for accounting impact from priority watersheds to the number of beneficiaries. This is reflected in the updated language we use to describe our target.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

These targets were developed following a data-driven, risk-based approach, in close partnership with the World Resources Institute (WRI). They prioritize action where it is needed most, based on the specific challenges faced by our local businesses, communities, and the surrounding region. Our approach also considers our ability to drive change, connecting Cargill's footprint and those of relevant stakeholders in the value chain.
[Add row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water protection

☑ Land/water management

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Law & policy

☑ Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ State and benefit indicators

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
		☑ Pressure indicators

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Yes (partial assessment)	*Currently undergoing full assessment.*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Currently undergoing full assessment.*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Currently undergoing full assessment.*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Yes (partial assessment)	*Currently undergoing full assessment.*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Currently undergoing full assessment.*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Currently undergoing full assessment.*

[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 States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Cargill has salt production rights within the refuge boundaries.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Ramsar sites

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Cargill Salt Ponds Bonnaire

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Cargill has salt production ponds within the site.
[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?

(13.1.1) Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years

(13.1.2) Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(13.1.3) Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

Cargill currently go through full Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG verification by a third-party and will continue to increase the data and information verified by a third party in future years.
[Fixed row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

	Additional information
	N/A

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Sustainability Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

[Fixed row]

(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:

☑ No