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# C1. Introduction

## (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**

*We’re a world-leading supplier of high-performance, highly specialised polymers and ingredients that play vital roles in key sectors such as coatings, construction, adhesives, and health and protection – growing markets that serve billions of end users worldwide. Through our agile approach, we collaborate with more than 6,000 customers to enhance our existing products and services, and create innovative tailor-made solutions. From our innovation centres of excellence and manufacturing sites across Europe, North America and Asia, we collaborate closely with our customers to develop new products and enhance existing ones tailored to their needs, with an increasing range of sustainability benefits. And through our focus on making our business more efficient, more global and even more specialised, we are positioned to lead the way as a speciality business whose products enhance people’s homes and cities, lifestyles, transportation and healthcare. We employ 4,215 employees in our 4 innovation centres of excellence and more than 30 manufacturing sites across Europe, North America and Asia. Our headquarters are in London, UK. We serve our customers from regional centres in Europe, North America and Asia – while also operating innovation centres of excellence in Harlow, UK; Marl, Germany; Akron in Ohio, USA and Kulai, Malaysia. Through our local production sites, we can better meet our customers’ specific needs, reduce the cost of logistics and minimise our environmental impact. Our values help us achieve our purpose: creating innovative and sustainable solutions for the benefit of customers and society. We’re focused on innovation – welcoming change and new ideas. We value teamwork because we’re stronger as one team. We act with integrity and show respect. And we believe in accountability, delivering on our promises. Most important is safety, health and environment. We always have time to work safely. Our new divisional structure since January 2023 is a response to our strategic evolution and reflects the integration of recent acquisitions, while fundamentally aligning our specialty operations with our end markets. Synthomer is structured around three global divisions, Coatings & Construction Solutions, Adhesives Solutions and Health & Protection and Performance Materials. We deliver solutions across a broad spectrum of coating and construction applications. Our specialist polymers enhance the sustainable performance of the products we rely on in the modern world. We work across architectural and masonry coatings, mortar modification, waterproofing and flooring, fibre bonding for applications from technical fabric to nappies, and our energy solutions promote drilling stability in the most challenging operating environments. Our adhesive solutions bond, modify and compatibilise surfaces and components. Some typical end markets for our products include tapes and labels, packaging, hygiene, tyres and plastic modification, and we are a top one or two supplier across these markets in EMEA and the Americas. As well as bonding dissimilar surfaces together, our customisable products can help improve permeability, strength, elasticity, damping, dispersion and grip. We help enhance protection and performance in a wide array of industries. We are a world-leading supplier of NBR and SBR latex water-based polymers for medical glove manufacture and are Europe’s largest manufacturer of SBR and SA high-performance binders for graphic, speciality paper and food packaging coatings. Our SBR, HS-SBR and SA binders help make the backing for carpet and artificial turf, and as gel foam elastomers for floor coverings.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

|  | **End date of reporting year** | **Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period** | **Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *12/31/2023* | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes | *Select from:*  ☑ No |

*[Fixed row]*

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

*2021200000*

## (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:*

☑ Yes

**(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier**

*GB00BNTVWJ75*

**CUSIP number**

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**Ticker symbol**

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier**

*SYNT.L*

**SEDOL code**

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier**

*BNTVWJ7*

**LEI number**

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier**

*213800EHT3TI1KPQQJ56*

**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*

☑ China ☑ Mexico

☑ Egypt ☑ Austria

☑ Italy ☑ Belgium

☑ Spain ☑ Czechia

☑ France ☑ Germany

☑ Malaysia ☑ United Arab Emirates

☑ Portugal ☑ United States of America

☑ Viet Nam ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Netherlands

☑ Saudi Arabia

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

|  | **Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes, for some facilities | *The location of our sites can be found in Synthomer web page. https://www.synthomer.com/about-us/global-locations-page/* |

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Akron*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*41.049112*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-81.47452*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 2**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Asua*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*43.298198*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-2.939224*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 3**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Beachwood*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*41.450422*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-81.50215*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 4**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Calhoun*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*34.555379*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-84.935863*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 5**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Caojing*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*30.787599*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*121.454649*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 6**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Chester*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*34.695699*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-81.19671*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 7**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Dammam*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*26.254445*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*49.987682*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 8**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Egypt*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*30.292665*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*31.742343*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 9**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Filago*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*45.618249*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*9.549843*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 10**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Fitchburg*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*42.552243*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-71.848329*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 11**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Gent*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*51.098061*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*3.68811*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 12**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Harlow*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*51.783583*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*0.120591*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 13**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Hasselt*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*52.576347*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*6.097965*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 14**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Jefferson*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*40.267823*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-79.902609*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 15**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Kluang*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*2.028815*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*103.317266*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 16**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Langelsheim*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*51.931721*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*10.323354*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 17**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Le Harve*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*49.482818*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*0.282804*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 18**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Marl Chemie Park*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*51.678795*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*7.09492*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 19**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Middleburg*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*51.494621*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*3.643721*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 20**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Mogadore*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*41.045333*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-81.390713*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 21**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Ningbo*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*29.96114*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*121.73845*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 22**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Oss*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*51.777705*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*5.547727*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 23**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Pasir Gudang MST*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*1.462195*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*103.908599*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 24**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Pasir Gudang NBR*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*1.444384*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*103.910796*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage.*

**Row 25**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Pischelsdorf*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*48.330075*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*15.956183*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 26**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Ribecourt*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*49.508027*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*2.940462*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 27**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Roebuck*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*34.872139*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-81.973254*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 28**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Sant Albano*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*44.499002*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*7.718779*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 29**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Sintra*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*38.779859*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-9.347236*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 30**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Sokolov*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*50.181379*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*12.667683*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 31**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Stafford*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*29.629259*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-95.550294*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 32**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Stallingborough*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*53.603865*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-0.139801*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 33**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Uruapan*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*19.410541*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*102.053129*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 34**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Vietnam*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*10.884183*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*106.750406*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 35**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*William Blythe*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*53.754071*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-2.393376*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 36**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Worms*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*49.655375*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*8.363909*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 37**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Asia Innovation Centre*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*1.640596*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*103.606529*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 38**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Akron Tech Center*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*1.640596*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*103.606529*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 39**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*China Tech Centre*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*31.190315*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*121.588315*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 40**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Marl Office & Labs*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*51.667002*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*7.033686*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 41**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Franklin*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*36.650527*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-77.000149*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 42**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Longview*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*32.437324*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-94.702569*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

**Row 43**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Nanjing*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*32.05838*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*118.79647*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*No plans to improve coverage*

*[Add row]*

## (1.14) In which part of the chemicals value chain does your organization operate?

**Bulk organic chemicals**  
☑ Polymers

**Other chemicals**  
☑ Specialty inorganic chemicals

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

**Timber products**

**(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced**

*Select from:*

☑ Sourced

**(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Trading

**(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 unknown

**(1.22.11) Form of commodity**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Boards, plywood, engineered wood

☑ Paper

**(1.22.12) % of procurement spend**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

**(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(1.22.19) Please explain**

*Only timber products used are wooden pallets for storage and transportation.*

**Palm oil**

**(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:*

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

**(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)**

*63.97*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(1.22.9) Original unit**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Kilogram

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

*Total volume 63,970.00KG. Divided by 1000 to convert into metric tonnes.*

**(1.22.11) Form of commodity**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Refined palm oil

**(1.22.12) % of procurement spend**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

**(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(1.22.19) Please explain**

*Synthomer buys RBD (refined, bleached, and deodorized) palm oil from local refiner. Refiner sources crude palm oil from Malaysia.*

**Soy**

**(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced**

*Select from:*

☑ Sourced

**(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Processing

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

*Select from:*

☑ Direct soy only

**(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)**

*4602.18*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(1.22.9) Original unit**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Kilogram

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

*Total volume 4,602,180 KG. Divide by 1000 to convert to metric tonnes.*

**(1.22.11) Form of commodity**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Soybean oil

**(1.22.12) % of procurement spend**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

**(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(1.22.19) Please explain**

*Synthomer buys RBD (refined, bleached, and deodorized) soy bean oil and soy fatty acid for production sites in Malaysia and Portugal. Suppliers are local for Soyabean oil and Taiwan/Japan for soya fatty acid but areas of soybeans origin are North and South America.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

**(1.24.1) Value chain mapped**

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

**(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped**

*Select from:*

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

*Select from:*

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

**(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping**

*Select from:*

☑ Smallholders not relevant, and not included

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

*We are a petrochemical business to business manufacturer, using primarily monomers from established cracking and refining processes. We understand and know the chemistry and upstream sources in detail. We segment our full supply base using several different risk lenses to understand and manage the risks appropriately. This includes accreditation requirements, Supplier Code of Conduct and also as members of Together for Sustainability (TFS) we are adoption their guidance and standards for assessments and audits for our targeted supplier.*

*[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, and we do not plan to within the next two years

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

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. This year we chose not to update our materiality assessment using our existing methodology, given the changing sustainability reporting requirements under the EU’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB). We are developing a ‘double’ materiality approach, in line with CSRD and ISSB, which will assess the issues that are material to our business prospects and their impact on the wider world. The double materiality assessment will include, but not be limited to the EFRAG European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS). This is a significant project, but we believe it will help us further integrate sustainability issues into our decision making, performance and disclosures. We expect to complete this work in 2024.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

|  | **Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity** | **Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Palm oil | *Select from:*  ☑ No | *Select from:*  ☑ Tier 1 suppliers |
| Soy | *Select from:*  ☑ No | *Select from:*  ☑ Tier 1 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)**

*2*

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

*Aligned with 2025, the short term horizon defined by the company for the quantitative and qualitative scenario analysis*

**Medium-term**

**(2.1.1) From (years)**

*2*

**(2.1.3) To (years)**

*7*

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

*Targeting 2030 to align with low carbon economy roadmap target years and with the medium term targets defined by the company*

**Long-term**

**(2.1.1) From (years)**

*7*

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(2.1.3) To (years)**

*27*

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

*Targeting 2050 to align with low carbon economy roadmap target years, and typical long term business investment strategy*

*[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

☑ 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

☑ End of life management

**(2.2.2.4) Coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Full

**(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

**(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment**

*Select from:*

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

**(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment**

*Select from:*

☑ More than once a year

**(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

**(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process**

*Select from:*

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

**(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

**(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used**

**Commercially/publicly available tools**  
☑ IBAT for Business

**Enterprise Risk Management**  
☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Risk models

**International methodologies and standards**  
☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

☑ Life Cycle Assessment

**Other**  
☑ Desk-based research

☑ External consultants

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

☑ Scenario analysis

**(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered**

**Acute physical**  
☑ Drought

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

☑ Heat waves

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

**Chronic physical**  
☑ Water stress ☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

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

☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

**Policy**  
☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

☑ Changes to national legislation

**Market**  
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

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

**Technology**  
☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

**Liability**  
☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

**(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers ☑ Local communities

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(2.2.2.16) Further details of process**

*The Board is responsible overall for ensuring that risk is effectively managed across the Group and for creating the framework for our risk management to operate effectively. On the Board’s behalf, the Audit Committee reviews and assesses the effectiveness of the Group’s risk management and internal control processes and monitors our risk exposure. Our Executive Risk Committee (ERC), introduced in 2022 and chaired by the Chief Financial Officer, is responsible for: 1. Conducting top-down risk assessments and reviews 2. Maintaining an overview of the key risks identified across the Group and how adequate our risk responses are 3. Assessing and reporting on principal and emerging risks to the Audit Committee and Board. We have a structured risk management framework that operates at division and Group function level. We use a standard methodology to quantify risk, with a risk assessment matrix to make sure risks are assessed consistently. The risk matrix looks at three risk dimensions: 1. The likelihood of the risk materialising 2. Its potential impact 3. The velocity – the time between the risk crystallising and its impact being felt Our divisions and functions conduct their own bottom-up risk assessments and record them in a risk register using the Group’s standard risk management methodology. They assess risks at both an inherent (gross) level and a residual (net) level, considering the mitigating controls that are in place. Risk owners also identify any additional activities that could mitigate the risk in line with our risk appetite, accepting that some level of risk-taking is necessary. We categorise our risks – and consider how effective our mitigating actions and controls are – in four areas: 1. Strategic risks that could prevent us achieving our strategic objectives 2. Operational risks that, if not successfully managed, would threaten our viability – these relate to our ability to operate a sustainable and safe business 3. Compliance risks, where a breach of regulations or laws could lead to fines from regulators or to reputational harm, which may disproportionately affect our standing in the investor and wider community 4. Financial risks relating to the Group’s funding and fiscal security As well as known risks, we identify and analyse emerging risks – and the need to mitigate them – as part of our existing risk management processes. Emerging risks are events that present uncertainty. They may affect us in the longer term, but we do not currently have sufficient information to understand and assess the likely scale, impact or velocity of the risk – or to define an appropriate risk response. Through the ERC, Audit Committee and Board, we continue to embed and discuss emerging risks as part of our risk programme, to make sure they are appropriately considered and monitored. We have assessed climate change as an emerging risk because it continues to evolve – so it remains integral to our risk management processes. Having thoroughly reviewed climate change risks and opportunities with input from TCFD scenario analysis, we believe climate change risk is best managed within our principal risks rather than separately, as a standalone principal risk. So, as part of our risk review, we have integrated climate-related risks into our principal risks, including physical risks – primarily the potential impact of droughts, flooding, rises in sea level and extreme temperatures on business operations – and transitional risks – primarily the po*

*[Add row]*

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

**(2.2.7.1) Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(2.2.7.3) Primary reason for not assessing interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(2.2.7.4) Explain why you do not assess the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities**

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. This year we chose not to update our materiality assessment using our existing methodology, given the changing sustainability reporting requirements under the EU’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB). We are developing a ‘double’ materiality approach, in line with CSRD and ISSB, which will assess the issues that are material to our business prospects and their impact on the wider world. The double materiality assessment will include, but not be limited to the EFRAG European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) including ESRS E4 Biodiversity and Ecosystems. This is a significant project, but we believe it will help us further integrate sustainability issues into our decision making, performance and disclosures. We expect to complete this work in 2024. Alongside the double materiality we will assess the requirements of the Taskforce for Nature-related Financial Disclosure (TNFD) in September 2024 to determine how it might be relevant for our company.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

**(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, we are currently in the process of identifying priority locations

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

**(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified**

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

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

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

*We have conducted a comprehensive review of all our sites utilizing the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) to assess their biodiversity impact. Through this analysis, we have identified the top five sites with the most significant impact on biodiversity. Initially, we employed the Aqueduct Water Risk Tool from the Water Resources Institute (WRI) to identify baseline and future water risks at all our sites. Subsequently, we assessed the scale of water withdrawal and consumption across these sites. Finally, we conducted a site survey for each location to evaluate water-related risks and issues.*

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

*Select from:*

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

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Risks**

**(2.4.1) Type of definition**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

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

*Select from:*

☑ EBITDA

**(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**

*Climate change and water related risks are included in Synthomer’s general risk assessment process. This includes a scoring methodology to quantify risks twice yearly, ranking them based on a combined view of their economic, operational or reputational impact and the likelihood that they may occur. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) lost or 1 month’s Business Interruption. Risks were assessed over a five-year period to December 2028, being the period covered by our approved strategic plan. It includes analysis of product and profit performance, cash flow, investment programmes and returns to shareholders. We have assessed climate change as an emerging risk because it continues to evolve. Having thoroughly reviewed climate change risks with input from TCFD scenario analysis, we believe it is best managed within our principal risks rather than separately, as a standalone principal risk. We have integrated climate-related risks into our principal risks, including physical risks – primarily the potential impact of droughts, flooding, rises in sea level and extreme temperatures on business operations – and transitional risks – primarily the potential impacts of carbon taxes, market changes and environmental policy changes. Our principal risks that include the impact of climate change are: 1. Delivery of our strategic initiatives 2. Technology and innovation 3. Disruption in supply to customers 4. Energy security and price risk in Europe 5. Ethics and compliance.. A sensitivity analysis has been undertaken, focusing on the impact of the principal risks over the five-year period, and the availability and likely effectiveness of mitigating actions. The risks have been assessed for their potential impact on the Group’s business model, future trading and funding structure. The sensitivity analysis has considered a number of severe but plausible scenarios, linked to the risks considered to have the most significant financial impact. The possible impact of climate change on future cash flows is assessed, in particular carbon pricing. In the event of global coordination of carbon pricing we consider it likely that we would be able to pass such costs on to our customers if material. The sensitivity analysis has therefore not been amended to include reduced profits from carbon pricing.*

**Opportunities**

**(2.4.1) Type of definition**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

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

*Select from:*

☑ EBITDA

**(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**

*Climate change and water related opportunities are included in Synthomer’s general risk assessment process. This includes a scoring methodology to quantify risks twice yearly, ranking them based on a combined view of their economic, operational or reputational impact and the likelihood that they may occur. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) increase. Opportunities were assessed over a five-year period to December 2028, being the period covered by our approved strategic plan. It includes analysis of product and profit performance, cash flow, investment programmes and returns to shareholders. We have assessed climate change as an emerging risk because it continues to evolve. Having thoroughly reviewed climate change opportunities with input from TCFD scenario analysis, we believe it is best managed within our principal risks rather than separately, as a standalone principal risk. We have integrated climate-related opportunities into our principal risks - primarily the potential impacts of carbon taxes, market changes and environmental policy changes. Our principal risks that include the impact of climate change are: 1. Delivery of our strategic initiatives 2. Technology and innovation 3. Disruption in supply to customers 4. Energy security and price risk in Europe 5. Ethics and compliance. A sensitivity analysis has been undertaken, focusing on the impact of the principal risks over the five-year period, and the availability and likely effectiveness of mitigating actions. The opportunities have been assessed for their potential impact on the Group’s business model, future trading and funding structure. The sensitivity analysis has considered a number of severe but plausible scenarios, linked to the opportunities considered to have the most significant financial impact. The possible impact of climate change on future cash flows is assessed, in particular carbon pricing. In the event of global coordination of carbon pricing we consider it likely that we would be able to pass such costs on to our customers if material.*

**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

**(2.4.3) Change to indicator**

*Select from:*

☑ Absolute decrease

**(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure**

*1*

**(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**

*Business interruption 1 month. Climate change and water related risks are included in Synthomer’s general risk assessment process. This includes a scoring methodology to quantify risks twice yearly, ranking them based on a combined view of their economic, operational or reputational impact and the likelihood that they may occur. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) lost or 1 month’s Business Interruption. Risks were assessed over a five-year period to December 2028, being the period covered by our approved strategic plan. It includes analysis of product and profit performance, cash flow, investment programmes and returns to shareholders. We have assessed climate change as an emerging risk because it continues to evolve. Having thoroughly reviewed climate change risks with input from TCFD scenario analysis, we believe it is best managed within our principal risks rather than separately, as a standalone principal risk. We have integrated climate-related risks into our principal risks, including physical risks – primarily the potential impact of droughts, flooding, rises in sea level and extreme temperatures on business operations – and transitional risks – primarily the potential impacts of carbon taxes, market changes and environmental policy changes. Our principal risks that include the impact of climate change are: 1. Delivery of our strategic initiatives 2. Technology and innovation 3. Disruption in supply to customers 4. Energy security and price risk in Europe 5. Ethics and compliance.. A sensitivity analysis has been undertaken, focusing on the impact of the principal risks over the five-year period, and the availability and likely effectiveness of mitigating actions. The risks have been assessed for their potential impact on the Group’s business model, future trading and funding structure. The sensitivity analysis has considered a number of severe but plausible scenarios, linked to the risks considered to have the most significant financial impact. The possible impact of climate change on future cash flows is assessed, in particular carbon pricing. In the event of global coordination of carbon pricing we consider it likely that we would be able to pass such costs on to our customers if material. The sensitivity analysis has therefore not been amended to include reduced profits from carbon pricing.*

*[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**

*Most of our operations are certified ISO14001 ensuring the identification and evaluation of all the environmental aspects including water pollutants that could have a detrimental impact on water and human health. A company procedure: SHEMS 12.01 "Effluent measurement and monitoring" has been developed to ensure that all Synthomer group companies have systems in place to measure and monitor their site’s liquid effluent discharges. Synthomer is committed to the UK Chemical Industries Association Sustainable Development guiding principles and the worldwide chemical industry Responsible Care programme. To this end, sites must be able to quantify their effluent releases in terms of quantity and quality to enable the impacts of such to be assessed. These impacts can then be managed such that the Group Safety, Health and Environmental Policy and Group Sustainable Development Policy objectives, relevant to liquid effluents and resource use, are met at all times. At facility level sites measure and report against a range of metrics. Analysis methods are in line with relevant national standards as set by the regulator (e.g. MCERTS in the UK). At Group level we request sites to report effluent discharge related phosphorus compound content, nitrogen/nitrate content, chemical oxygen demand and a range of potential heavy metal content.*

*[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**

*This refers to heavy metals that are dangerous because their toxicity and because they tend to bio-accumulate.Human exposure to heavy metals can result in different types of diseases.*

**(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

**(2.5.1.5) Please explain**

*Most sites are certified under ISO 14001. Programs to prevent loss of containment are in place company wide. All sites need to report immediately any non compliance with effluent quality and any significant loss of containment and need to put in place actions to prevent recurrence. The number of these and corrective actions taken are tracked centrally. Sites also report centrally the amount of heavy metals released at least once per year. Any significant change vs. previous year needs to be addressed.*

**Row 2**

**(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category**

*Select from:*

☑ Nitrates

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

*This refers to Nitrogen compounds. Excess nitrogen can harm water bodies. Excess nitrogen can cause over-stimulation of growth of aquatic plants and algae. Excessive growth of these organisms, in turn, can clog water intakes, use up dissolved oxygen as they decompose, and block light to deeper waters*

**(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

**(2.5.1.5) Please explain**

*Most sites are certified under ISO 14001. Programs to prevent loss of containment are in place company wide. All sites need to report immediately any non compliance with effluent quality and any significant loss of containment and need to put in place actions to prevent recurrence. The number of these and corrective actions taken are tracked centrally. Sites also report centrally the amount of nitrogen compounds released at least once per year. Any significant change vs. previous year needs to be addressed.*

**Row 3**

**(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category**

*Select from:*

☑ Phosphates

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

*This refers to phosphoruos compounds. Phosphorus is a common constituent of agricultural fertilizers, manure, and organic wastes in sewage and industrial effluent. It is an essential element for plant life, but when there is too much of it in water, it can speed up eutrophication (a reduction in dissolved oxygen in water bodies caused by an increase of mineral and organic nutrients) of rivers and lakes.*

**(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

**(2.5.1.5) Please explain**

*Most sites are certified under ISO 14001. Programs to prevent loss of containment are in place company wide. All sites need to report immediately any non compliance with effluent quality and any significant loss of containment and need to put in place actions to prevent recurrence. The number of these and corrective actions taken are tracked centrally. Sites also report centrally the amount of phosphorous compounds released at least once per year. Any significant change vs. previous year needs to be addressed.*

**Row 4**

**(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category**

*Select from:*

☑ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

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

*This refers to COD. Higher COD levels mean a greater amount of oxidisable organic material in the sample, which will reduce dissolved oxygen (DO) levels. A reduction in DO can lead to anaerobic conditions, which is deleterious to higher aquatic life forms*

**(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

**(2.5.1.5) Please explain**

*Most sites are certified under ISO 14001. Programs to prevent loss of containment are in place company wide. all sites need to report immediately any non compliance with effluent quality and any significant. The number of these and corrective actions taken are tracked centrally. Sites also report centrally the amount of COD released at least once per year. Any significant change vs. previous year needs to be addressed.*

*[Add row]*

# C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

**Climate change**

**(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified**

*Select from:*

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

**Forests**

**(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Select from:*

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

**(3.1.3) Please explain**

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors, and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. Forest commodities was not identified as one of the most relevant sustainability issues (Annual Report 2023 Page 30). The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. All identified risks are quantified against a risk matrix that considers the likelihood of an event occurring and the consequences in terms of potential impact on profit before tax, business interruption and potential SHE effects including injuries to people and the environment. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) lost or 1 month’s Business Interruption. Senior management use this to determine priorities across all the range of business risk factors (not just deforestation).The earnings at risk are significantly less than 1%. The risks associated with deforestation have been assessed as significantly lower impact and hence priority compared with the risks associated with other raw materials such as climate change related aspects as GHG emissions, water consumption or waste consumption.*

**Water**

**(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, only within our direct operations

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

*Select from:*

☑ Evaluation in progress

**(3.1.3) Please explain**

*Although physical risks have not been experienced in the short term by our own operations we have identified potential water-related risks at five of our tier 1 manufacturing sites. We updated our water risk assessment using v4 of the Aqueduct model to assess sites in high water stress areas or forecast to be so - this gave a potential 19 locations of concern. Screening further to remove those with low water demand and at least medium term good water availability led to those sites with more substantive risks being identified; 2 French sites with regulatory risks/demands, 1 site with significant growth forecasts in Saudi Arabia, 1 site in Germany with risks from both availability of river water and operational corrosion, and one UK site at risk of future climate change related coastal flood risk. Of the 4 water stress sites, 2 have baseline high water stress and 2 have forecast future annual average water stress. In the medium and longer-term, the pattern of increasing global average temperatures and the frequency of extreme weather events such as drought could affect our plants’ ability to operate efficiently and could give rise to supplier and logistics disruption. In 2024 we will conduct further scenario analysis and financial analysis to fully address this. In the next 2 years we shall begin to assess water risk for our key suppliers and build an appropriate plan in response to any significant risks arising.*

**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:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(3.1.3) Please explain**

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. This year we chose not to update our materiality assessment using our existing methodology, given the changing sustainability reporting requirements under the EU’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB). We are developing a ‘double’ materiality approach, in line with CSRD and ISSB, which will assess the issues that are material to our business prospects and their impact on the wider world. The double materiality assessment will include, but not be limited to the EFRAG European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) including ESRS E5 Resource use and circular economy. This is a significant project, but we believe it will help us further integrate sustainability issues into our decision making, performance and disclosures. We expect to complete this work in 2024. Alongside the double materiality we will assess the requirements of the Taskforce for Nature-related Financial Disclosure (TNFD) in September 2024 to determine how it might be relevant for our company and the plastics topic.*

*[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 ☑ Austria

☑ Egypt ☑ Belgium

☑ Italy ☑ Czechia

☑ France ☑ Germany

☑ Mexico ☑ Malaysia

☑ Portugal ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Viet Nam

☑ Netherlands

☑ Saudi Arabia

☑ United States of America

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

*It is still not clear how some of the countries we operate in will implement their pledges to the Paris Agreement, but it could be foreseen that some countries or regions, implement ambitious transition plan that enable alignment to a low carbon emissions trajectory. For example, in Europe this is leading to a reduction in free allowances under the EU ETS scheme, and the introduction of a carbon border adjustment mechanism (CBAM) that would apply a carbon price / tax to imported goods in certain categories. Many Synthomer raw materials are petrochemical derivatives that could be largely affected by carbon pricing mechanism. To better understand the potential opportunities and impacts of physical climate risks and the transition to a low-carbon economy, we carried out qualitative and quantitative analyses for three different climate scenarios: a rise in temperature of 1.5C, 2C and 3C over short- (to 2025), medium- (to 2030) and long-term (to 2050) horizons. The carbon price increase scenario was evaluated quantitatively for 3 different lines of products, each one produced in one of three different sites. The sites and products were selected to cover as many variables as possible. The sites were in 3 different regions: Germany, Malaysia and United States. The products use various of our top raw materials, are used in many applications and travel by water and by road. The impact is highly dependent on the time horizon, the site, the affected line of products.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Increased direct costs

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-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**

*We consider the impact of this risk does not give rise to a potential material financial statement impact. In the Synthomer Annual Report 2023 our auditor considered impairment of non-current assets, especially impairment of goodwill and intangible assets, as the area to potentially be materially affected by climate risk. The auditors procedures did not identify any material impact in the context of our audit of the financial statements as a whole, or key audit matters for the year ended 31 December 2023. Risks are quantified in a matrix that considers the likelihood of an event and the potential financial impact. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) lost or 1 month’s Business Interruption. Senior management use this to determine priorities across all the range of business risks. In the short term (to 2025), around three quarters of any potential financial impact of the risks from climate change for our business was forecast to come from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy (mainly higher costs due to GHG-related taxes) under a 1.5ºC temperature rise scenario. Under this scenario, we also see the greatest potential opportunity for growth in demand from our customers and their consumers, for those products that offer lower-GHG or circularity benefits. Given our existing plans to prioritise lower-GHG products and Scope 1 and 2 GHG reduction plans we would expect this growth in demand to offset any negative financial implications. Looking beyond 2025, our scenario analyses confirmed that transitioning to a low-carbon economy would remain our most significant potential climate-related financial risk; by 2030 and 2050 the relative weighting of transition risks compared to physical risks will become higher (approximately 90:10 vs approximately 75:25 in 2025). Indirect emissions from our value chain (Scope 3) make up approximately 85% of our total GHG footprint, of which category 1 (purchased goods and services) accounts for more than 85%. Our transition planning is therefore focused on reducing our supply-chain GHG emissions, reducing our GHG emissions from our manufacturing sites and innovating to deliver lower-GHG products. We will continue to conduct further scenario analysis and financial analysis on an on-going periodic basis to assess this risk.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*42000000*

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

*55000000*

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

*42000000*

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

*550000000*

**(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure**

*The potential financial impact figure is based on the quantitative scenario analysis performed for 3 key lines of products in 3 of our sites in Germany, Malaysia and United States; covering more than 50% of our products by volume. The 2030 (Medium term horizon) and Middle of the Road Scenario (2 degrees ambition, following the temperature scenarios RCP2.6/SSP2) financial estimations have been considered. The 3 scenarios estimated costs showed a high variability depending on region and chemistry. Malaysia estimated costs were around 4 /tonne, Germanys were around 15 /tonne and US associated costs were around 170 /tonne. The weighted average (based on production) being 26 / tonne. To estimate the financial figures, the 2022 company production (around 1,600,000 tonnes) was divided by type of chemistry. Each chemistry was multiplied by the estimated costs per tonne associated with that specific chemistry. Due to the low production in 2022 the result obtained applying the above assumptions was considered the minimum of the financial range. To calculate the maximum, and increase of production of 30% by 2030 has been considered.*

**(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk**

**Policies and plans**   
☑ Develop a climate transition plan

**(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk**

*15000000*

**(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation**

*The figure provided is an estimated of the cost of the decarbonisation projects identified for completion before 2030. During 2022 the existing coal burning unit at our plant in Czech Republic has been replaced by a natural gas boiler. The cost of the investment has been 4.4 million GBP. The project saved per year around 30,000 tonnes of CO2e emissions to the atmosphere and will avoid the purchase of around 40,000 tonnes of carbon allowances to comply with EU-ETS.*

**(3.1.1.29) Description of response**

*Through our scenario analysis we identified five primary strategic responses, whichever climate scenario ultimately plays out. The five responses have already been incorporated into our 2030 goals. Four of the five responses address this risk (in order of priority): 1. Work with selected suppliers: Our immediate focus is to explore working with suppliers that can make the lowest-GHG monomers from existing feedstocks. In the medium term, we are also also working to identify and introduce alternative feedstocks, including those from bio-based or circular sources which provide a lower GHG solutions. 2. Reduce our Scope 1 emissions and 3. Reduce our Scope 2 emissions: Synthomer has SBTi validated science-based targets which are Paris aligned and has started to develop decarbonisation roadmaps for the sites with highest GHG emissions. Projects to achieve the necessary emissions reductions to mitigate the risks associated with increasing carbon pricing have been identified. During 2022 the existing coal burning unit at our plant in Czech Republic was replaced by a natural gas boiler. The cost of the investment was 4.4 million GBP. The project saved per year around 30,000 tonnes of CO2e emissions and will avoid the purchase of about 40,000 tonnes of EU ETS carbon allowances. In 2024, we will focus on progressing design work on longer-term projects, including heat recovery projects in France, lower carbon technology waste treatment in the Czech Republic and further improvements at our main plant in Malaysia. We estimate that, once complete, these will save a further 7% of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 2028, as well as delivering production efficiencies and cost savings. 80% of our purchased electricity is from renewable sources and we will continue to reduce and optimise electricity and heat consumption in the short term. From 2024, we are working to enter into or expand power purchase agreements. 4. Innovation: prioritising lower-GHG product development.*

**Water**

**(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier**

*Select from:*

☑ Risk2

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

**Policy**  
☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation

**(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*

☑ France

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Seine

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

*We have identified this water-related risk at two of our tier 1 manufacturing sites in France. In the medium term, the pattern of increasing global average temperatures and the frequency of extreme weather events such as drought could affect our plants’ ability to operate efficiently, could lead to further statutory water withdrawal limits and changes to water allocation, and could give rise to supplier disruption. At one site the regulator target is for a 10% absolute reduction by end 2025 versus 2019 baseline, and a 25% reduction by 2034. The site also has to develop clear plans for short term water consumption management against 4 different potential water alert levels. At the second site the local prefecture requires the site to propose measures to reduce absolute water withdrawal by 20% against 2022 baseline “as soon as possible”. The site has to send its proposal to the prefecture by 31st December 2024, the prefecture will then review and agreed a final timeline. Provisionally the target date defined is 31st December 2026.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Short-term

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

*Select from:*

☑ About as likely as not

**(3.1.1.14) Magnitude**

*Select from:*

☑ Medium-low

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

*The specific financial impact is at this point still to be determined - for the French sites the primary shorter term risk relates to financial penalties of not achieving the specified water withdrawal reductions or introducing the control measures for the 4 defined water alert levels.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk**

**Engagement**  
☑ Engage with regulators/policy makers

**(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk**

*35000*

**(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation**

*Costs are for the two phases of consultancy support on water risk assessment and improvement opportunity identification and recommendation.*

**(3.1.1.29) Description of response**

*The French site in an area of forecast extreme water stress has engaged with a consultancy to complete a thorough water risk assessment, including a review of suppliers, infrastructure and water usage to better quantify the risk and identify future reduction opportunities. Planned improvement proposals will be submitted to the authorities for review with a suggested timeline by the end of 2024 as required under the regulations.*

**Climate change**

**(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier**

*Select from:*

☑ Risk3

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

**Acute physical**  
☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

**(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs**

*Select all that apply*

☑ China

☑ Germany

☑ Italy

☑ Malaysia

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

*Physical Operations and Supply Chain disruption due to flooding. As a result of potential greater incidence and severity of fluvial flooding due to intense rainfall or excessive up-stream run-off our operations and profits could be negatively impacted. This could be relevant to some river and coastal adjacent sites in Germany, Italy, China, Malaysia or the UK. There were some recorded business disruptions in Germany due to flooding in 2013 and in 2021. The disruptions could potentially directly affect Synthomer production (Direct Operations) due to installations flooding and associated equipment failure or indirectly due to lack of raw materials availability (Upstream) or disruptions in transportation both of raw materials from suppliers (Upstream) or products to customers (Downstream). To better understand the potential opportunities and impacts of physical climate risks and the transition to a low-carbon economy, we carried out qualitative and quantitative analyses for three different climate scenarios: a rise in temperature of 1.5C, 2C and 3C over short- (to 2025), medium- (to 2030) and long-term (to 2050) horizons. The flooding scenario analysis was evaluated quantitatively for two different lines of products, produced in Germany and Malaysia. The sites and products were selected to cover as many variables as possible.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Medium-term

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

*Select from:*

☑ More likely than not

**(3.1.1.14) Magnitude**

*Select from:*

☑ Medium-low

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

*We consider the impact of this risk does not give rise to a potential material financial statement impact. In the Synthomer Annual Report 2023 our auditor considered impairment of non-current assets, especially impairment of goodwill and intangible assets, as the area to potentially be materially affected by climate risk. The auditors procedures did not identify any material impact in the context of our audit of the financial statements as a whole, or key audit matters for the year ended 31 December 2023. Risks are quantified in a matrix that considers the likelihood of an event and the potential financial impact. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) lost or 1 month’s Business Interruption. Senior management use this to determine priorities across all the range of business risks. In the short term (to 2025), around three quarters of any potential financial impact of the risks from climate change for our business was forecast to come from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy (mainly higher costs due to GHG-related taxes) under a 1.5ºC temperature rise scenario. Looking beyond 2025, our scenario analyses confirmed that transitioning to a low-carbon economy would remain our most significant potential climate-related financial risk; by 2030 and 2050 the relative weighting of transition risks compared to physical risks will become higher (approximately 90:10 vs approximately 75:25 in 2025). The potential financial impact figure for this risk was based on the quantitative scenario analysis performed for 2 lines of products in 2 of our sites in Germany and Malaysia. The German scenario considered river flooding and the Malaysian scenario considered sea level increase and coastal flooding. The 2030 (Medium term horizon) and Middle of the Road Scenario (2 degrees ambition, following the temperature scenarios RCP2.6/SSP2) financial estimations have been considered. The scenarios considered a 100% loss of output and income for 14 days or 26% loss of out put and income due to flood-induced partial disruption for 56 days.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*5600000*

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

*7400000*

**(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure**

*The potential financial impact figure is based on the quantitative scenario analysis performed for 2 lines of products in 2 of our sites in Germany and Malaysia. The German scenario considered river flooding and the Malaysian scenario considered sea level increase and coastal flooding. The 2030 (Medium term horizon) and Middle of the Road Scenario (2 degrees ambition, following the temperature scenarios RCP2.6/SSP2) financial estimations have been considered. The scenarios considered a 100% loss of output and income for 14 days or 26% loss of out put and income due to flood-induced partial disruption for 56 days. An average cost per tonne (14.6) was calculated considering the 2 scenarios mentioned above. This amount was multiplied by the 2022 production of the Synthomer sites that, according WRI Aqueduct database, have a river/coastal flooding medium risk (or above). Those 13 sites accounted for about 24% of total Synthomer production (around 1,600,000 tonnes). Due to the low production in 2022, the result obtained applying the above assumptions was considered the minimum of the financial range. To calculate the maximum, and increase of production of 30% by 2030 has been considered*

**(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk**

**Compliance, monitoring and targets**   
☑ Other compliance, monitoring or target, please specify **:**Future additional scenario analysis at all sites to inform potential future risk identification and management

**(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk**

*100000*

**(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation**

*Costs are for additional physical climate risk scenario analysis to be conducted in 2024/2025*

**(3.1.1.29) Description of response**

*Future additional scenario analysis at all sites to inform potential future risk identification and management to be conducted in 2024 and 2025*

**Climate change**

**(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier**

*Select from:*

☑ Risk4

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

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

**(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Germany

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

*Change in precipitation pattern: Synthomer's processes require significant clean and enough water resources for its manufacturing processes in particular, with most of its aqueous polymers having on average 50% water content. There have already been two historical episodes of low river levels or high river water temperatures that have affected Synthomer German sites resulting in cooling and raw materials river transportation issues. The episodes have been limited but could potentially get more frequent and impactful in the future. The impossibility of making accurate predictions of weather patterns limits the extent of the analysis, but it is safe to assume that variability will increase and with it the associated risks. Impact of drought scenario has been analysed quantitatively for one line of products in one of our sites in Germany, nevertheless the results of this scenario have not been considered representative enough to be extrapolated to the full company as the sites in Germany are considered less affected by drought than other countries in which we operate. We will therefore be expanding the drought scenario to include a wider range of products and countries in 2024 and 2025.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Medium-term

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

*Select from:*

☑ More likely than not

**(3.1.1.14) Magnitude**

*Select from:*

☑ Medium-low

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

*We consider the impact of this risk does not give rise to a potential material financial statement impact. In the Synthomer Annual Report 2023 our auditor considered impairment of non-current assets, especially impairment of goodwill and intangible assets, as the area to potentially be materially affected by climate risk. The auditors procedures did not identify any material impact in the context of our audit of the financial statements as a whole, or key audit matters for the year ended 31 December 2023. Risks are quantified in a matrix that considers the likelihood of an event and the potential financial impact. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) lost or 1 month’s Business Interruption. Senior management use this to determine priorities across all the range of business risks. In the short term (to 2025), around three quarters of any potential financial impact of the risks from climate change for our business was forecast to come from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy (mainly higher costs due to GHG-related taxes) under a 1.5ºC temperature rise scenario. Looking beyond 2025, our scenario analyses confirmed that transitioning to a low-carbon economy would remain our most significant potential climate-related financial risk; by 2030 and 2050 the relative weighting of transition risks compared to physical risks will become higher (approximately 90:10 vs approximately 75:25 in 2025).*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*4300000*

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

*5500000*

**(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure**

*The potential financial impact figure is based on the quantitative scenario analysis performed for one of our sites in Germany The cost has been estimated evaluating the scenarios for the potentially affected Synthomer manufacturing sites including short periods of disruption up to 3 months. To identify the affected sites WRI Aqueduct database has been used: we have identified 7 sites situated in high or Extremely High Stress areas. Financial impact is the average of potential loss of gross contribution associated with the disruption. Annual average gross margin per site has been around 17,000,000. The results of the quantitative drought scenario performed have not been extrapolated for the whole company due to the local likelihood and impacts of this risk. In order to obtain a more reliable estimate we plan to expand the drought scenario to include a wider range of products and countries in 2024 and 2025.*

**(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk**

**Compliance, monitoring and targets**   
☑ Other compliance, monitoring or target, please specify **:**Future additional scenario analysis at all sites to inform potential future risk identification and management

**(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk**

*100000*

**(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation**

*Costs are for additional physical climate risk scenario analysis to be conducted in 2024/2025*

**(3.1.1.29) Description of response**

*Future additional scenario analysis at all sites to inform potential future risk identification and management to be conducted in 2024 and 2025*

**Water**

**(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier**

*Select from:*

☑ Risk5

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

**Chronic physical**  
☑ Water stress

**(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Saudi Arabia

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Umm er Radhuma- Dammam Aquifer System

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

*Saudi Arabia is relying more on desalination (as well as recycling processes) to maintain water supplies - there are risks of disruption and cost increases as aquifer stocks become depleted in the long-term*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Medium-term

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

*Select from:*

☑ About as likely as not

**(3.1.1.14) Magnitude**

*Select from:*

☑ Low

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

*We consider the impact of this risk does not give rise to a potential material financial statement impact. In the Synthomer Annual Report 2023 our auditor considered impairment of non-current assets, especially impairment of goodwill and intangible assets, as the area to potentially be materially affected by climate risk. The auditors procedures did not identify any material impact in the context of our audit of the financial statements as a whole, or key audit matters for the year ended 31 December 2023. Risks are quantified in a matrix that considers the likelihood of an event and the potential financial impact. Impacts are considered substantive if it is believed they could result in over 1% PBT (Profit Before Tax) lost or 1 month’s Business Interruption. Senior management use this to determine priorities across all the range of business risks. This facility represents a single manufacturing site. This is our only manufacturing site in this geographical area. Water scarcity is regarded as the biggest water risk. There are concerns about long term water availability - operation cost increases associated with desalination are a likely future issue.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*425000*

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

*850000*

**(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure**

*Costs have been defined taking into consideration the site gross margin and assuming a total disruption taking place during 15 to 30 days*

**(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk**

**Compliance, monitoring and targets**   
☑ Establish site-specific targets

**(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk**

*15000*

**(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation**

*Cost of response has been considered assuming 0.25 Full Time Equivalents Employees*

**(3.1.1.29) Description of response**

*The primary response is to use our Manufacturing Excellence programme to drive efficient water usage to only consume the water that is sold in our products.*

*[Add row]*

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

**Climate change**

**(3.1.2.1) Financial metric**

*Select from:*

☑ Revenue

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

*55000000*

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-10%

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

*12900000*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

**(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures**

*The potential financial impact figure due to transition risk (Risk 1) is based on the quantitative scenario analysis performed for 3 key lines of products in 3 of our sites in Germany, Malaysia and United States; covering more than 50% of our products by volume. The 2030 (Medium term horizon) and Middle of the Road Scenario (2 degrees ambition, following the temperature scenarios RCP2.6/SSP2) financial estimations have been considered. The 3 scenarios estimated costs showed a high variability depending on region and chemistry. Malaysia estimated costs were around 4 /tonne, Germanys were around 15 /tonne and US associated costs were around 170 /tonne. The weighted average (based on production) being 26 / tonne. To estimate the financial figures, the 2022 company production (around 1,600,000 tonnes) was divided by type of chemistry. Each chemistry was multiplied by the estimated costs per tonne associated with that specific chemistry. Due to the low production in 2022 the result obtained applying the above assumptions was considered the minimum of the financial range. To calculate the maximum, and increase of production of 30% by 2030 has been considered. The potential financial impact figure due to physical risk (Risk 3 and 4) is based on the quantitative scenario analysis performed for 2 lines of products in 2 of our sites in Germany and Malaysia. The German scenario considered river flooding and the Malaysian scenario considered sea level increase and coastal flooding. The 2030 (Medium term horizon) and Middle of the Road Scenario (2 degrees ambition, following the temperature scenarios RCP2.6/SSP2) financial estimations have been considered. The scenarios considered a 100% loss of output and income for 14 days or 26% loss of out put and income due to flood-induced partial disruption for 56 days. An average cost per tonne (14.6) was calculated considering the 2 scenarios mentioned above.*

**Water**

**(3.1.2.1) Financial metric**

*Select from:*

☑ Revenue

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

*500000*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

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

*850000*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

**(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures**

*The potential financial impact due to transition risk (Risk 2) is currently an estimate because the specific financial impact is at this point still to be determined by the regulator. For the French sites the primary shorter term risk relates to financial penalties of not achieving the specified water withdrawal reductions or introducing the control measures for the 4 defined water alert levels. The potential financial impact due to physical risk (Risk 5) have been defined taking into consideration the Dammam site gross margin and assuming a total disruption taking place during 15 to 30 days*

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

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

**France**  
☑ Seine

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

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

*2*

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-10%

**(3.2.11) Please explain**

*We have identified this water-related risk at two of our tier 1 manufacturing sites in France. In the medium term, the pattern of increasing global average temperatures and the frequency of extreme weather events such as drought could affect our plants’ ability to operate efficiently, could lead to further statutory water withdrawal limits and changes to water allocation, and could give rise to supplier disruption. At one site the regulator target is for a 10% absolute reduction by end 2025 versus 2019 baseline, and a 25% reduction by 2034. The site also has to develop clear plans for short term water consumption management against 4 different potential water alert levels. At the second site the local prefecture requires the site to propose measures to reduce absolute water withdrawal by 20% against 2022 baseline “as soon as possible”. The site has to send its proposal to the prefecture by 31st December 2024, the prefecture will then review and agreed a final timeline. Provisionally the target date defined is 31st December 2026.*

**Row 2**

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

**Saudi Arabia**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Umm er Radhuma- Dammam Aquifer System

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

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

*1*

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-10%

**(3.2.11) Please explain**

*This facility represents a single manufacturing site. This is our only manufacturing site in this geographical area. Water scarcity is regarded as the biggest water risk. There are concerns about long term water availability - operation cost increases associated with desalination are a likely future issue.*

*[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**

*The Non-Compliance has been inherited from the previous company owner. Corresponds to 4 Fines issued to Jefferson site in US: The site is currently reporting National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) exceedances and paying stipulated penalties on a quarterly basis. Total amount in 2023 fines has been around 11,000 (9,000 pounds). The site is currently working on a corrective mechanism to ensure compliance with the NPDES permit, there is a 2023 Consent Decree serves as the corrective mechanism to ensure compliance with the NPDES Permit is achieved in a timely manner. All the deadlines associated with the consent Decree have been fulfilled by the corresponding deadlines*

*[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**

*4*

**(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines**

*9000*

**(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated**

*3*

**(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

**(3.3.1.5) Comment**

*Fines are exactly the same as previous year and correspond to the same site in US. The site is currently reporting NPDES exceedances and paying stipulated penalties on a quarterly basis. The Non-Compliance has been inherited from the previous company owner*

*[Fixed row]*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ EU ETS

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

**EU ETS**

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

*51.9*

**(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**

*12/30/2023*

**(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated**

*111649*

**(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased**

*0*

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

*119832*

**(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**

*There were 3 sites covered by EU ETS agreements in 2023, in France, the Netherlands and Czechia. Verified Scope 1 emissions totals are based on reporting as per EU ETS rules and using relevant factors in the 3 countries. For Czechia this includes mass balance derived process emissions calculations. There was an small excess of 2023 Scope 1 emissions vs. 2023 allocated allowances that was covered by allowances purchased in 2024. Group reported totals for Scope 1 under the GHG Protocol approach use a slightly modified approach that accounts for net inventory change in the mass balance approach that the ETS rules do not. Group S1 totals also include process emissions linked to hydrogen production in the SMR plant at the Dutch site - the volumes were below the threshold limits for ETS so not included here, but changes to the thresholds from 2024 will see these included going forward.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

*We are regulated under EU-ETS. To ensure all our emissions are covered under EU-ETS we usually try to anticipate the yearly Scope 1 emissions of all affected sites (Czech Republic, France and Netherlands) and identify if the assigned allowances will be enough to cover them. If the answer is no, and there are no allowances on stock from previous years we proceed to the purchase of allowances. Nevertheless the main strategy in recent years has been to reduce the Scope 1 emissions to avoid any allowances purchase:For the French site, due to the reduction of Scope 1 emissions, the 2022 assigned allowances have been enough to cover the requirements. Projects in 2023 to reduce gas consumption also meant no allowances had to be purchased and in 2024 the site is looking to come out of EU ETS as it wil fall below the applicable threshold. For the Czech site, the closing of the coal power plant that took place mid 2022 and the replacement by a natural gas burning unit has been a major contributor to reducing Scope 1 emissions and meant that purchased allowances were not required for 2023. Looking forward in order to address the reduction in free allowances expected, the site is looking to identify further efficiency projects as well as changes to how waste streams are processed on site in order to reduce gas demand for thermal oxidiation. In the next few years it is expected that the amount of purchased allowances required will increase. The Netherlands site has had to purchase some allowances in 2024 to cover its 2023 Scope 1 emissions, and threshold limit changes mean that other parts of the process will come into scope from 2024 and increase the associated costs. Synthomer is working closely with the site to define a plan to reduce Scope 1 emissions during next years.*

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

**Climate change**

**(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified**

*Select from:*

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

**Forests**

**(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Select from:*

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

**(3.6.3) Please explain**

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors, and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. Forest commodities was not identified as one of the most relevant sustainability issues (Annual Report 2023 Page 30). The risks associated with deforestation have been assessed as significantly lower impact and hence lower priority compared with the risks associated with other raw materials such as climate change related aspects as GHG emissions, water consumption or waste consumption. Some medium and longer-term options do exist as we look to expand our range of bio-based/circular products, but given the amount spent in this category is below 0.01% it is not likely to be a substantive opportunity in the near-term. The end-market is not yet positioned for a substantive transition to such products.*

**Water**

**(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Select from:*

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

**(3.6.3) Please explain**

*As a company already predominantly producing water-based products, we feel substantive new opportunities are limited. Some medium and longer-term options do exist as we look to drive innovation in certain products that could help customers reduce the amount of water they use in their manufacturing operations. This is not likely to be a substantive opportunity in the near-term.*

*[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:*

☑ Downstream value chain

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ China ☑ Austria

☑ Egypt ☑ Belgium

☑ Italy ☑ Czechia

☑ France ☑ Germany

☑ Mexico ☑ Malaysia

☑ Portugal ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Viet Nam

☑ Netherlands

☑ Saudi Arabia

☑ United States of America

**(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description**

*The increase in demand from customers for more sustainable products gives us an opportunity to use our innovation skills to create competitive advantage. Having developed our in-house lifecycle assessment (LCA) and product carbon footprint (PCF) capabilities last year, we can provide our customers with PCF reports in accordance with Together for Sustainability (TfS) guidelines, covering more than 60% of our production volume. Our LCA/PCF methodology is focused on the application/chemical family combination, which makes it possible to assess the carbon footprint for each market segment. This year, we also launched nine new products with enhanced sustainability benefits, meaning we reached 64% (up from 50% in 2022). This is our third consecutive rise since we launched our Vision 2030 roadmap. Much of our progress is thanks to the success of our product sustainability scorecard, introduced in 2021. We use the scorecard to prioritise innovation projects against specific criteria, such as the use of raw materials, ability to reduce energy consumption, and helping customers meet their sustainability goals. It provides a clear framework to discuss product development and has transformed the way we design with sustainability in mind. We are also making products that help support a more circular economy, such as our new SyNovusTM Plus product line, which is helping to recycle rubber gloves into new applications, including soles for safety shoes.*

**(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:*

☑ Likely (66–100%)

**(3.6.1.12) Magnitude**

*Select from:*

☑ Medium

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

*Over the shorter term horizon it is expected that the opportunities captured here will have a relatively neutral short term impact. In the medium term the financial impact estimation of 1% increase of gross margin has been considered the minimum and 2 % the maximum. This opportunity could be higher if there were a bigger demand from customers. This opportunity is expected to increase with the increasing medium to longer-term demand from customers.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*9000000*

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

*18000000*

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

*Our estimation is based on expectations of existing demand for low carbon products. Calculations have taken into consideration annual gross margins increase of about 1-2%. The gross margins of the company in 2022 were close to 900,000,000 GBP. For the financial impact estimation. 1% increase of gross margin has been considered the minimum and 2 % the maximum. This opportunity could be higher if there were a bigger demand from customers. This opportunity is expected to increase with the increasing demand from customers.*

**(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity**

*1500000*

**(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation**

*The cost to realize the opportunity has been estimated per year taking into consideration the R&D average cost to develop a product with sustainability benefits ( 750,000). 2 new sustainability product per year until 2030 are expected.*

**(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity**

*Case study: SyNovus is our latest innovation platform for developing sustainable NBR for glove manufacturing customers. It enables customers to use lower curing temperatures in their process, reducing their energy costs and carbon footprint. Trial results demonstrate that with SyNovus Plus, glove-making customers can potentially reduce their operating temperature by 20C, which is equivalent to 2kg of CO2 emission per 1,000 pieces. And because SyNovus Plus requires less heat to cure, customers benefit from energy savings of more than 10%, making it a significantly more sustainable material than conventional latex. This was demonstrated through an independent lifecycle assessment conducted according to ISO 14040, 14044 and 14071.*

**Climate change**

**(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier**

*Select from:*

☑ Opp2

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

**Markets**   
☑ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

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

*Select from:*

☑ Downstream value chain

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ China ☑ Austria

☑ Egypt ☑ Belgium

☑ Italy ☑ Czechia

☑ France ☑ Germany

☑ Mexico ☑ Malaysia

☑ Portugal ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Viet Nam

☑ Netherlands

☑ Saudi Arabia

☑ United States of America

**(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description**

*We rely on certain resources, such as key monomer feedstocks and water, to make our products. And like many manufacturing businesses, our production processes create a certain amount of waste. So we have a responsibility to ensure that we use, manage and dispose of those resources and the associated waste carefully. One of the ways we can do that is through the choice of feedstocks we use, and, where we can, we want to start introducing alternative raw materials, including materials that are bio-based or contribute to a circular economy approach whilst also having a lower product carbon footprint. This year we became certified at a Group level under the International Sustainability and Carbon Certification for Biomass and Bioenergy’s ISCC PLUS programme. Six individual manufacturing sites were also certified this year, and we expect another two sites to be certified in 2024. This allows us to introduce those alternative bio-based and circular materials and report using a ‘mass balance’ approach. It is an important step in helping us diversify our raw materials and create the products our customers are looking for to address their own sustainability challenges, including lower carbon footprint. The certification was implemented in direct response to customer feedback.*

**(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:*

☑ 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**

*Over the shorter term horizon it is expected that the opportunities captured here will have a relatively neutral short term impact. Over the shorter term horizon it is expected that the opportunities captured here will have a relatively neutral short term impact. In the medium term the financial impact estimation of 1% increase of gross margin has been considered the minimum and 2 % the maximum. This opportunity could be higher if there were a bigger demand from customers. This opportunity is expected to increase with the increasing medium to longer-term demand from customers.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*1000000*

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

*2000000*

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

*Our estimation is based on expectations of future demand for low carbon products. Calculations have taken into considerations projected future pricing for these products following engagements with our customers.*

**(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity**

*150000*

**(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation**

*The cost to realise the opportunity has been estimated per year based on third party certification costs per site, plus the resource costs of the central project team.*

**(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity**

*We are continuing to create and respond to demand from our customers for more sustainable products. Our immediate focus as identified in our TCFD report is to explore how to work with suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks. This is also where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 emissions reduction target. Introducing alternative feedstocks, including those from certified bio-based or circular sources where they offer a lower-carbon solution is key to the strategy to realise this opportunity.*

**Climate change**

**(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier**

*Select from:*

☑ Opp3

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

**Resource efficiency**  
☑ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

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

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ China ☑ Austria

☑ Egypt ☑ Belgium

☑ Italy ☑ Czechia

☑ France ☑ Germany

☑ Mexico ☑ Malaysia

☑ Portugal ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Viet Nam

☑ Netherlands

☑ Saudi Arabia

☑ United States of America

**(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description**

*Synthomer metered energy use amounted to nearly 1.6 million MWh in 2023, highlighting the relevance of energy for our operations. Energy consumption reduction can contribute to reduce our operating costs. A refreshed portfolio of projects to help the company to improve energy efficiency and reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions has been drawn up, and alongside this from 2024 continuous improvement actions will be embedded as part of site manufacturing strategies and Value Gap tracking, with key projects tracked by a central Operational Sustainability team. This includes both shorter term actions and medium term projects that are currently only at concept stage. The need for climate change mitigation, which is driven by the Paris Climate Agreement and our commitment to meeting our 2030 Science Based Targets, is leading to new/extended incentives for energy efficiency (e.g. tax cuts, levy exemptions) that Synthomer could benefit from and is actively engaging on – in particular for a future project on alternative waste treatment in Czechia. Synthomer is committed to source most of its electricity from renewable sources. This is being accomplished mainly through Renewable Energy Attribute Certificates but we have also set up new supply contracts and are evaluating off-site virtual power purchase agreements (vPPA) opportunities in Europe and Asia. Solar panels are installed at several of our sites and long-standing PPAs are in place at sites in Stallingborough, UK and Jefferson, USA.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Short-term

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

*Select from:*

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

**(3.6.1.12) Magnitude**

*Select from:*

☑ 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**

*Over the shorter term horizon it is expected that the opportunities captured here will have a relatively neutral short term impact. Capital outlay requirements are within normal budget ranges, with payback within a 2-3 year time horizon.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*3701000*

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

*4091000*

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

*The projects and actions delivering benefit in 2023 and anticipated to deliver benefit in the short term horizon window should help achieve the targeted 5% efficiency improvement. The impact provided refers to annual savings and has been estimated taking into consideration the saving associated directly with achieving a reduction of 5% (/- 20%) in energy consumption (Total delivered energy costs in 2023 for operated sites were estimated at around 77,915,000).*

**(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity**

*4400000*

**(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation**

*The quoted costs calculations are the estimated capital outlay costs for energy and emission reduction projects implemented or being assessed for implementation between 2023 and 2025. Some of the benefits realised in 2023 are linked back to the 4.4 million investment in gas boilers to replace coal as a fuel source at our site in Czechia, completed mid 2022.*

**(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity**

*Case Study 1: The multi-million GBP project to replace coal burning unit at our plant in Czechia with natural gas boilers was completed mid-2022, with 2023 the first year seeing the full benefit of the more efficient new plant, with the site’s energy usage per tonne improving 5% saving an estimated 17,500 MWh of energy in 2023 and the associated significant reduction in Scope 1 emissions helping the site’s EU ETS related emissions fall below its free allowance limit for the first time in several years. Case Study 2: During a period of low output our largest Asian site in Pasir Gudang, Malaysia managed to optimise chiller demand through match sequencing management and optimise thermal oxidiser operation to achieve a 15% improvement in energy efficiency and 29% reduction in gas usage, with the like for like energy savings estimated at 15,000 MWh. As capacity recovers work is progressing on a capital project to enable waste gas buffering and maintain optimum TOX operating conditions.*

*[Add row]*

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

**Climate change**

**(3.6.2.1) Financial metric**

*Select from:*

☑ Revenue

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

*18000000*

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-10%

**(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures**

*Our estimation is based on expectations of existing demand for low carbon products. Calculations have taken into consideration annual gross margins increase of about 1-2%. The gross margins of the company in 2022 were close to 900,000,000 GBP. For the financial impact estimation. 1% increase of gross margin has been considered the minimum and 2 % the maximum. This opportunity could be higher if there were a bigger demand from customers. This opportunity is expected to increase with the increasing demand from customers.*

*[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:*

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

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

*The Board should be diverse in terms of skills, knowledge, professional and industry background and geographical experience as well as characteristics including but not limited to gender and ethnicity A Board that demonstrates both diversity and an inclusive culture will make better decisions and will benefit shareholders and other stakeholders The Board has a role in setting a tone from the top and working with the Executive Committee to champion Diversity and Inclusion throughout Synthomer. The Board commits to: Gender: maintaining at least the current 33% level of female representation on the Board and working towards a gender balanced board Ethnicity: ensuring that at least one director is from a diverse ethnic background and working towards a higher representation. The Board will support management in increasing Diversity and Inclusion throughout Synthomer and Synthomer’s commitment to: Increase Diversity and Inclusion by focusing on all aspects of the employee lifecycle Measure and report on a wide range of diversity characteristics, including but not restricted to gender, ethnicity and age (where it is culturally and legally appropriate to do so) Develop and maintain a global Diversity and Inclusion action plan that will be shared with key stakeholders including the Board and employees annually Measure and report on a range of inclusion indicators, including but not restricted to, employee surveys*

**(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)**

*diversity\_and\_inclusion\_policy\_feb2021-1.pdf*

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Climate change**

**(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**Forests**

**(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

*We are making our suppliers comply with the EU Deforestation directive. The use of commodities affected by deforestation is very low. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. The earnings at risk are significantly less than 1%. Synthomer conducts a materiality matrix every 2-years which has identified Sustainable Procurement as an important topic. The risks associated with deforestation have been assessed as significantly lower impact and hence priority compared with the risks associated with other raw materials such as climate change related aspects as GHG emissions, water consumption or waste consumption.*

**Water**

**(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**Biodiversity**

**(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Climate change**

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ 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*

☑ Board mandate

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

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets ☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis ☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets ☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets ☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments ☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

**(4.1.2.7) Please explain**

*In 2023, the Board, rather than a Committee of the Board, took ownership of the Company’s progress against our sustainability strategy, Vision 2030 targets and 2050 net zero pledge. Given that these environmental, social and governance (ESG) matters are a key part of our strategy, we want to clearly show that the Board retains ultimate oversight of, and responsibility for, delivering against our stated ESG goals. At the Executive Committee level, in 2022 Synthomer formed the Executive Sustainability Steering Committee. It is chaired by the CEO, meets quarterly and is attended by the full Executive Committee. It oversees our overall sustainability agenda and progress on each of our Vision 2030 sustainability goals. These goals are owned and sponsored by an Executive Committee member, who is responsible for making sure we have the right plans in place to deliver within the timeframe. The Company also formed an Executive Risk Committee in 2022. This Committee is chaired by the CFO and ensures a robust process for identifying, prioritising, managing and controlling significant risks affecting the Group. It is attended by the full Executive Committee and the Head of Internal Audit. It makes sure the Group has risk management policies and procedures in place – including those covering ESG, project governance, sanctions, crisis management, human rights, business continuity and business management. The Board is responsible for the overall oversight of strategic risk management, including topics in the environment policy such as water, biodiversity and climate-related risks and opportunities. The Board reviews our risk profile twice a year. The material is prepared by the Executive Risk Committee (ERC), which reports to the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee ensures that the Board’s risk management is effective. Climate-related risks are part of the agenda. Any large capex, M&A and business plan proposals, including sustainability projects, are approved by the Board – climate change (and carbon tax) are considered as factors when assessing these plans. The Board engages quarterly with the Vice President, ESG to review the risks and opportunities in relation to Synthomer’s ability to drive strategic value through ESG (including climate change)*

**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*

☑ Board mandate

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

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets ☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis ☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets ☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets ☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments ☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

**(4.1.2.7) Please explain**

*In 2023, the Board, rather than a Committee of the Board, took ownership of the Company’s progress against our sustainability strategy, Vision 2030 targets and 2050 net zero pledge. Given that these environmental, social and governance (ESG) matters are a key part of our strategy, we want to clearly show that the Board retains ultimate oversight of, and responsibility for, delivering against our stated ESG goals. At the Executive Committee level, in 2022 Synthomer formed the Executive Sustainability Steering Committee. It is chaired by the CEO, meets quarterly and is attended by the full Executive Committee. It oversees our overall sustainability agenda and progress on each of our Vision 2030 sustainability goals. These goals are owned and sponsored by an Executive Committee member, who is responsible for making sure we have the right plans in place to deliver within the timeframe. The Company also formed an Executive Risk Committee in 2022. This Committee is chaired by the CFO and ensures a robust process for identifying, prioritising, managing and controlling significant risks affecting the Group. It is attended by the full Executive Committee and the Head of Internal Audit. It makes sure the Group has risk management policies and procedures in place – including those covering ESG, project governance, sanctions, crisis management, human rights, business continuity and business management. The Board is responsible for the overall oversight of strategic risk management, including topics in the environment policy such as water, biodiversity and climate-related risks and opportunities. The Board reviews our risk profile twice a year. The material is prepared by the Executive Risk Committee (ERC), which reports to the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee ensures that the Board’s risk management is effective. Climate-related risks are part of the agenda. Any large capex, M&A and business plan proposals, including sustainability projects, are approved by the Board – climate change (and carbon tax) are considered as factors when assessing these plans. The Board engages quarterly with the Vice President, ESG to review the risks and opportunities in relation to Synthomer’s ability to drive strategic value through ESG (including climate change)*

**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*

☑ Board mandate

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

*Select from:*

☑ Sporadic – agenda item as important matters arise

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

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

**(4.1.2.7) Please explain**

*In 2023, the Board, rather than a Committee of the Board, took ownership of the Company’s progress against our sustainability strategy, Vision 2030 targets and 2050 net zero pledge. Given that these environmental, social and governance (ESG) matters are a key part of our strategy, we want to clearly show that the Board retains ultimate oversight of, and responsibility for, delivering against our stated ESG goals. At the Executive Committee level, in 2022 Synthomer formed the Executive Sustainability Steering Committee. It is chaired by the CEO, meets quarterly and is attended by the full Executive Committee. It oversees our overall sustainability agenda and progress on each of our Vision 2030 sustainability goals. These goals are owned and sponsored by an Executive Committee member, who is responsible for making sure we have the right plans in place to deliver within the timeframe. The Company also formed an Executive Risk Committee in 2022. This Committee is chaired by the CFO and ensures a robust process for identifying, prioritising, managing and controlling significant risks affecting the Group. It is attended by the full Executive Committee and the Head of Internal Audit. It makes sure the Group has risk management policies and procedures in place – including those covering ESG, project governance, sanctions, crisis management, human rights, business continuity and business management. The Board is responsible for the overall oversight of strategic risk management, including topics in the environment policy such as water, biodiversity and climate-related risks and opportunities. The Board reviews our risk profile twice a year. The material is prepared by the Executive Risk Committee (ERC), which reports to the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee ensures that the Board’s risk management is effective. Climate-related risks are part of the agenda. Any large capex, M&A and business plan proposals, including sustainability projects, are approved by the Board – climate change (and carbon tax) are considered as factors when assessing these plans. The Board engages quarterly with the Vice President, ESG to review the risks and opportunities in relation to Synthomer’s ability to drive strategic value through ESG (including climate change)*

*[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

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

**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

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

**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

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

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Climate change**

**(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**Forests**

**(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

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

**(4.3.2) Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(4.3.3) Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues**

*Forest related products are accounted for less than 0.01% of our total spend, therefore our impact in this area is very limited.*

**Water**

**(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**Biodiversity**

**(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

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

**(4.3.2) Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(4.3.3) Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues**

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors, and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. This year we chose not to update our materiality assessment using our existing methodology, given the changing sustainability reporting requirements under the EU’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB). We are developing a ‘double’ materiality approach, in line with CSRD and ISSB, which will assess the issues that are material to our business prospects and their impact on the wider world. The double materiality assessment will include, but not be limited to the EFRAG European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) including ESRS E4 Biodiversity and Ecosystems. This is a significant project, but we believe it will help us further integrate sustainability issues into our decision making, performance and disclosures. We expect to complete this work in 2024. Alongside the double materiality we will assess the requirements of the Taskforce for Nature-related Financial Disclosure (TNFD) in September 2024 to determine how it might be relevant for our company and adjust our management of biodiversity based on the outcome of the double materiality assessment.*

*[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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

**Engagement**   
☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

**Policies, commitments, and targets**   
☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

**Strategy and financial planning**  
☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ 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

**(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**

*Synthomer reports against TCFD for the last three years. The Board engages quarterly with the Vice President, ESG to review the risks and opportunities in relation to Synthomer’s ability to drive strategic value through ESG (including climate change). Any large capex, M&A and business plan proposals, including sustainability projects, are approved by the Board – climate change (and carbon tax) are considered as factors when assessing these plans.*

**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**  
☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

**Policies, commitments, and targets**   
☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

**Strategy and financial planning**  
☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

**(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**

*Synthomer reports against TCFD for the last three years. The Board engages quarterly with the Vice President, ESG to review the risks and opportunities in relation to Synthomer’s ability to drive strategic value through ESG (including climate change). Any large capex, M&A and business plan proposals, including sustainability projects, are approved by the Board – climate change (and carbon tax) are considered as factors when assessing these plans.*

*[Add row]*

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

**Climate change**

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*10*

**(4.5.3) Please explain**

*As of 2021, 10% of executives' annual Perfomance Share Plan award has been based on Greenhouse Gas reduction in line with our near-term Science-based Scope 1 and 2 CO2 emissions from the 2019 baseline. See 2023 Annual report page 107 for additional information.*

**Forests**

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

*Select from:*

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

**(4.5.3) Please explain**

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors, and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. Forest commodities was not identified as one of the most relevant sustainability issues (Annual Report 2023 Page 30) The use of commodities affected by deforestation is very low. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. The earnings at risk are significantly less than 1%. Synthomer conducts a materiality matrix every 2-years. The risks associated with deforestation have been assessed as significantly lower impact and hence priority compared with the risks associated with other raw materials such as climate change related aspects as GHG emissions, water consumption or wast*

**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**

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. Water was not identified as one of the most relevant sustainability issues (Annual Report 2023 Page 30) In 2024 we are developing a ‘double’ materiality approach, in line with CSRD and ISSB, which will assess the issues that are material to our business prospects and their impact on the wider world. The double materiality assessment will include, but not be limited to the EFRAG European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) including ESRS E3 Water and marine resources. The Remuneration Committee review and revise incentives in line with the issues that matter most.*

*[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**  
☑ Board/Executive board

**(4.5.1.2) Incentives**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Shares

**(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics**

**Targets**  
☑ Achievement of environmental targets

**Emission reduction**  
☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

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

*Select from:*

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

**(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives**

*As of 2021, 10% of executives' annual Perfomance Share Plan award has been based on Carbon reduction – in Scope 1 and 2 CO2 emissions from the 2019 baseline. See 2023 Annual report page 107 for additional information.*

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

*This incentive is directly linked to Scope 1 and 2 CO2e emissions reductions that contributes directly to Company Vision 2030 that includes our near-term Science-based target to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 47% in 2030*

*[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*

☑ Climate change

**(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Organization-wide

**(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ Portfolio

**(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage**

*Synthomer is fully committed to supporting the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement, the objectives of the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the worldwide chemical industry Responsible Care Guiding Principles. We are committed to continually improving our environmental performance related to relevant aspects across the entire value chain of our business.*

**(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content**

**Environmental commitments**  
☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

**Climate-specific commitments**  
☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

☑ Commitment to not invest in fossil-fuel expansion

**Additional references/Descriptions**  
☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

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

☑ Yes, in line with another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify

**(4.6.1.7) Public availability**

*Select from:*

☑ Publicly available

**(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy**

*syn-group-environmental-policy-2023.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

**(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage**

*Description of business dependency on water. Description of business impact on water. Commitment to align with international frameworks, standards, and widely-recognized water initiatives. Commitment to prevent, minimize, and control pollution. Commitment to reduce water withdrawal and/or consumption volumes in direct operations. Commitments beyond regulatory compliance. Recognition of environmental linkages, for example, due to climate change.*

**(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content**

**Environmental commitments**  
☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

**Water-specific commitments**  
☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

**Additional references/Descriptions**  
☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation

☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

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

**(4.6.1.7) Public availability**

*Select from:*

☑ Publicly available

**(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy**

*water\_management.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*

☑ International Sustainability & Carbon Certification (ISCC)

☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

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

☑ Other, please specify **:**Together for Sustainability (TfS)

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

*This year we became certified at a Group level under the International Sustainability and Carbon Certification for Biomass and Bioenergy’s ISCC PLUS programme. Six individual sites were also certified this year, and we expect another two sites to be certified in 2024. This allows us to introduce those alternative materials and report using a ‘mass balance’ approach. It is an important step in helping us diversify our raw materials and create the products our customers are looking for to address their own sustainability challenges. Indeed, we applied for certification in direct response to customer engagement. Our near-term targets to reduce Scope 1, 2 and 3 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions have been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) We have made considerable progress against our climate targets over the past three years, and invested significantly in our procurement teams to develop their skills and expertise, particularly in understanding the challenge we face in addressing our indirect Scope 3 emissions. To accelerate our learning and help us adopt good practices, we have joined Together for Sustainability (TfS). Through the TfS Academy our procurement teams now have access to resources covering assessment, audit and corrective action planning. We also want to help customers better understand the full impact of using our products. Having developed our own in-house lifecycle assessment (LCA) and product carbon footprint (PCF) capabilities last year, we are now able to provide our customers with PCF reports in accordance with TfS guidelines, covering more than 60% of our production volume. We work closely with the main sector groups in our industry, including the Chemical Industries Association (CIA) in the UK, the European Polymer Dispersion and Latex Association (EPDLA) in the EU, the American Chemistry Council (ACC) in the USA, and the Malaysian Rubber Glove Manufacturers Association (MARGMA) and Malaysian Rubber Products Manufacturers Association (MRPMA) in Malaysia. In many cases, this work includes taking a seat on the sustainability committees and actively participating in sustainability workshops within these groups.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

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

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

*Select from:*

☑ 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**

*syn-group-environmental-policy-2023 (1).pdf*

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We work closely with the main sector groups in our industry, including the Chemical Industries Association (CIA) in the UK, CEFIC and the European Polymer Dispersion and Latex Association (EPDLA) in the EU, the American Chemistry Council (ACC) in the USA, and the Malaysian Rubber Glove Manufacturers Association (MARGMA) and Malaysian Rubber Products Manufacturers Association (MRPMA) in Malaysia. In many cases, this work includes taking a seat on the sustainability committees and actively participating in sustainability workshops. We have also joined the peer network Together for Sustainability*

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement**

*Select from:*

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

**(4.11.2.4) Trade association**

**Europe**  
☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**UK Chemical Industries Association

**(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 UK Chemical Industries Association is committed to further reductions in the carbon emissions associated with chemical industry operations, provided targets are realistic and do not lead to "carbon leakage" by driving investment to territories with less stringent regulation. Its position is set out in its Energy and Climate Change Policy available at https://www.cia.org.uk/Policy/Energy-and-climate-change*

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

*84396.53*

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

*This funding is for an annual membership fee which enables our engagement and participation on several committees to contribute to discussion on sustainability topics including climate action.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Paris Agreement

**Row 2**

**(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement**

*Select from:*

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

**(4.11.2.4) Trade association**

**Europe**  
☑ European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC) [CH only]

**(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**

*In 2013 CEFIC produced a roadmap with its policy for how it believes Europe can be competitive, low carbon and energy efficient. It believes that the EU "should continue to pursue a global climate policy agreement. In the absence of an equitable global carbon cost, the EU should improve supporting mechanisms for the competitiveness of its industry by measures that seek to minimise the energy cost differential with its major competitors." There is also support for new innovations and technology to improve investment. Recently CEFIC issued a position paper supporting the Green Deal and Europe’s ambition to become climate neutral by 2050. CEFIC’s position paper on EU Climate Law puts forward a number of proposals to; provide clear long-term signals for investments; to ensure a coherent approach at EU level with contributions from all sectors of the economy; as well as outlines identifies the enabling conditions.*

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

*158289.55*

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

*This funding is for an annual membership fee which enables our engagement in General Assembly and participation on several committees to contribute to discussion on chemical safety and sustainability topics.*

**(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**

**North America**  
☑ American Chemistry 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

☑ Water

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

*Select from:*

☑ Consistent

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

*Select from:*

☑ 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**

*As Congress develops strategies to fight climate change, ACC members have adopted a set of Climate Policy Principles. A combination of technology, market-based, and policy solutions will be necessary to reduce GHG emissions and achieve climate goals, such as those of the Paris Agreement. A summary of climate policy positions is available at https://www.americanchemistry.com/Climate-Policy-Positions.pdf ACC is actively promoting a programme for Water Body Risk Assessment to identify risk areas and drive member companies to engage proactively with relevant stakeholders and "become stewards to protect water resources near their facilities".*

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

*139380.26*

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

*This is the membership fee for participation in general meetings, participation in the RCMS working group and RCMS certification, and participation on the Sustainability Committee, Chemtrec emergency incident support.*

**(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*

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

**(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication**

*Select from:*

☑ Complete

**(4.12.1.5) Content elements**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Emission targets

**(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference**

*Main references: TCFD report: pages 56-59 of annual report. Sustainability in focus 31-33 of annual report.*

**(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication**

*synt\_ar23\_full\_interactive\_report.pdf*

**(4.12.1.8) Comment**

*As detailed in our 2023 Annual Report: https://www.synthomer.com/media/abwot0vb/synt\_ar23\_full\_interactive\_report.pdf and highlighted in the sustainability insights section on the Synthomer website: https://www.synthomer.com/sustainability/our-sustainability-insights.*

*[Add row]*

# C5. Business strategy

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

**Climate change**

**(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis**

*Select from:*

☑ Every three years or less frequently

**Forests**

**(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis**

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

*Our approach is informed by the issues that matter most to our stakeholders, including employees, investors and customers, and that are most aligned with delivering our business strategy. We update our understanding of those issues through a materiality assessment, and completed our last one in 2021. Having reviewed that assessment, we believe we are still focused on the most relevant sustainability issues. This year we chose not to update our materiality assessment using our existing methodology, given the changing sustainability reporting requirements under the EU’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB). We are developing a ‘double’ materiality approach, in line with CSRD and ISSB, which will assess the issues that are material to our business prospects and their impact on the wider world. The double materiality assessment will include, but not be limited to the EFRAG European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS). This is a significant project, but we believe it will help us further integrate sustainability issues into our decision making, performance and disclosures. We expect to complete this work in 2024. We are making our suppliers comply with the EU Deforestation directive. The use of commodities affected by deforestation is very low. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. The earnings at risk are significantly less than 1%. Synthomer conducts a materiality matrix every 2-years which has identified Sustainable Procurement as an important topic. The risks associated with deforestation have been assessed as significantly lower impact and hence priority compared with the risks associated with other raw materials such as climate change related aspects as GHG emissions, water consumption or waste consumption.*

**Water**

**(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis**

*Select from:*

☑ Every three years or less frequently

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Climate change**

**(5.1.1.1) Scenario used**

**Physical climate scenarios**  
☑ RCP 1.9

**(5.1.1.2) Scenario used  SSPs used in conjunction with scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ SSP1

**(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

**(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Organization-wide

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Policy ☑ Acute physical

☑ Market ☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

**(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ 1.5°C or lower

**(5.1.1.7) Reference year**

*2019*

**(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

**(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario**

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**   
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

**Stakeholder and customer demands**  
☑ Consumer sentiment

**Regulators, legal and policy regimes**   
☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

**Macro and microeconomy**   
☑ Globalizing markets

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

*The studies covered 3 temperature scenarios and 3 sites in 3 different regions. In each site a different product line was analysed. Together these give us sufficient coverage for a general understanding of the identified climate risks and opportunities facing the Group as a whole. Taken together, the product lines cover all three of our key chemistries (acrylic emulsions, synthetic elastomer emulsions and hydrocarbon resins), our three main regions (USA, Europe, Asia), more than 50% of our products. In a 1.5 C scenario there is an ambitious, politically coordinated and rapid technological and policy transition that enables alignment to a low carbon emissions trajectory. The physical impacts of climate change are relatively small and driven by locked in emissions from activity in prior decades. There is an emphasis on sustainable development, this drives down regional and local income inequalities which enables the global population to stabilise. Under the 1.5C Steady Path to Sustainability scenario, the world takes the rapid and drastic policy measures required to meet the ambitions of the 2015 Paris Agreement. Net zero emissions targets are adopted and fossil fuels quickly take a back seat as low carbon technologies take over. Climate considerations are prioritised strategically, allowing for enhanced flexibility and resilience. At 1.5C of global warming there are still climatic changes. However, the prioritisation of climate issues in this scenario mean changes have been actively anticipated and, to a significant extent, mitigated. Some Headlines Political - Global climate diplomacy is successful - Nations cooperate to create ambitious climate policy Economic - An ambitious global carbon price is put in place, reaching 100/tCO2e by 2030 and exceeding 250/tCO2e by 2050 - The financial system places climate risk at its core Social - Environmental awareness grows - Society looks for a just transition and expanded corporate responsibility Technology - Low carbon technology focuses on ultra efficiency in processes and there are significant programs of investment in electrification and energy efficiency Environment - The worst physical impacts are avoided, but the climate continues to become harsher - Nature based solutions are pursued Legal - Swathes of ambitious environmental regulation are introduced in the 2020s businesses are incentivised to report on and align their activities to science based targets around climate and wider sustainability goals*

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

*Climate change with its associated environmental and socioeconomic impacts presents both ongoing and potential future risks throughout our supply chains and operations, and for our customers and end markets. But, as a speciality chemicals business, it may also bring opportunities for Synthomer. We have been working on these risks and opportunities for many years. We remain committed to taking action and supporting policies aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C This scenario provides a view of the likely impact of a Paris compliant scenario on the business to shape our future innovation and investment strategies (SSP1/RCP1.9). RCP and SSP scenario-aligned data on hydrological drought risk from Arnell et. al. – produced by researchers from the Met Office Hadley Centre and University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit (Arnell, Nigel W., et al. "The global and regional impacts of climate change under representative concentration pathway forcing and shared socioeconomic pathway socioeconomic scenarios." Environmental Research Letters 14.8 (2019): 084046) Regional SSP/RCP aligned hydrological flood risk data used: - World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal data• Country-level data for the increase in the number of days with rainfall 20mm in 2025, 2030 and 2050 compared to 2020 - Baseline flood-risk likelihood was used with the estimated relative increases in rainfall 20mm for the RCP scenario to calculate a serious flood likelihood in 2030 and 2050, for all RCP scenarios Carbon pricing data used data from the SSP Public Database (Version 2.0) by selecting the relevant SSP scenario*

**Water**

**(5.1.1.1) Scenario used**

**Water scenarios**  
☑ WRI Aqueduct

**(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

☑ Policy

☑ Reputation

**(5.1.1.7) Reference year**

*2019*

**(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2050

**(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario**

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**   
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

**Regulators, legal and policy regimes**   
☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify

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

*To provide a greater degree of granularity for water-related risks and to complement the climate scenario analysis we used Aqueduct 4.0, the latest iteration of World Resource Institute’s (WRI) water risk framework designed to translate complex hydrological data into intuitive indicators of water-related risk. There are 13 water risk indicators—spanning quantity, quality, and reputational concerns. Each indicator is sourced from an open-source, peer-reviewed data provider and then transformed to normalized risk score based on the severity of the water challenge. For 5 of the 13 indicators, WRI used a global hydrological model called PCR-GLOBWB 2 to generate novel datasets on sub-basin water supply and use. WRI also used the PCR-GLOBWB 2 model to project future sub-basin water supply, demand, stress, depletion, and variability using CMIP6 climate forcings. The projections centred around three periods (2030, 2050, and 2080) under three future scenarios (business-as-usual SSP 3 RCP 7.0, optimistic SSP 1 RCP 2.6, and pessimistic SSP 5 RCP 8.5). Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) and Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP) were broadly consistent with the temperature outcomes and socioeconomic conditions desired by Synthomer for the scenarios considered. PCR-GLOBWB 2 is a global, gridded hydrological model. Each grid cell has a size of 5 5 arc minutes. This equates roughly to 10 kilometer (km) 10 km pixels, with any variation depending on the latitude. The constraint with the WRI Aqueduct using this model is that it is not granular enough to fully assess water risks for Synthomer locations. So we then had to complement the Aqueduct results with a a site-specific review to better assess the local context.*

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

*Climate change with its associated environmental and socioeconomic impacts presents both ongoing and potential future risks throughout our supply chains and operations, and for our customers and end markets. But, as a speciality chemicals business, it may also bring opportunities for Synthomer. We have been working on these risks and opportunities for many years. We remain committed to taking action and supporting policies aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C WRI Aqueduct was chosen because the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) and Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP) were broadly consistent with the temperature outcomes and socioeconomic conditions desired by Synthomer for the scenarios considered.*

**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*

☑ Policy ☑ Acute physical

☑ Market ☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

**(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

**(5.1.1.7) Reference year**

*2019*

**(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

**(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario**

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**   
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

**Stakeholder and customer demands**  
☑ Consumer sentiment

**Regulators, legal and policy regimes**   
☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

**Macro and microeconomy**   
☑ Globalizing markets

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

*The studies covered 3 temperature scenarios and 3 sites in 3 different regions. In each site a different product line was analysed. Together these give us sufficient coverage for a general understanding of the identified climate risks and opportunities facing the Group as a whole. Taken together, the product lines cover all three of our key chemistries (acrylic emulsions, synthetic elastomer emulsions and hydrocarbon resins), our three main regions (USA, Europe, Asia), more than 50% of our products. In a 2C scenario the world follows a path in which social, economic, and technological trends do not shift significantly from established patterns. Global and national institutions work towards making progress on sustainable development goals but given the slow pace of climate mitigation action, environmental systems still experience degradation which will cause regional specific instability. Global warming, region specific changes become more apparent with the intensification of tropical cyclones, increases in river floods, increases in aridity, and significant increases in wildfire. At the same time, there are some improvements, resource and energy use declines due in part to technological improvements, resulting in temperatures stabilising at 2C by end of century. Significant international action fall short of reaching the greatest ambitions of the 2015 Paris Agreement. Lack of unanimous action both within and between nations leads to disparities in response. Some headlines Political - Climate diplomacy experiences periods of marked progress, and periods of backwards movement Economic - Income growth is uneven across regions - Sustainable development/’Just Transition’ goals met in some regions, but not others - Fossil fuel dependency decreases slowly Social - Development is uneven education investment is not high enough to accelerate transition to lower population growth in low income countries, driving persistent income inequality Technology - Technological progress is viewed as an inevitability - Government support to enable innovation and spur technological adaptation is largely absent Environment - Extreme weather events worsen, in their intensity and frequency - Progress achieved on climate action averts significant sea level rise Legal - There is an emphasis on creating a regulatory environment that balances business objectives and climate goals, sometimes achieving neither*

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

*Climate change with its associated environmental and socioeconomic impacts presents both ongoing and potential future risks throughout our supply chains and operations, and for our customers and end markets. But, as a speciality chemicals business, it may also bring opportunities for Synthomer. We have been working on these risks and opportunities for many years. We remain committed to taking action and supporting policies aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C. This scenario provides a view of the likely impact on the business to shape our future innovation and investment strategies if RCP1.9/SSP1 failed to materialise and we had to follow RCP2.6/SSP2. RCP and SSP scenario-aligned data on hydrological drought risk from Arnell et. al. – produced by researchers from the Met Office Hadley Centre and University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit (Arnell, Nigel W., et al. "The global and regional impacts of climate change under representative concentration pathway forcing and shared socioeconomic pathway socioeconomic scenarios." Environmental Research Letters 14.8 (2019): 084046) Regional SSP/RCP aligned hydrological flood risk data used: - World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal data• Country-level data for the increase in the number of days with rainfall 20mm in 2025, 2030 and 2050 compared to 2020 - Baseline flood-risk likelihood was used with the estimated relative increases in rainfall 20mm for the RCP scenario to calculate a serious flood likelihood in 2030 and 2050, for all RCP scenarios Carbon pricing data used data from the SSP Public Database (Version 2.0) by selecting the relevant SSP scenario*

**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:*

☑ 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*

☑ Policy ☑ Acute physical

☑ Market ☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

**(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ 3.0ºC - 3.4ºC

**(5.1.1.7) Reference year**

*2019*

**(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

**(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario**

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**   
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

**Stakeholder and customer demands**  
☑ Consumer sentiment

**Regulators, legal and policy regimes**   
☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

**Macro and microeconomy**   
☑ Globalizing markets

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

*The studies covered 3 temperature scenarios and 3 sites in 3 different regions. In each site a different product line was analysed. Together these give us sufficient coverage for a general understanding of the identified climate risks and opportunities facing the Group as a whole. Taken together, the product lines cover all three of our key chemistries (acrylic emulsions, synthetic elastomer emulsions and hydrocarbon resins), our three main regions (USA, Europe, Asia), more than 50% of our products. In a 3C scenario the political and economic status quo prevails. Energy and food security goals are prioritised. Inaction on climate forces drastic measures to adapt to and mitigate the physical impacts of climate change. The 3C scenario explores a possible route in which the world continues to use fossil fuels as the engine of economic growth, resulting in significant warming and extensive business disruption. Governments quietly drop their climate commitments and instead scramble to intervene and build resilience to the worst impacts of climate change as they become apparent. Some Headlines: Political - Climate diplomacy fails - Nations deprioritise climate targets and focus on energy and food security. Economic - Consumption led economic growth is achieved through the 2020s - By the 2040s, physical climate impacts start significantly disrupting growth Social - Quality of life improves through the 2020s, fuelled by growth in developing regions - Climate related migration and inequality impacts social cohesion Technology - Technology is framed as a tool to help society adapt to climate change - As physical impacts worsen, governments invest in hard adaptation measures Environment - Extreme weather events worsen significantly, causing major disruptions - Health impacts and humanitarian crises result in rich and poor countries alike Legal - Laws and litigation around climate related liability have little impact through the 2020s, there is an emphasis on creating a regulatory environment favourable to business at the expense of climate goals*

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

*Climate change with its associated environmental and socioeconomic impacts presents both ongoing and potential future risks throughout our supply chains and operations, and for our customers and end markets. But, as a speciality chemicals business, it may also bring opportunities for Synthomer. We have been working on these risks and opportunities for many years. We remain committed to taking action and supporting policies aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C. The scenarios in Aqueduct provided a view of the likely impact on the business to shape our future innovation and investment strategies if RCP1.9/SSP1 and RCP2.6/SSP2 failed to materialise and we had to follow RCP8.5/SSP3 RCP and SSP scenario-aligned data on hydrological drought risk from Arnell et. al. – produced by researchers from the Met Office Hadley Centre and University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit (Arnell, Nigel W., et al. "The global and regional impacts of climate change under representative concentration pathway forcing and shared socioeconomic pathway socioeconomic scenarios." Environmental Research Letters 14.8 (2019): 084046) Regional SSP/RCP aligned hydrological flood risk data used: - World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal data• Country-level data for the increase in the number of days with rainfall 20mm in 2025, 2030 and 2050 compared to 2020 - Baseline flood-risk likelihood was used with the estimated relative increases in rainfall 20mm for the RCP scenario to calculate a serious flood likelihood in 2030 and 2050, for all RCP scenarios Carbon pricing data used data from the SSP Public Database (Version 2.0) by selecting the relevant SSP scenario*

**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 ☑ Acute physical

☑ Market ☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

**(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ 1.5°C or lower

**(5.1.1.7) Reference year**

*2019*

**(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

**(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario**

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**   
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

**Stakeholder and customer demands**  
☑ Consumer sentiment

**Regulators, legal and policy regimes**   
☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

**Macro and microeconomy**   
☑ Globalizing markets

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

*The qualitative and quantitative studies covered 3 temperature scenarios and 3 sites in 3 different regions. In each site a different product line was analysed. Together these give us sufficient coverage for a general understanding of the identified climate risks and opportunities facing the Group as a whole. Taken together, the product lines cover all three of our key chemistries (acrylic emulsions, synthetic elastomer emulsions and hydrocarbon resins), our three main regions (USA, Europe, Asia), more than 50% of our products. Europe: The European Union executes a ‘Green New Deal’ which provides support to industry and the utility system to enable full decarbonisation and/or offsetting by 2050. Synthomer could benefit from policy in the ‘Green New Deal’ – and win grants and government funding for research and innovation to enable the low-carbon transition. The financial system increasingly internalises climate risks to business and facilitates capital allocation that enables the net zero transition. Synthomer, as a veteran participant in climate-related TCFD, and CDP disclosures, is well placed and identified as a strong candidate for ESG-aligned investing. Asia: Decentralised renewable power grids have replaced fossil-intensive electricity generating systems, Synthomer faces different costs for its electricity supply and makes plans to be resilient in the face of greater intermittency across the electricity system. North America: Ambitious climate policies have enabled a shift to decentralised low-carbon electricity systems and economic growth driven by low-carbon industry and services. As in locations in Asia, Synthomer faces different costs for its electricity supply and makes plans to be resilient in the face of greater intermittency across the electricity system. Policy to support the full circularity of the economy is announced, with renewed interest and investment in recycling spurring additional low-carbon innovation. The government provides grants and funding to spur research and innovation across sectors, benefiting Synthomer. Revenues from carbon taxes are re-invested in national infrastructure to create an integrated low-carbon transport system across the United States and Canada*

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

*Climate change with its associated environmental and socioeconomic impacts presents both ongoing and potential future risks throughout our supply chains and operations, and for our customers and end markets. But, as a speciality chemicals business, it may also bring opportunities for Synthomer. We have been working on these risks and opportunities for many years. We remain committed to taking action and supporting policies aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C This scenario provides a view of the likely impact of a Paris compliant scenario on the business to shape our future innovation and investment strategies (SSP1/RCP1.9). RCP and SSP scenario-aligned data on hydrological drought risk from Arnell et. al. – produced by researchers from the Met Office Hadley Centre and University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit (Arnell, Nigel W., et al. "The global and regional impacts of climate change under representative concentration pathway forcing and shared socioeconomic pathway socioeconomic scenarios." Environmental Research Letters 14.8 (2019): 084046) Regional SSP/RCP aligned hydrological flood risk data used: - World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal data• Country-level data for the increase in the number of days with rainfall 20mm in 2025, 2030 and 2050 compared to 2020 - Baseline flood-risk likelihood was used with the estimated relative increases in rainfall 20mm for the RCP scenario to calculate a serious flood likelihood in 2030 and 2050, for all RCP scenarios Carbon pricing data used data from the SSP Public Database (Version 2.0) by selecting the relevant SSP scenario*

**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 ☑ Acute physical

☑ Market ☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

**(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

**(5.1.1.7) Reference year**

*2019*

**(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

**(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario**

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**   
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

**Stakeholder and customer demands**  
☑ Consumer sentiment

**Regulators, legal and policy regimes**   
☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

**Macro and microeconomy**   
☑ Globalizing markets

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

*The qualitative and quantitative studies covered 3 temperature scenarios and 3 sites in 3 different regions. In each site a different product line was analysed. Together these give us sufficient coverage for a general understanding of the identified climate risks and opportunities facing the Group as a whole. Taken together, the product lines cover all three of our key chemistries (acrylic emulsions, synthetic elastomer emulsions and hydrocarbon resins), our three main regions (USA, Europe, Asia), more than 50% of our products. Europe: Climate policy across Europe is largely successful in enabling a transition to a low-carbon economy, however the same can not be uniformly said for the rest of the world. Synthomer faces different transition costs in the markets it operates in, and higher climate costs across all areas due to lack of coordinate effective action. A significant refugee crisis fuelled by growth in climate refugees from the Middle East, Asia, and Africa, puts strain on economic and social-welfare systems, threatening the political consensus that enabled the successful shift to a low-carbon economy. Political instability and uncertainty leads to greater market volatility in the markets that Synthomer operates in. Asia: Decentralised renewable power grids have replaced a significant share of fossil-intensive electricity generating systems, but countries like Malaysia still pursue opportunities for natural resource extraction for export and own-consumption. Synthomer faces erratic changes in the prices of fuel and electricity. North America: Carbon taxes are pursued across a selection of states in the United States and Canada, responsible for the majority of the region’s carbon emissions. Synthomer faces high transition costs in North America, and also faces significant climate costs due to the results of uncoordinated action. Ambitious national-level policy enables large-scale decarbonisation of the electricity system with decentralised renewable power grids, alongside significant investments in largely carbon-based flexible back-up power generation. Synthomer faces changing prices of various petrochemical by-product inputs to production given changes in demand and prices for oil in different key markets.*

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

*Climate change with its associated environmental and socioeconomic impacts presents both ongoing and potential future risks throughout our supply chains and operations, and for our customers and end markets. But, as a speciality chemicals business, it may also bring opportunities for Synthomer. We have been working on these risks and opportunities for many years. We remain committed to taking action and supporting policies aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C. This scenario provides a view of the likely impact on the business to shape our future innovation and investment strategies if RCP1.9/SSP1 failed to materialise and we had to follow RCP2.6/SSP2. RCP and SSP scenario-aligned data on hydrological drought risk from Arnell et. al. – produced by researchers from the Met Office Hadley Centre and University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit (Arnell, Nigel W., et al. "The global and regional impacts of climate change under representative concentration pathway forcing and shared socioeconomic pathway socioeconomic scenarios." Environmental Research Letters 14.8 (2019): 084046) Regional SSP/RCP aligned hydrological flood risk data used: - World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal data• Country-level data for the increase in the number of days with rainfall 20mm in 2025, 2030 and 2050 compared to 2020 - Baseline flood-risk likelihood was used with the estimated relative increases in rainfall 20mm for the RCP scenario to calculate a serious flood likelihood in 2030 and 2050, for all RCP scenarios Carbon pricing data used data from the SSP Public Database (Version 2.0) by selecting the relevant SSP scenario*

**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 ☑ Acute physical

☑ Market ☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

**(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ 3.0ºC - 3.4ºC

**(5.1.1.7) Reference year**

*2019*

**(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

**(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario**

**Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts**   
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

**Stakeholder and customer demands**  
☑ Consumer sentiment

**Regulators, legal and policy regimes**   
☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

**Macro and microeconomy**   
☑ Globalizing markets

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

*The qualitative and quantitative studies covered 3 temperature scenarios and 3 sites in 3 different regions. In each site a different product line was analysed. Together these give us sufficient coverage for a general understanding of the identified climate risks and opportunities facing the Group as a whole. Taken together, the product lines cover all three of our key chemistries (acrylic emulsions, synthetic elastomer emulsions and hydrocarbon resins), our three main regions (USA, Europe, Asia), more than 50% of our products. Europe: Opportunities for using more environmentally-friendly originated inputs to production, such as natural rubber or, corn- or sugar beet-derived organic chemical compounds, are reduced due to greater competition for natural resources. Policy makers pursue a combination of adaptation measures, tightening border controls and conducting internal relocations (e.g. relocating households and business to higher ground outside flood areas), resulting in internal political crises across Europe as appropriate land only becomes scarcer over time. Synthomer is exposed to severe market instability due to the wider conditions of severe social and economic uncertainty. Asia: Unmitigated impacts of climate change, coastal flooding across Southeast Asia drives a series of internal relocations, and external migrations to regions abroad perceived to be less impacted by climate change. Synthomer pays a steep insurance premium to continue operations at sites in Malaysia, and considers operational resilience measures. Countries such as Malaysia, continue to explore opportunities for natural resource extraction for export and own-consumption, making Synthomer’s operations in markets pursuing more carbon intensive development paths more risky from an ESG-investing perspective. North America: Extreme heat makes outdoor activities dangerous most days of the summer across the South East and the South West of the USA. This ultimately has implications on Synthomer’s operational resilience and worker productivity in this region. There is a massive refugee crisis at the United States’ southern border, triggered by cascading crop failures across Central and South American states, and subsequent internal political upheaval. These migrations drive internal political instability in states on the southern border, and at a national level. Synthomer is exposed to severe market instability due to the wider conditions of severe social and economic uncertainty.*

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

*Climate change with its associated environmental and socioeconomic impacts presents both ongoing and potential future risks throughout our supply chains and operations, and for our customers and end markets. But, as a speciality chemicals business, it may also bring opportunities for Synthomer. We have been working on these risks and opportunities for many years. We remain committed to taking action and supporting policies aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement to limit the rise in global temperatures to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels, and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5C. This scenario provides a view of the likely impact on the business to shape our future innovation and investment strategies if RCP1.9/SSP1 and RCP2.6/SSP2 failed to materialise and we had to follow RCP8.5/SSP3 RCP and SSP scenario-aligned data on hydrological drought risk from Arnell et. al. – produced by researchers from the Met Office Hadley Centre and University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit (Arnell, Nigel W., et al. "The global and regional impacts of climate change under representative concentration pathway forcing and shared socioeconomic pathway socioeconomic scenarios." Environmental Research Letters 14.8 (2019): 084046) Regional SSP/RCP aligned hydrological flood risk data used: - World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal data• Country-level data for the increase in the number of days with rainfall 20mm in 2025, 2030 and 2050 compared to 2020 - Baseline flood-risk likelihood was used with the estimated relative increases in rainfall 20mm for the RCP scenario to calculate a serious flood likelihood in 2030 and 2050, for all RCP scenarios Carbon pricing data used data from the SSP Public Database (Version 2.0) by selecting the relevant SSP scenario*

*[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**

*In the short to medium term (to 2025 and 2035), transition risks, particularly global or regional carbon taxes, are most likely to affect Synthomer. The physical risks of climate change, while already starting to occur in the form of more frequent extreme weather in more parts of the world, are likely to increase and therefore become more costly over the medium to long term (2035 and 2050). More specifically, in the short term (to 2025), under a 1.5ºC temperature rise scenario, from our analysis we estimate that around 75% of the impact of the risks from climate change will come from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy (notably higher costs), with just 25% coming from physical risks (more extreme weather events affecting our operations). In that context however, if there is global coordination of carbon pricing and environmental taxes then it is likely that Synthomer would be able to pass most climate-related cost through to our customers. At the same time, with increasing awareness of climate-related issues, we expect to see growing demand from the market for products that avoid solvent emissions, lower carbon intensive or higher circularity benefits – which will give a considerable measure of resilience to our business. Should there be insufficient alignment globally to constrain the temperature increase, or it occurs too slowly, then a 2C or even 3C temperature rise becomes increasingly likely, and with it an increase in physical risks over the medium to longer term. Synthomer is, however, in a relatively strong position to withstand the impact of these risks, because our network of manufacturing sites across the world is wider, meaning that we can continue to supply customers from an alternative site if one is affected by extreme weather. We perform sensitivity analysis for our Scope 1 and 2, and Scope 3 GHG emissions taking account of each Division’s strategic business plans to inform and assess the resilience of our business planning. Our overall climate resilience is intrinsically linked to our ability to commercialise lower-carbon raw materials, manufacturing and products through our corporate strategy. Through our scenario analysis we identified five primary strategic responses, whichever climate scenario ultimately plays out. The five responses have already been incorporated into Synthomer’s strategic breakthrough objectives and goals. Our five responses (in order of priority) and the work conducted in 2023 are: 1. Work with selected suppliers: we have begun to engage suppliers of our key raw materials. Our immediate focus is to explore how to work with suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks. This is where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 emissions. In the medium term, we are also working to identify and introduce alternative feedstocks, including those from bio-based or circular sources where they offer a lower-carbon solution, although we may have to consider trade-offs with other environmental factors, such as land use change. 2. Reduce our Scope 1 emissions: we have already taken significant action by ending the use of coal in our manufacturing sites. In the short term, we are continuing to decarbonise our operations through process optimisation as part of our Manufacturing Excellence programme. In the medium term, we have active projects focused on electrification, heat pumps and solar power. And for the long term, we are involved in a feasibility project for the use of green hydrogen at one of our key European sites. 3. Reduce our Scope 2 emissions: 80% of our purchased electricity already comes from renewable sources and we will continue to reduce and optimise electricity and heat consumption in the short-term. From 2024, we are working to enter into or expand power purchase agreements linked to clean-energy generation. 4. Innovate to decarbonise our products: we are continuing to create and respond to demand from our customers for more sustainable products. In 2023, we revised our product sustainability scorecard to support the further prioritisation of lower-carbon product development for commercialisation in the medium term. 5. Enhance our physical resilience: using the World Resources Institute (WRI) Aqueduct tools, we have assessed the water-related risks at our own operations. We are now implementing improvement plans for the three sites identified as being at high risk to ensure business continuity and regulatory compliance.*

**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**

*In the short to medium term (to 2025 and 2035), transition risks, particularly global or regional carbon taxes, are most likely to affect Synthomer. The physical risks of climate change, while already starting to occur in the form of more frequent extreme weather in more parts of the world, are likely to increase and therefore become more costly over the medium to long term (2035 and 2050). More specifically, in the short term (to 2025), under a 1.5ºC temperature rise scenario, from our analysis we estimate that around 75% of the impact of the risks from climate change will come from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy (notably higher costs), with just 25% coming from physical risks (more extreme weather events affecting our operations). In that context however, if there is global coordination of carbon pricing and environmental taxes then it is likely that Synthomer would be able to pass most climate-related cost through to our customers. At the same time, with increasing awareness of climate-related issues, we expect to see growing demand from the market for products that avoid solvent emissions, lower carbon intensive or higher circularity benefits – which will give a considerable measure of resilience to our business. Should there be insufficient alignment globally to constrain the temperature increase, or it occurs too slowly, then a 2C or even 3C temperature rise becomes increasingly likely, and with it an increase in physical risks over the medium to longer term. Synthomer is, however, in a relatively strong position to withstand the impact of these risks, because our network of manufacturing sites across the world is wider, meaning that we can continue to supply customers from an alternative site if one is affected by extreme weather. We perform sensitivity analysis for our Scope 1 and 2, and Scope 3 GHG emissions taking account of each Division’s strategic business plans to inform and assess the resilience of our business planning. Our overall climate resilience is intrinsically linked to our ability to commercialise lower-carbon raw materials, manufacturing and products through our corporate strategy. Through our scenario analysis we identified five primary strategic responses, whichever climate scenario ultimately plays out. The five responses have already been incorporated into Synthomer’s strategic breakthrough objectives and goals. Our five responses (in order of priority) and the work conducted in 2023 are: 1. Work with selected suppliers: we have begun to engage suppliers of our key raw materials. Our immediate focus is to explore how to work with suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks. This is where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 emissions. In the medium term, we are also working to identify and introduce alternative feedstocks, including those from bio-based or circular sources where they offer a lower-carbon solution, although we may have to consider trade-offs with other environmental factors, such as land use change. 2. Reduce our Scope 1 emissions: we have already taken significant action by ending the use of coal in our manufacturing sites. In the short term, we are continuing to decarbonise our operations through process optimisation as part of our Manufacturing Excellence programme. In the medium term, we have active projects focused on electrification, heat pumps and solar power. And for the long term, we are involved in a feasibility project for the use of green hydrogen at one of our key European sites. 3. Reduce our Scope 2 emissions: 80% of our purchased electricity already comes from renewable sources and we will continue to reduce and optimise electricity and heat consumption in the short-term. From 2024, we are working to enter into or expand power purchase agreements linked to clean-energy generation. 4. Innovate to decarbonise our products: we are continuing to create and respond to demand from our customers for more sustainable products. In 2023, we revised our product sustainability scorecard to support the further prioritisation of lower-carbon product development for commercialisation in the medium term. 5. Enhance our physical resilience: using the World Resources Institute (WRI) Aqueduct tools, we have assessed the water-related risks at our own operations. We are now implementing improvement plans for the three sites identified as being at high risk to ensure business continuity and regulatory compliance.*

*[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:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Currently a work in progress

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

*We are developing a transition plan in 2024/5. Our near-term GHG targets to 2030 have been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative. The Scope 1 and 2 target is in line with a 1.5C trajectory, while our Scope 3 target is in line with a less than 2C trajectory. We have also made a commitment to net-zero by 2050. Our strategy, risk and governance process incorporates the climate-related risks and opportunities reported in our TCFD report (see Annual Report 2023). Our climate scenario analysis addressed three time horizons (2025, 2030 and 2050) and covered all three of our key chemistries in our three main regions; covering more than 50% of our products by volume. In the short term (to 2025), around 75% of the climate-related financial impact will come from the transition to a low-carbon, circular economy with around 25% coming from physical risks (more extreme weather events affecting our or our suppliers’ operations) under a 1.5ºC scenario. Under this scenario, we also see the greatest potential for growth in demand from our customers and their consumers, for products that offer lower-carbon or circularity benefits. Looking beyond 2025 transitioning to a low-carbon economy remains our most significant financial risk; by 2030 and 2050 the split between transition and physical risks will become higher (approximately 90:10 vs 75:25 in 2025). Through our scenario analysis, we identified five primary responses which will form the basis of our transition plan. 1. Working with selected strategic suppliers, to encourage them to reduce their own emissions, 2. Reducing our Scope 1 emissions in the short term through process optimisation; in the medium term through capital projects such as electrification and heat pumps; and in the long term, using hydrogen where possible. 3. Reducing our Scope 2 emissions by reducing and optimising electricity consumption in the short term, and entering into, or expanding, renewable power purchase agreements in the medium term. 4. Innovating to decarbonise our products. We have revised our innovation scorecard to prioritise lower-carbon product development in the medium term. 5. Enhancing our physical resilience by assessing and responding to water-related risks of our own operations*

*[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**

*In the short term (to 2025), around 75% of any potential financial impact of climate risks for our business are from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy (mainly higher costs), with around 25% coming from physical risks (more extreme weather events affecting our or our suppliers’ operations) under a 1.5ºC temperature rise scenario. Under this scenario, we also see the greatest potential opportunity for growth in demand from our customers and their consumers, for those products that offer lower-carbon or circularity benefits. Looking beyond 2025, our scenario analyses confirmed that transitioning to a low-carbon economy would remain our most significant potential climate-related financial risk; by 2030 and 2050 the relative weighting of transition risks compared to physical risks will become higher (approximately 90:10 vs approximately 75:25 in 2025). Indirect emissions from our value chain (Scope 3) make up approximately 85% of our total carbon footprint, of which category 1 (purchased goods and services) accounts for more than 85%. Our transition planning is therefore focused on reducing our value-chain GHG emissions. In the past year, we have run a cross-business project to develop strategic roadmaps that identify the raw material and technology options to guide our divisions towards reducing our Scope 3 emissions through the products provided to our customers. The analysis has helped us better understand our data and the tools we use to track it, as well as prioritise the key raw materials and products that will help us achieve our ambition. What has become clear is that tackling these emissions will take time, with some solutions available more quickly than others. So, we have divided our work into three time horizons, the next two years, up to 2030, and up to 2040. We have also identified three key strategic levers for action. 1. Upstream benefits: we will engage more with suppliers. Our immediate focus will be to work with suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks. This is where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 emissions. We also want to identify and introduce alternative feedstocks where they offer a lower-carbon solution, as is the case with bio-based monomers. 2. ‘Value without volume’: as we evolve to become a speciality chemicals business, we will need to develop new business models that support decarbonisation, and we will use carbon footprint alongside financial modelling to help us do that. 3. Innovation gap: in our 2040 time horizon, we will need to adopt new, alternative, low-carbon raw materials and technologies. This is a complicated process that will take time, because any change made in the way a material is introduced into the value chain can have a knock-on effect on the processes and equipment that we – and our customers – use.*

**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**

*In the short term (to 2025), around 75% of any potential financial impact of climate risks for our business are from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy. Looking beyond 2025 to 2030 and 2050 the relative weighting of transition risks to physical risks will become higher (approximately 90:10 vs approximately 75:25 in 2025). Indirect emissions from our value chain (Scope 3) make up approximately 85% of our total carbon footprint, of which category 1 (purchased goods and services) accounts for more than 85%. Our transition planning is therefore focused on reducing our value-chain GHG emissions. In the past year, we have run a cross-business project to develop strategic roadmaps that identify the raw material and technology options to reduce our Scope 3 emissions through the products provided to our customers. The analysis has helped us better understand our data and the tools we use to track it, as well as prioritise the key raw materials and products that will help us achieve our ambition. What has become clear is that tackling these emissions will take time, with some solutions available more quickly than others. So, we have divided our work into three time horizons, the next two years, up to 2030, and up to 2040. We have also identified three key strategic levers for action. 1. Upstream benefits: we will engage more with suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks. This is where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 emissions. We also want to identify and introduce alternative feedstocks where they offer a lower-carbon solution, as is the case with bio-based monomers. 2. ‘Value without volume’: as we evolve to become a speciality chemicals business, we will need to develop new business models that support decarbonisation, and we will use carbon footprint alongside financial modelling to help us do that. 3. Innovation gap: in our 2040 time horizon, we will need to adopt new, alternative, low-carbon raw materials and technologies. To support deliver the Upstream benefits have spent time educating our procurement teams on the changing market landscape. We started talking to suppliers and potential future technology partners about our options for the longer term. Different divisions of the company are at different stages of developing their next steps. For example, our HPPM division has already developed its upstream and downstream value chain roadmap to take advantage of lower-carbon opportunities. Meanwhile, in 2023, we ran three workshops with two divisions in 2024 to determine initial priority initiatives for each division by discussing the big market challenges that need to be solved within the value chain and to ensure that our preferred applications and customer requirements align with our business strategy and/or the technology options that we will need to deliver value while reducing our Scope 3 emissions.*

**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**

*In the short term (to 2025), around 75% of any potential financial impact of climate risks for our business will come from transitioning to a low-carbon, circular economy, with around 25% coming from physical risks under a 1.5ºC temperature rise scenario. Under this scenario, we also see the greatest potential opportunity for growth in demand from our customers and their consumers, for those products that offer lower-carbon or circularity benefits. Looking beyond 2025 transitioning to a low-carbon economy would remain our most significant potential climate-related financial risk; by 2030 and 2050 the relative weighting of transition risks compared to physical risks will become higher (approximately 90:10 vs approximately 75:25 in 2025). Indirect emissions from our value chain (Scope 3) make up approximately 85% of our total carbon footprint, of which category 1 (purchased goods and services) accounts for more than 85%. Our transition planning is therefore focused on reducing our value-chain GHG emissions. A new project started in 2024 to further incorporate climate change risks and opportunities into the business planning processes, with the objective of improving our forecasting of the potential financial impacts related to our net-zero transition plan Investment in products that may have lower emissions is already an ongoing activity. Further R&D resources have been added to build a platform to reduce the carbon intensity of our products, by seeking alternative bio based raw materials and working closely with our suppliers to reduce Scope 3 emissions of our standard raw materials. Innovation is key to building our portfolio of specialised, highly differentiated products, which is at the heart of Synthomer’s growth strategy. The rapid increase in demand from customers for products with sustainable benefits gives us an opportunity to use our innovation skills to create competitive advantage. Everything we do in innovation – new product design, process improvements, new application development – is designed to bring us closer to our customers’ needs, offering more sustainable products and value-added performance – which in turn helps drive Synthomer’s growth. This approach is enabling us to proactively build our innovation product pipeline towards our sustainable products goal of having 60% of new products with sustainability benefits. This year, we launched nine new products with enhanced sustainability benefits, meaning we reached 64% (up from 50% in 2022). This is our third consecutive annual rise.*

**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

☑ Water

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

*Reducing our Scope 1 emissions: we have already taken significant action by ending the use of coal in our manufacturing sites. In the short term, we are continuing to decarbonise our operations and reduce water consumption through process optimisation as part of our Manufacturing Excellence programme. In the medium term, we have active projects focused on electrification, heat pumps and solar power. And for the long term, we are involved in a feasibility project for the use of green hydrogen at one of our key European sites. In order to take rapid action to reduce scope 1 emissions we have ended the use of coal burning across our global organisation – this has resulted in the closure of the coal power station at our plant in Czechia during 2022 Reducing our Scope 2 emissions: 80% of our purchased electricity already comes from renewable sources and we will continue to reduce and optimise electricity and heat consumption in the short term. From 2024, we are working to enter into or expand power purchase agreements linked to clean-energy generation. A number of operations have commitments and obligations to comply with ISO 50001 and Group targets for reducing emissions. An internal carbon price has been introduced for all Capex projects 1million GBP*

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Revenues

☑ Direct costs

☑ 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

☑ Water

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

*Revenues: Implemented the Product Sustainability Scorecard to focus on opportunities for the development of products with sustainability benefits, the Synovus Plus glove line being an example as it allows the reduction of energy and the potential reduction of water in our customers manufacturing processes. Direct Costs: Both energy efficiency impact on operating cost (which may then support capital spend) and energy / carbon compliance scheme costs are considered. The selection of green tariffs as part of decarbonisation of our grid supplied electricity is prioritised against standard tariffs. The move to PPA’s will secure the use of renewable electricity in the long run and stabilize the associated cost, enabling the achievement of at least 80% of renewable electricity of Vision 2030. Capital Expenditures: To achieve Group targets on reducing emissions and energy consumption there is a focus on capital plans linked to the sites accounting for 70-75% of energy / emissions and an acceptance of medium term payback windows within justification for such work. Capital allocation in terms of natural, human and social capital is starting to be evaluated through our project sustainability scorecard, where these aspects, together with the internal carbon price are taken into consideration. In 2022, we introduced a shadow carbon price, set at 85 per tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent. Every capital investment decision above 1 million will incorporate that carbon price in its financial projections. This will ensure that our engineers always consider how they can optimise the energy and climate impacts of their proposed projects.*

*[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** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes | *Select all that apply*  ☑ Other methodology or framework |

*[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:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Capital expenditure internal classification system

**(5.4.1.5) Financial metric**

*Select from:*

☑ CAPEX

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

*5000000*

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

*13*

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

*13*

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

*13*

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

*As external taxonomies are not yet well enough developed for thorough and meaningful implementation we use an internal capex classification system. At project creation a 'Category' and 'Sub-category' must be selected. One of the 6 main categories is Sustainability related to projects which improve site ESG performance including carbon footprint/water use/emissions/waste production.*

*[Add row]*

## (5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?

**(5.5.1) Investment in low-carbon R&D**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(5.5.2) Comment**

*Innovation is key to building our portfolio of specialised, highly differentiated products, which is at the heart of Synthomer’s growth strategy. The potential rapid increase in demand from customers for products with sustainable benefits including lower-carbon gives us an opportunity to use our innovation skills to create competitive advantage. Everything we do in innovation – new product design, process improvements, new application development – is designed to bring us closer to our customers’ needs, offering more sustainable products and value-added performance – which in turn helps drive Synthomer’s growth. This approach is enabling us to proactively build our innovation product pipeline towards our Vision 2030 sustainable products goal of having 60% of new products with sustainability benefits. This year, we launched nine new products with enhanced sustainability benefits, meaning we reached 64% (up from 50% in 2022). This is our third consecutive rise since we launched our Vision 2030 roadmap.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (5.5.3) Provide details of your organization’s investments in low-carbon R&D for chemical production activities over the last three years.

**Row 1**

**(5.5.3.1) Technology area**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Air quality & VOC emissions reduction

**(5.5.3.2) Stage of development in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Full/commercial-scale demonstration

**(5.5.3.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years**

*12*

**(5.5.3.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)**

*0*

**(5.5.3.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years**

*15*

**(5.5.3.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan**

*Research and Development programs in core emulsion polymerisation processes to investigate technology to reduce the emissions of harmful materials to the atmosphere, for example, residual volatile organic compounds, formaldehyde, ammonia. This program has resulted in the commercialisation of a number of new products in, for example, coatings and textile applications. This investment value includes technologies that have been fully scaled up (10%) as well as ongoing R&D programs (90%). Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are not considered significant direct greenhouse gases. However, they do contribute to climate change indirectly. When VOCs react with nitrogen oxides in the presence of sunlight, they form tropospheric ozone, a harmful air pollutant. Some VOCs can also act as indirect greenhouse gases through these chemical processes.*

**Row 2**

**(5.5.3.1) Technology area**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Downstream energy efficiency

**(5.5.3.2) Stage of development in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Applied research and development

**(5.5.3.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years**

*3*

**(5.5.3.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)**

*0*

**(5.5.3.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years**

*6*

**(5.5.3.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan**

*Ongoing R&D programs in our core emulsion polymerisation program to investigate technology to reduce the energy consumption in our customers processes. The program is looking at mechanistic routes to improve the overall drying process and/or the required curing systems used to deliver the correct performance properties in, for example, adhesive or textile applications. This investment value includes technologies that have been fully scaled up (5%) as well as ongoing R&D programs (95%). This R&D option supports the reduction of life cycle GHG emissions and Synthomer's Scope 3 emissions.*

**Row 4**

**(5.5.3.1) Technology area**

*Select from:*

☑ Product redesign

**(5.5.3.2) Stage of development in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Applied research and development

**(5.5.3.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years**

*1*

**(5.5.3.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)**

*0*

**(5.5.3.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years**

*5*

**(5.5.3.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan**

*New R&D program established to evaluate the use of new raw materials with a significant bio-based / renewably sourced content that can be incorporated into our core technology platforms. Initial work has covered technology scouting of both commercially available materials and those likely to be commercially available in usable quantities in the next 5 years. Also includes applied research into qualification emerging supplies of commercially available bio and circular content alternatives to fossil-based petrochemical raw materials. Bio-based and renewably sourced raw materials are one of the most significant levers for change Synthomer has to reduce its Scope 3 emissions.*

**Row 5**

**(5.5.3.1) Technology area**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**End of life

**(5.5.3.2) Stage of development in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Applied research and development

**(5.5.3.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years**

*3*

**(5.5.3.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)**

*0*

**(5.5.3.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years**

*6*

**(5.5.3.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan**

*Options to deliver a reduce environmental impact of consumer products at end of life are being evaluated. Two primary areas are being assessed; 1) bio-degradability/composability where post consumer waste is not able to be recycled; 2) enabling improved recycling routes for post consumer waste where these routes are available. Product areas are primarily focused in adhesive or textile applications. This R&D option supports the reduction of life cycle GHG emissions and Synthomer's Scope 3 emissions.*

*[Add 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)**

*3*

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

*0*

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

*3*

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

*5*

**(5.9.5) Please explain**

*There was a slight increase in anual spend for activities such as leak reduction in 2023 compared to 2022 and for 2024 similar spend is anticipated. Looking beyond 2024 there are more significant projects under evaluation, including moving to closed loop cooling at one of our German sites, with a large increase in water related capex spend forecast across 2025/26. Whilst water savings will lead to reductions in demand and lower Opex for several sites, general inflationary pressures mean an anticipated general increase in Opex spend is anticipated.*

*[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

☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making

☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

☑ Influence strategy and/or financial planning

**(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Alignment to international standards

☑ Alignment with the price of a carbon tax

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

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

*The internal carbon price used currently was determined based on EU ETS market prices in 2021/early 2022 and industry trend forecasts, with a view of fixing a price that was around the mid-point of the FC range, allowing for all projects globally to be assessed on a basis that matched the actual economics for the sites covered by carbon taxes. 3 initial options were presented and the median point approved by the Executive in May 2022.*

**(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)**

*85*

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

*85*

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Operations

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify **:**Capital expenditure projects > £1million

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

*11*

**(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**

*The carbon price is used to support payback cases for significant sustainability investment. Potential projects are screened to assess how many move to within 2 year or 5 year payback windows once the carbon price is included. Forward trends on EU ETS carbon price are also monitored annually to see if the internal price needs adjusting to stay in alignment, although to maintain support for CO2 reduction projects we did not lower the internal carbon prices when EU ETS prices eased in 2023. Going forward we anticipate the internal price will likely rise toward the end of the decade as market prices also adjust (in part as free allowances reduce and there is an anticipated increased demand.*

*[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

**Smallholders**

**(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues**

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

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

*We do not source from smallholders*

**Customers**

**(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

**Investors and shareholders**

**(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

**Other value chain stakeholders**

**(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues**

*Select from:*

☑ No, 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**

*Initially we are concentrating our engagement efforts on suppliers and customers in relation to GHG emissions risks and opportunities.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Climate change**

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

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

**(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed**

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25%

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

*We have defined a tier 1 supplier as a supplier of one or more of our top twenty raw materials. Our top twenty raw materials account for than 80% of our upstream scope 3 emissions. The threshold is for a supplier to have a product carbon footprint equal to or better than they secondary data from third party sources.*

**(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**

*11*

*[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*

☑ Material sourcing ☑ Supplier performance improvement

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Product lifecycle

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

**(5.11.2.4) Please explain**

*Through our climate scenario analysis we identified five primary strategic responses, whichever climate scenario ultimately plays out. Given our Scope 3 emissions are approximately 85% of our product lifecycle footprint, the highest priority of the five strategic responses is to work with selected strategic suppliers of our key raw materials. To mitigate our business risk we need to lower our carbon emissions while growing our business. In the past year, we have run a cross-business project to develop strategic roadmaps that identify the raw material sourcing and technology options to guide our Scope 3 emissions in line with our targets. The analysis has helped us better understand our data and the tools we use to track it, as well as prioritise key raw material sourcing and product innovations that will help us achieve our ambition. In 2023 we identified the key raw materials with the lowest carbon footprints and engaged suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks and explore their performance improvement plans. This is where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 emissions. In the medium term, we are also working to identify and introduce alternative feedstocks, including those from bio-based or circular sources where they offer a lower-carbon solution, although we may have to consider trade-offs with other environmental factors, such as land use change.*

*[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, but we 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**

*This year we carried out our most comprehensive assessment of carbon emissions inside our value chain, to find new ways to meet our science-based greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions targets and identify the business opportunities to help us achieve our 2050 net zero ambition. This is particularly challenging for us given that indirect emissions (known as Scope 3) make up approximately 85% of our total carbon footprint. We ran a cross-business project to develop strategic roadmaps that identify the raw material and technology options to guide our divisions towards reducing our Scope 3 emissions in line with our target The analysis has helped us to prioritise the key raw materials and products that will help us achieve our ambition. We are now engaging more with suppliers to evolve our approach to sourcing raw materials. Our immediate focus will be to work with suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks. This is where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 emissions. Going forward we are exploring how to incorporate this into our purchasing process alongside other critical procurement criteria such as cost and availability.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Climate change**

**(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement**

*Select from:*

☑ Emissions reduction

**(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement**

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

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

☑ Other capacity building activity, please specify **:**Product Carbon Footprint methodology

**Information collection**  
☑ Other information collection activity, please specify **:**Begun to request Scope 3 data from suppliers of key raw materials.

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

**(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

☑ 26-50%

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

*Strategic buyers are assessing suppliers via a broad ESG rating and improvement plans in addition to the typical purchasing requirements. The aim is for a structured approach to start conversation with suppliers on sustainability using a common improvement plan. As measure of success "% of spend coverage with a sustainability rating and improvement plan with rating agency" has been defined as Key Performance Indicator with targets stablished from 2022 (30%), 2025 (50%) and 2030 (80%). Target for 2022 was 30%, the % achieved was 30% so the target was achieved. This year we carried out our most comprehensive assessment of carbon emissions inside our value chain, to find new ways to meet our science-based greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions targets and identify the business opportunities to help us achieve our 2050 net zero ambition. We ran a cross-business project to develop strategic roadmaps that identify the raw material and technology options to guide our divisions towards reducing our Scope 3 emissions in line with our target. The analysis has helped us to prioritise the key raw materials and products that will help us achieve our ambition. The suppliers of our top 20 raw materials account for more than 80% of our Scope 3 Category 1 emissions, which in turn accounts for more than 85% of our Total Scope 3 emissions. Scope 3 is also more than 85% of our total carbon footprint. We are now engaging more with those suppliers to evolve our approach to sourcing raw materials. We are asking those suppliers to provide the Product Carbon Footprint (PCF) for the raw materials they supply Synthomer. The PCF can differ for each supplier's own upstream raw material footprint and production process. If we know the PCF for each supplier's raw material we can explore options to select lower carbon footprint suppliers. Our analysis has shown this is where we have the potential to make the most immediate and substantive impact on our Scope 3 emissions. Going forward we are exploring how to incorporate this into our purchasing process alongside other critical procurement criteria such as cost and availability. In turn this will also support us to inform the innovation and business teams of the available technology to engage customers and identify business opportunities.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Unknown

*[Add row]*

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

**Climate change**

**(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder**

*Select from:*

☑ Customers

**(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement**

**Education/Information sharing**  
☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

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

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

**(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged**

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25%

**(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ 51-75%

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

*Synthomer is a manufacturing company. Scope 3 emissions account for more than 85% of our carbon footprint. We can only deliver against our Scope 3 science-based target by being able to encourage, innovate and deliver sales of lower carbon products. We therefore need to engage customers on what lower carbon products could be for today and what lower carbon innovation they might require in the future. There has been also engagement with some key customers through submission of responses to their own sustainability questionnaires, and engagement with others on climate change issues, predominantly driven by their own activities looking at supply chain. Sustainability and in particular the reduction of emissions upstream the value chain has been a topic covered in most of the meetings with key account customers, mainly in Europe but occasionally in Asia and the US.*

**(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success**

*The effect of engagement has been to increase the depth of conversation and development of ideas and options for lower carbon products with an increasing number of customers. There is active promotion of new products with sustainability benefits, such as lower carbon intensity or lower VOC content, and R&D engagement to continue developing products that have lower environmental impact, including emissions impact. Success will be measured by the contribution of commercial sales coming from lower carbon products.*

**Water**

**(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder**

*Select from:*

☑ Investors and shareholders

**(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement**

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

**(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

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

*Water is a topic investors and shareholders need to understand the material ESG topics which we are focused on addressing through our Vision 2030 sustainability roadmap and targets. Relevant information is shared through our Annual Report, website and involvement with ratings and rankings such as CDP.*

**(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success**

*Inclusion of information related to water management in the Annual Report and website has allowed investors and shareholders to better understand the relevant risks and opportunities and assess our response to those risks and opportunities. Success has been judged by the low number of questions investors and shareholders have raised with us on the topic of water management.*

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(5.12.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

**(5.12.4) Initiative category and type**

**Certification**  
☑ Other certification, please specify

**(5.12.5) Details of initiative**

*Explore the provision of ISCC PLUS certified products.*

**(5.12.6) Expected benefits**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Reduction of downstream value chain emissions (own scope 3)

**(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits**

*Select from:*

☑ 1-3 years

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

**(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings**

*0*

**(5.12.11) Please explain**

*Estimated lifetime savings in CO2e are dependent upon the quantity of product we supply. It is therefore not possible to provide a figure of CO2e savings until the commercial arrangements have been finalised.*

*[Add row]*

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

|  | **Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement** | **Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives** | **Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Select from:*  ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years | *Select from:*  ☑ Other, please specify **:**Requires extensive collaboration | *Requires extensive collaboration with* |

*[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**

*Most of Synthomer owned sites are under Synthomer operational control. There are 1 JV and 2 sites operated by 3rd party. Based on that it have been decided to use Operational Control approach. Synthomer accounts for 100% of the Energy consumption and Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions under operational control. Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions of the sites out of operational control are included under Scope 3 GHG emissions. This has been the approach followed in previous years*

**Forests**

**(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used**

*Select from:*

☑ Operational control

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

*Most of Synthomer owned sites are under Synthomer operational control. There are 1 JV and 2 sites operated by 3rd party. Based on that it have been decided to use Operational Control approach. Synthomer accounts for 100% of the Forest related commodities under operational control. This has been the approach followed in previous years*

**Water**

**(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used**

*Select from:*

☑ Operational control

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

*Most of Synthomer owned sites are under Synthomer operational control. There are 1 JV and 2 sites operated by 3rd party. Based on that it have been decided to use Operational Control approach. Synthomer accounts for 100% of the Water consumption and withdrawal under operational control. This has been the approach followed in previous years*

**Plastics**

**(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used**

*Select from:*

☑ Operational control

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

*Most of Synthomer owned sites are under Synthomer operational control. There are 1 JV and 2 sites operated by 3rd party. Based on that it have been decided to use Operational Control approach.*

**Biodiversity**

**(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used**

*Select from:*

☑ Operational control

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

*Most of Synthomer owned sites are under Synthomer operational control. There are 1 JV and 2 sites operated by 3rd party. Based on that it have been decided to use Operational Control approach.*

*[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, a divestment

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

*5 sites corresponding to Laminates & films business were divested. 1 additional site was closed*

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

*Sites divesture took place begining February 2023, for reporting purposes the dat from those 5 sites were excluded for the full year. Site closure took place in July 2023, for reporting purposes the site has been included until closure*

*[Fixed row]*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Yes, a change in methodology

☑ Yes, a change in boundary

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

*2 changes in boundaries: the 5 divested sites have been removed from calculations since 2019 (baseline). Scope 1 process emissions are now included (also since 2019 baseline) from 2 specific processes on 2 sites. Changes in methodology consisted in the use of more accurate emission factors received from suppliers mainly for imported steam and cooling. Scope 3 emissions calculations have been updated to a hybrid approach using both consumption based data and spend based data ( in line with the WRI’s Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard, as well as the WBCSD Guidance for Accounting and Reporting Corporate GHG Emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain. Where consumption-based data was available process-based method was applied. Emission factors were sourced from LCA databases such as GaBi (LCA for Expert). Extended Environmental Input-Output (EEIO) method was applied for categories where spend data was more readily available. This method combines macro economic data and industry-level carbon emissions data to estimate the carbon associated with financial activity in a given sector and geography.*

*[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**

*We have recalculated our Scope 1 and 2 base year emissions to exclude the divested business. Scope 1 emissions have also been modified to include process emissions.The initial significance treshold is 5% but changes are usually made with lower thresholds. Scope 3 emissions have not been recalculated as the baseline calculation for 2019 completed in 2022 also excluded the divested business*

**(7.1.3.4) Past years’ recalculation**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

*[Fixed row]*

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019

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

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

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

|  | **​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 | *Both methodologies follow the GHG protocol guidance* |

*[Fixed row]*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

**Row 1**

**(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions**

*Small number of remote offices*

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

**(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source**

*Select from:*

☑ Emissions are not relevant

**(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded**

*We have considered as not relevant in terms of emissions any office whose energy consumptions are below 0.05% of company energy consumption.*

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

*Central company office accounts for less than 0.01% of company energy consumption. Remote small offices would account for much less %. Estimations have been performed based on office dimensions and occupancy and all the estimation confirm data under 0.05%*

*[Add row]*

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

**Scope 1**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*309645*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Calculated using GHG protocol guidelines. The baseline has been modified taking into account the divesture of part of the business and the inclusion of process emissions from 2 sites*

**Scope 2 (location-based)**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*263745*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Calculated using GHG protocol guidelines. The baseline has been modified taking into account the divesture of part of the business and more accurate emission factors*

**Scope 2 (market-based)**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*259040*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Calculated using GHG protocol guidelines. The baseline has been modified taking into account the divesture of part of the business and more accurate emission factors*

**Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*2781165*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*EEIO modelling method and process-based method (for 9 key monomer only) Includes the Eastman acquisition as reported in 2022*

**Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*996.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*EEIO modelling method*

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

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*93907.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Process-based method*

**Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*27848.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*EEIO modelling method*

**Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*4351.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*EEIO modelling method*

**Scope 3 category 6: Business travel**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*788.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*EEIO modelling method*

**Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*6225.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Process-based method*

**Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*44371.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Process-based method*

**Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable for our approved Science Based Targets Initiative (STBI).*

**Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable for our approved Science Based Targets Initiative (STBI).*

**Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Process-based method*

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

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*8653.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Process-based method*

**Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable for our approved Science Based Targets Initiative (STBI).*

**Scope 3 category 14: Franchises**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable for our approved Science Based Targets Initiative (STBI).*

**Scope 3 category 15: Investments**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*24101.0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Process-based method*

**Scope 3: Other (upstream)**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable for our approved Science Based Targets Initiative (STBI).*

**Scope 3: Other (downstream)**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

*12/31/2019*

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0*

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable for our approved Science Based Targets Initiative (STBI).*

*[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)**

*230798*

**(7.6.3) Methodological details**

*Following GHG protocol. Includes fuels combustion emissions, emissions associated with refrigerant releases and production emissions from 2 sites with specific processes*

*[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)**

*207957*

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

*97984*

**(7.7.4) Methodological details**

*Following GHG protocol. Includes indirect emissions related to imported electricity, steam, compressed air, cooling water etc., with the exception of transmission and distribution losses for electricity, which are considered as Scope 3. Scope 2 emissions associated with electricity have been calculated using two different methods as per GHG Protocol requirements: Market Base: using market-based emissions factors for electricity from suppliers of standard grid fuel mix tariffs, and emission factors of zero where verifiable renewable tariffs or renewable certificates with guarantees of origin have been purchased. In cases where supplier emissions factors were not available, the residual mix factor was used for EU and UK sites and the Location Base approach for non-EU sites. Location Base: using emissions factors from DEFRA (dataset published in June 2023) for UK grid electricity, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Inventory eGRID sub-region factors for US sites (April 2023 dataset) and for other countries grid electricity from the relevant IEA (International Energy Authority) ‘World CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion’ databases. In accordance with UK Government guidance, factors used for 2023 reporting are based on 2021 validated data. Scope 2 emissions associated with imported steam have been estimated using verified emission factors provided by the suppliers where available. Where not available the UK DEFRA heat and steam factor has been used.*

*[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)**

*2216688*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Hybrid method

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation following GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard, using consumption-based data and a process-based method. Emission factors were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Capital goods**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*It has not been possible to isolate capital goods from the rest of the procurement mapping due to limitations in the data. Therefore category 2 emissions have been accounted for within category 1 above.*

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

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*75763*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Fuel-based method

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Fuel and energy related activities not included in scope 1 or scope 2 is calculated using the process-based method as follows: a) Obtain data from fuels, purchased electricity, and purchased heat and steam for each Synthomer and Eastman (within Synthomer’s operational control) site. b) Convert all fuels and electricity to kilowatt hours (kWh). c) For fuels, apply the kWh of fuels purchased to suitable DEFRA 2022 well-to-tank (WTT) of fuels. d) For electricity transmission and distribution (T&D) and well-to-tank (WTT) apply Defra 2022 emission factors for UK sites. For international sites apply IEA emission factors (T&D) factors and DEFRA 2022 well-to-tank (WTT). e) For energy generated from steam apply DEFRA WTT and T&D steam factors, international sites generating electricity from steam also apply the DEFRA factors*

**Upstream transportation and distribution**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*163075*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Spend-based method

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Synthomer uses the EEIO modelling method to calculate its emissions associated with upstream transportation. This is due to a lack of available transport mode, weight and distance data. The calculation method includes: - Economic activity impact modelling (EEIO) – where weight and/or distance data is unavailable Synthomer will use EEIO modelling to fill any remaining data gaps. It has not been possible to determine mode of transport from the data available, therefore an average carbon intensity has been used*

**Waste generated in operations**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*8938*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Spend-based method

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Waste emissions is calculated based on spend using the EEIO method as follows: - Economic activity impact modelling (EEIO) – where weight and disposal method is unavailable Synthomer will use EEIO modelling to fill any data gaps*

**Business travel**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*10607*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Spend-based method

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Business travel emissions is based on spend and uses the EEIO method to calculate the associated emissions, as follows: - Economic activity impact modelling (EEIO) – where specific travel data is unavailable Synthomer will use EEIO modelling to fill any data gaps. Accenture applied an average ‘business travel’ emissions factor to spend categorised as business travel due to the mode of transport being unknown*

**Employee commuting**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*8610*

**(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**

*Employee commuting has been calculated a. Obtain site full time employee (FTE) figures and apply site closure rates (where sites are closed, there are no employee commuting). b. Split proportion of FTEs who reside between London, urban and rural. Without accurate data it has been estimated 100% of FTEs reside in rural areas to be conservative. c. Calculate distance travelled per mode using Department for Transport commuting trends. d. Emissions are calculated using the DEFRA emission factors (including WTT) based on the travel mode.*

**Upstream leased assets**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Synthomer does not have assets in this category that are leased to other entities, therefore this category is not relevant to Synthomer*

**Downstream transportation and distribution**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Synthomer has limited visibility of the downstream transportation of its products but this category has been estimated to be similar (or maximum 2 times due to the water content in our products) to Upstream transportation and distribution emissions that have been calculated and are not relevant.*

**Processing of sold products**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Relevant, not yet calculated

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Processing of sold products have been excluded in line with the WBCSD guidance on value chain reporting for the chemicals sector. The guidance aims to support business report on their value chain emissions consistently and builds upon the WRI GHG reporting protocol. The guidance states that chemical companies are not required to report scope 3 category 10 emissions since reliable figures are difficult to obtain due to diverse application and customer structure*

**Use of sold products**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*This is not a material source of scope 3 emissions in Synthomer’s value chain. All Synthomer’s products are intermediate B2B products which are used in end products. A relevance test in appendix B reviews Synthomer’s products to ascertain which products should be reported in this category.*

**End of life treatment of sold products**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*12363*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Other, please specify **:**A process-based method has been used to calculate emissions from the incineration and landfilling of Synthomer’s products using a benchmark estimate model.

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*A process-based method has been used to calculate emissions from the incineration and landfilling of Synthomer’s products using a benchmark estimate model. Accenture has developed a benchmark model, incorporating total weight of product sold in 2019, packaging type, disposal routes, and Defra 2022 conversion factors for Synthomer’s 12 key product categories. The benchmark model is used to calculate product end of life emissions and packing end of life emissions. The assumptions created for previous years Scope 3 calculations were utilised and emissions were calculated using a proportional increase factor based on the increase in total revenue*

**Downstream leased assets**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*55444*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Fuel-based method

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*- Scope 1 and 2 data were calculated using the data provided by the asset on energy consumption. Energy has been converted into assests Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions using the same methodology to calculate Synthomer operated sites Scope 1 and 2 emissions*

**Franchises**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Synthomer does not have franchises, therefore this category is not relevant to Synthomer*

**Investments**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

*11469*

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Asset-specific method

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

*0*

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*To calculate the emissions associated with Synthomer’s investments, the following methodology was used: - Scope 1 and 2 data were calculated using the data provided by the JV on energy consumption. Energy has been converted into assests Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions using the same methodology to calculate Synthomer operated sites Scope 1 and 2 emissions - Apply equity share to total emissions: The equity share percentage assumption provided by Synthomer was applied to calculate the emissions associated with Synthomer’s joint venture*

**Other (upstream)**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*No other upstream categories*

**Other (downstream)**

**(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*No other downstream categories*

*[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**

*GHG verification 2023 - Scope 1+2 report.pdf*

**(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference**

*5*

**(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard**

*Select from:*

☑ ISO14064-1

**(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**

*GHG verification 2023 - Scope 1+2 report.pdf*

**(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference**

*5*

**(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard**

*Select from:*

☑ ISO14064-1

**(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

*100*

**Row 2**

**(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2 location-based

**(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place**

*Select from:*

☑ Annual process

**(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Complete

**(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance**

*Select from:*

☑ Limited assurance

**(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement**

*GHG verification 2023 - Scope 1+2 report.pdf*

**(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference**

*5*

**(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard**

*Select from:*

☑ ISO14064-1

**(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

*100*

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Scope 3: Investments ☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3: Business travel ☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting ☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

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

☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

**(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**

*GHG verification 2023 - Scope 3 report.pdf*

**(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference**

*6*

**(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard**

*Select from:*

☑ ISO14064-3

**(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

*100*

*[Add row]*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

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

**Change in renewable energy consumption**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*8288*

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

**(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)**

*3*

**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

*The % of purchased renewable electricity was slightly higher than previous year. The change in emissions was calculated as the difference of Electricity Scope 2 Market base emissions from 2022 and 2023 electricity taking into consideration the production reduction in 2023*

**Other emissions reduction activities**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*16707*

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

**(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)**

*5*

**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

*Includes the emissions reductions associated with the projects implemented during 2023 and from projects implemented before that that fully delivered in 2023*

**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**

*Not applicable*

**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**

*Not applicable*

**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**

*Not applicable*

**Change in output**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*23015*

**(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**

*The production decreased a 11% in 2023 vs. 2022. The reduction of production impacts negatively into the plants efficiency as it is not aligned with an equivalent energy consumption reduction and subsequent emissions reduction: 2/3 of the 11% production reduction was considered for Scope 1 and 2 emissions.*

**Change in methodology**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*0*

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

**(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)**

*0*

**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

*Although changes in methology have been implemented, those changes have been also applied to previous years so dont have impact in variations year over year*

**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**

*Although changes in boundary have been implemented, those changes have been also applied to previous years so dont have impact in variations year over year*

**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**

*Not applicable*

**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

## (7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

**Row 1**

**(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas**

*Select from:*

☑ CO2

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

*226015*

**(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:*

☑ HFCs

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

*4138*

**(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:*

☑ CH4

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

*316*

**(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference**

*Select from:*

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

**Row 4**

**(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas**

*Select from:*

☑ N2O

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

*329*

**(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.

**Austria**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*362*

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

*546*

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

*0*

**Belgium**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*2238*

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

*741*

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

*0*

**China**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*840*

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

*6667*

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

*1899*

**Czechia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*62225*

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

*34883*

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

*14790*

**Egypt**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*6*

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

*32*

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

*32*

**France**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*15169*

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

*4156*

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

*4911*

**Germany**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*1028*

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

*53331*

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

*48087*

**Italy**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*8906*

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

*2164*

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

*0*

**Malaysia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*14580*

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

*47332*

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

*1415*

**Mexico**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*676*

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

*186*

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

*0*

**Netherlands**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*61537*

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

*10890*

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

*12555*

**Portugal**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*1518*

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

*309*

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

*0*

**Saudi Arabia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*975*

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

*3969*

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

*3969*

**Spain**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*263*

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

*172*

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

*0*

**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)**

*10322*

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

*7698*

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

*6443*

**United States of America**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*49966*

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

*34458*

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

*3883*

**Viet Nam**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*188*

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

*423*

**(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 | *Coatings and Construction* | *52672* |
| Row 3 | *Adhesive solutions* | *90518* |
| Row 4 | *Health & Protection and Performence Materials* | *87608* |

*[Add row]*

## (7.19) Break down your organization’s total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

|  | **Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chemicals production activities | *229348* | *Calculated removing separate offices and labs* |

*[Fixed 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 | *Coatings and Construction* | *46943* | *30050* |
| Row 2 | *Health & Protection and Performence Materials* | *132737* | *55441* |
| Row 4 | *Adhesive solutions* | *28276* | *12492* |

*[Add row]*

## (7.21) Break down your organization’s total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

|  | **Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e** | **Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chemicals production activities | *204832* | *97975* | *Calculated removing separate offices and labs* |

*[Fixed 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)**

*230798*

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

*207957*

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

*97984*

**(7.22.4) Please explain**

*Our response does not include any other entities*

**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**

*Our response does not include any other entities*

*[Fixed row]*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

## (7.25) Disclose the percentage of your organization’s Scope 3, Category 1 emissions by purchased chemical feedstock.

**Row 1**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Butadiene (C4 sep.)

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*14.38*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Row 2**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Other (please specify) **:**Styrene

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*13.57*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Row 3**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Propylene (FCC)

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*5.27*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Row 4**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Other (please specify) **:**Acrylonitrile

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*6.66*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Row 5**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Other (please specify) **:**n-Butyl Acrylate

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*9.35*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Row 6**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Other (please specify) **:**C9 Resin

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*2.66*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Row 7**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Other (please specify) **:**Vinyl acetate

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*3.52*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

**Row 8**

**(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock**

*Select from:*

☑ Other (please specify) **:**1,3-Pentadiene

**(7.25.2) Percentage of Scope 3, Category 1 tCO2e from purchased feedstock**

*2.64*

**(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology**

*Scope 3 emissions calculation for good and services follow GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The methodology uses consumption-based data with a process-based method. Emission factors for key raw materials were sourced from LCA database GaBi (LCA for Expert).*

*[Add row]*

## (7.25.1) Disclose sales of products that are greenhouse gases.

**Carbon dioxide (CO2)**

**(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons**

*0*

**(7.25.1.2) Comment**

*Product not sold*

**Methane (CH4)**

**(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons**

*0*

**(7.25.1.2) Comment**

*Product not sold*

**Nitrous oxide (N2O)**

**(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons**

*0*

**(7.25.1.2) Comment**

*Product not sold*

**Hydrofluorocarbons (HFC)**

**(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons**

*0*

**(7.25.1.2) Comment**

*Product not sold*

**Perfluorocarbons (PFC)**

**(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons**

*0*

**(7.25.1.2) Comment**

*Product not sold*

**Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)**

**(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons**

*0*

**(7.25.1.2) Comment**

*Product not sold*

**Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)**

**(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons**

*0*

**(7.25.1.2) Comment**

*Product not sold*

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Ansell. We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Ansell products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*19990*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*1756*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 1 emissions come from the use of natural gas to produce steam*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 1 calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified. The degree of uncertainty is still high as some of the affected sites produce different families of products with different associated emissions*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 2**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Ansell. We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Ansell products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*19990*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*0*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*0*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*No Scope 2 emissions reported in the sites where Ansell products were manufactured, supplied electricity was 100% renewable during 2023*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 2 are market base. Calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 3**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Category 15: Investments ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 13: Downstream leased assets ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Company wide

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*19990*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*36582*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*50*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 3 emissions come from Purchased Goods and Services (86%) being most of them related with monomers production by our suppliers*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We have considered the total Scope 3 emissions of the company per produced tonne and the tonnes sold to Ansell during 2023. The uncertainty is big as product specific Scope 3 emissions are not available and the scope 3 emissions are estimated.*

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

*Total Scope 3 Emissions are published in the 2023 Synthomer ESG Datapack that can be found in Synthomer web page and also following this link: https://www.synthomer.com/media/do1jcybh/fy2023-synthomer\_esg-data-pack\_final\_v3.pdf*

**Row 4**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Avery Denison. We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Avery Denison products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*1680*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*1431*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 1 emissions come from the use of natural gas to produce steam*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 1 calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified. The degree of uncertainty is still high as some of the affected sites produce different families of products with different associated emissions*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 5**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Avery Dennison. We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Avery Dennison products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*1680*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*314*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*The major source of Scope 2 emissions is imported electriciity, not all electricity used is renewable*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 2 are market base. Calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 6**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Category 15: Investments ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 13: Downstream leased assets ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Company wide

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*1670*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*3074*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*50*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 3 emissions come from Purchased Goods and Services (86%) being most of them related with monomers production by our suppliers*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We have considered the total Scope 3 emissions of the company per produced tonne and the tonnes sold to Avery Dennison during 2023. The uncertainty is big as product specific Scope 3 emissions are not available and the scope 3 emissions are estimated*

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

*Total Scope 3 Emissions are published in the 2023 Synthomer ESG Datapack that can be found in Synthomer web page and also following this link: https://www.synthomer.com/media/do1jcybh/fy2023-synthomer\_esg-data-pack\_final\_v3.pdf*

**Row 7**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Ecolab. We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Ecolab products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*314*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*34*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 1 emissions come from the use of natural gas to produce steam*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 1 calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. The degree of uncertainty is still high as some of the affected sites produce different families of products with different associated emissions*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 8**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Ecolab. We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Ecolab products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*314*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*0*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*0*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*The source of Scope 2 emissions is electricity but the affected sites use renewable electricity with 0 associated emissions*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 2 are market base. Calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 9**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Category 15: Investments ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 13: Downstream leased assets ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Company wide

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*314*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*575*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*50*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 3 emissions come from Purchased Goods and Services (86%) being most of them related with monomers production by our suppliers*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We have considered the total Scope 3 emissions of the company per produced tonne and the tonnes sold to Ecolab during 2023. The uncertainty is big as product specific Scope 3 emissions are not available and the scope 3 emissions are estimated.*

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

*Total Scope 3 Emissions are published in the 2023 Synthomer ESG Datapack that can be found in Synthomer web page and also following this link: https://www.synthomer.com/media/do1jcybh/fy2023-synthomer\_esg-data-pack\_final\_v3.pdf*

**Row 10**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Michelin, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Michelin products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*3182*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*2815*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 1 emissions come from the use of natural gas to produce steam*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 1 calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. The degree of uncertainty is still high as some of the affected sites produce different families of products with different associated emissions*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 11**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Michelin, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Michelin products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*3182*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*477*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*The main source of emissions is imported electricity. Some of the purchased electricity for the affected sites is renewable but not all*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 2 are market base. Calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified.*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 12**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Category 15: Investments ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 13: Downstream leased assets ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Company wide

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*3182*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*5823*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*50*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 3 emissions come from Purchased Goods and Services (86%) being most of them related with monomers production by our suppliers*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We have considered the total Scope 3 emissions of the company per produced tonne and the tonnes sold to Michelin during 2023. The uncertainty is big as product specific Scope 3 emissions are not available and the scope 3 emissions are estimated*

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

*Total Scope 3 Emissions are published in the 2023 Synthomer ESG Datapack that can be found in Synthomer web page and also following this link: https://www.synthomer.com/media/do1jcybh/fy2023-synthomer\_esg-data-pack\_final\_v3.pdf*

**Row 13**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Pirelli, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Pirelli products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*8441*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*8266*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 1 emissions come from the use of natural gas to produce steam*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 1 calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. The degree of uncertainty is still high as some of the affected sites produce different families of products with different associated emissions*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 14**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Pirelli, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Pirelli products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*8441*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*1667*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*The main source of emissions is imported electricity. Some of the purchased electricity for the affected sites is renewable but not all*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 2 are market base. Calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified.*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 15**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Category 15: Investments ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 13: Downstream leased assets ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Company wide

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*8441*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*15447*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*50*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 3 emissions come from Purchased Goods and Services (86%) being most of them related with monomers production by our suppliers*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We have considered the total Scope 3 emissions of the company per produced tonne and the tonnes sold to Pirelli during 2023. The uncertainty is big as product specific Scope 3 emissions are not available and the scope 3 emissions are estimated*

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

*Total Scope 3 Emissions are published in the 2023 Synthomer ESG Datapack that can be found in Synthomer web page and also following this link: https://www.synthomer.com/media/do1jcybh/fy2023-synthomer\_esg-data-pack\_final\_v3.pdf*

**Row 16**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Baker Hughes, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Baker Hughes products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*3647*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*827*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 1 emissions come from the use of natural gas to produce steam*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 1 calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. The degree of uncertainty is still high as some of the affected sites produce different families of products with different associated emissions*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 17**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Baker Hughes, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Baker Hughes products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*3647*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*292*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*The main source of emissions is imported steam. Most of the purchased electricity for the affected sites is renewable*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 2 are market base. Calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified.*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 18**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Category 15: Investments ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 13: Downstream leased assets ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Company wide

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*3647*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*8645*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*50*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 3 emissions come from Purchased Goods and Services (86%) being most of them related with monomers production by our suppliers*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We have considered the total Scope 3 emissions of the company per produced tonne and the tonnes sold to Baker Hughes during 2023. The uncertainty is big as product specific Scope 3 emissions are not available and the scope 3 emissions are estimated*

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

*Total Scope 3 Emissions are published in the 2023 Synthomer ESG Datapack that can be found in Synthomer web page and also following this link: https://www.synthomer.com/media/do1jcybh/fy2023-synthomer\_esg-data-pack\_final\_v3.pdf*

**Row 19**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Schlumberger, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Schlumberger products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*4422*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*1832*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 1 emissions come from the use of natural gas to produce steam*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 1 calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. The degree of uncertainty is still high as some of the affected sites produce different families of products with different associated emissions*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 20**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

**(7.26.5) Allocation level detail**

*We have identified the sites manufacturing products for Schlumberger, We have estimated each site emissions that could correspond to Schlumberger products considering a mass approach. Finally we have added all the sites to get the total*

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*4422*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*1976*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*20*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*The main source of emissions is imported steam. Most of the purchased electricity for the affected sites is renewable*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*Scope 2 are market base. Calculations per site have been based on GHG protocol and have been verified by a third party. Allocations havent been verified.*

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

*Information by site not published*

**Row 21**

**(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Category 15: Investments ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 13: Downstream leased assets ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

☑ Company wide

**(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

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

*4422*

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

*23411*

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

*50*

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Main Scope 3 emissions come from Purchased Goods and Services (86%) being most of them related with monomers production by our suppliers*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

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

*We have considered the total Scope 3 emissions of the company per produced tonne and the tonnes sold to Schlumberger during 2023. The uncertainty is big as product specific Scope 3 emissions are not available and the scope 3 emissions are estimated*

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

*Total Scope 3 Emissions are published in the 2023 Synthomer ESG Datapack that can be found in Synthomer web page and also following this link: https://www.synthomer.com/media/do1jcybh/fy2023-synthomer\_esg-data-pack\_final\_v3.pdf*

*[Add row]*

## (7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

**Row 1**

**(7.27.1) Allocation challenges**

*Select from:*

☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

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

*Equipment / product line level monitoring linked to plant process control systems to allow product level estimation of energy consumption - this is not viewed as a viable practical option for all our diverse facilities globally.*

**Row 3**

**(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**

*There is the potential for competitors to use some data to estimate plant capabilities - this can be overcome to a degree through confidentiality agreements.*

*[Add row]*

## (7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

**(7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities**

*We have a core group that takes care of PCF and LCA calculations. To do this, we use the GaBi platform to develop models based on the type of product and its manufacturing process. We are using primary date for emissions from our operations and secondary date for materials and transport. The reports produced are in line with TfS recommendations. To date, we have calculated PCF for over 60% of our portfolio by volume*

*[Fixed 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:*  ☑ Yes |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired steam | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes |
| Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes |

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

**Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)**

**(7.30.1.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV (higher heating value)

**(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources**

*0*

**(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources**

*993226*

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

*993226*

**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**

*267848*

**(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources**

*67156*

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

*335004*

**Consumption of purchased or acquired heat**

**(7.30.1.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources**

*0*

**(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources**

*3452*

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

*3452*

**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**

*16116*

**(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources**

*212538*

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

*228654*

**Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling**

**(7.30.1.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources**

*0*

**(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources**

*17349*

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

*17349*

**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**

*559*

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

*559*

**Total energy consumption**

**(7.30.1.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources**

*284523*

**(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources**

*1293721*

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

*1578244*

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.30.3) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for chemical production activities in MWh.

**Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)**

**(7.30.3.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV (higher heating value)

**(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)**

*985554*

**(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary**

*985554*

**Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity**

**(7.30.3.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary**

*261600*

**(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)**

*67085*

**(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary**

*328685*

**Consumption of purchased or acquired heat**

**(7.30.3.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)**

*3452*

**(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary**

*3452*

**Consumption of purchased or acquired steam**

**(7.30.3.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary**

*16116*

**(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)**

*212538*

**(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary**

*228654*

**Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling**

**(7.30.3.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)**

*17349*

**(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary**

*17349*

**Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy**

**(7.30.3.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary**

*559*

**(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary**

*559*

**Total energy consumption**

**(7.30.3.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary**

*278275*

**(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)**

*1285978*

**(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary**

*0*

**(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary**

*1564253*

*[Fixed row]*

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

|  | **Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application** |
| --- | --- |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity | *Select from:*  ☑ No |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling | *Select from:*  ☑ No |
| Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation | *Select from:*  ☑ 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:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

*0*

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

*0*

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

*0*

**(7.30.7.6) 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**

*Biomass not consumed as fuel*

**Other biomass**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

*0*

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

*0*

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

*0*

**(7.30.7.6) 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 bionmass not consumed as fuel*

**Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

*0*

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

*0*

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

*0*

**(7.30.7.6) 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 not consumed as fuel*

**Coal**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

*0*

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

*0*

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

*0*

**(7.30.7.6) 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 not consumed as fuel*

**Oil**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

*77068*

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

*77068*

**(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**

*Corresponds to all light and heavy oils used*

**Gas**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

*915961*

**(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**

*915951*

**(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**

*10*

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

*The trigeneration corresponds to 1 site in Italy*

**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**

*197*

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

*197*

**(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**

*Refers to Liquefied petroleum gas (LPG)*

**Total fuel**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

*993226*

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

*77265*

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

*915951*

**(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**

*10*

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

*No comments*

*[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)**

*4712*

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

*4712*

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

*559*

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

*559*

**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)**

*732769*

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

*732769*

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

*0*

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

*0*

**Cooling**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

*0*

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

*0*

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

*0*

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

*0*

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.30.11) Provide details on electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for chemical production activities.

**Electricity**

**(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*4712*

**(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*4712*

**(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)**

*559*

**(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**Heat**

**(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**Steam**

**(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*732769*

**(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*732769*

**(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**Cooling**

**(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)**

*0*

**(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (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:*

☑ Austria

**(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:*

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify **:**Power is generated using heat from exothermal chemical process

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

*4109*

**(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:*

☑ Austria

**(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**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 2**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Austria

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

*Select from:*

☑ Steam

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

*Select from:*

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify **:**Power is generated using heat from exothermal chemical process

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

*16116*

**(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:*

☑ Austria

**(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**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 3**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Belgium

**(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:*

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify **:**Mix of low carbon energies

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

*5439*

**(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:*

☑ No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 4**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ China

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

*Select from:*

☑ Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

*Select from:*

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, solar and small Hydro

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

*7782*

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

*Select from:*

☑ I-REC

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

*Select from:*

☑ China

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*2010*

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*China renewable electricity was sourced from 2 hydropoower stations, one was commisioned in 2010 and the second in 2017*

**Row 5**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Czechia

**(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 **:**Solar, wind, hydro, biomass, biogas

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

*47312*

**(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:*

☑ Czechia

**(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**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 6**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ France

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

*Select from:*

☑ Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

*Select from:*

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Solar, wind

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

*8503*

**(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:*

☑ Italy

**(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)**

*2006*

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*Renewable electricity is sourced from various countries the main one being Italy but also Sweden, France and Netherlands. The main commissioning year was 2006 but are also installation commissioned on 2008, 2020, 2021 and 2022*

**Row 7**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Germany

**(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)**

*20569*

**(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:*

☑ Germany

**(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**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 8**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Italy

**(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:*

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

*7657*

**(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:*

☑ Italy

**(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**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 9**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Malaysia

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

*Select from:*

☑ Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

*Select from:*

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Solar and small Hydro

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

*74000*

**(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:*

☑ 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**

*Renewable electricity has various sources. The main commissioning year was 2023 but are also installations commissioned on 2018*

**Row 10**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Mexico

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

*Select from:*

☑ Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

*Select from:*

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Solar and Hydro

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

*457*

**(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:*

☑ Mexico

**(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)**

*2018*

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No comment*

**Row 11**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Netherlands

**(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)**

*589*

**(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:*

☑ No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 12**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Netherlands

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Solar pannels on site

**(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)**

*455*

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Produced on site, owned by site

**(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:*

☑ No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No comment*

**Row 13**

**(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:*

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Solae and small Hydro

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

*5659*

**(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:*

☑ Portugal

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*2023*

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No comment*

**Row 14**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Portugal

**(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 **:**Hydro, wind

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

*2036*

**(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:*

☑ Portugal

**(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**

*No commissioning year as green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 15**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Spain

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Solar panels autogenerated

**(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)**

*104*

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Solar panels owned by site

**(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)**

*2021*

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No comment*

**Row 16**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Spain

**(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)**

*1142*

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

*Select from:*

☑ GO

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

*Select from:*

☑ Spain

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 17**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

**(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 **:** Mix of renewable energy sources wind, Hydro and Photovoltaic

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

*12935*

**(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:*

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No commissioning year as Green electricity from energy supplier*

**Row 18**

**(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:*

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind and Solar

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

*68910*

**(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:*

☑ No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

*No comment*

**Row 19**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

*Select from:*

☑ Viet Nam

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

*Select from:*

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

*Select from:*

☑ Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

*Select from:*

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Solar and Hydro

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

*748*

**(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:*

☑ Viet Nam

**(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**

*No comment*

*[Add row]*

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

**Austria**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*4109*

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

*0*

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

*16116*

**(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)**

*20225.00*

**Belgium**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*5439*

**(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)**

*5439.00*

**China**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*8089*

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

*0*

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

*9522*

**(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)**

*17611.00*

**Czechia**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*47312*

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

*0*

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

*37011*

**(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)**

*84323.00*

**Eygpt**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*81*

**(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)**

*81.00*

**France**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*24966*

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

*0*

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

*15882*

**(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)**

*40848.00*

**Germany**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*26212*

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

*0*

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

*147210*

**(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)**

*173422.00*

**Italy**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*7657*

**(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)**

*7657.00*

**Malaysia**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*76281*

**(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)**

*76281.00*

**Mexico**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*457*

**(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)**

*457.00*

**Netherlands**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*34847*

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

*455*

**(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)**

*35302.00*

**Portugal**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*2036*

**(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)**

*2036.00*

**Saudi Arabi**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*6480*

**(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)**

*6480.00*

**Spain**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*1142*

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

*104*

**(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)**

*1246.00*

**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)**

*19412*

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

*0*

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

*3452*

**(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)**

*22864.00*

**United States of America**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*69735*

**(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)**

*69735.00*

**Viet Nam**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

*748*

**(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)**

*748.00*

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.31) Does your organization consume fuels as feedstocks for chemical production activities?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

## (7.31.1) Disclose details on your organization’s consumption of feedstocks for chemical production activities.

**Row 1**

**(7.31.1.1) Fuels used as feedstocks**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify  **:**Styrene

**(7.31.1.2) Total consumption**

*164*

**(7.31.1.3) Total consumption unit**

*Select from:*

☑ thousand metric tons

**(7.31.1.4) Inherent carbon dioxide emission factor of feedstock, metric tons CO2 per consumption unit**

*1830*

**(7.31.1.5) Heating value of feedstock, MWh per consumption unit**

*11.86*

**(7.31.1.6) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV

**(7.31.1.7) Comment**

*Used in the production of NBR and SBR latex products, as well as styrene acrylate dispersion products. The company is disclosing information on 4 of its main feedstocks.*

**Row 2**

**(7.31.1.1) Fuels used as feedstocks**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify  **:**Butadiene

**(7.31.1.2) Total consumption**

*160*

**(7.31.1.3) Total consumption unit**

*Select from:*

☑ thousand metric tons

**(7.31.1.4) Inherent carbon dioxide emission factor of feedstock, metric tons CO2 per consumption unit**

*1990*

**(7.31.1.5) Heating value of feedstock, MWh per consumption unit**

*15.96*

**(7.31.1.6) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV

**(7.31.1.7) Comment**

*Used in the production of NBR and SBR latex products. The company is disclosing information of 4 of its main feedstocks.*

**Row 3**

**(7.31.1.1) Fuels used as feedstocks**

*Select from:*

☑ Natural gas

**(7.31.1.2) Total consumption**

*6.3*

**(7.31.1.3) Total consumption unit**

*Select from:*

☑ thousand metric tons

**(7.31.1.4) Inherent carbon dioxide emission factor of feedstock, metric tons CO2 per consumption unit**

*2557.57*

**(7.31.1.5) Heating value of feedstock, MWh per consumption unit**

*14.01*

**(7.31.1.6) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV

**(7.31.1.7) Comment**

*Used in an hydrogenation process at Middelburg site in the Netherlands. Site acquired in 2022. The company is disclosing information of 4 of the main feedstocks*

**Row 4**

**(7.31.1.1) Fuels used as feedstocks**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify  **:**Propylene

**(7.31.1.2) Total consumption**

*68*

**(7.31.1.3) Total consumption unit**

*Select from:*

☑ thousand metric tons

**(7.31.1.4) Inherent carbon dioxide emission factor of feedstock, metric tons CO2 per consumption unit**

*1720*

**(7.31.1.5) Heating value of feedstock, MWh per consumption unit**

*9.66*

**(7.31.1.6) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☑ HHV

**(7.31.1.7) Comment**

*Used in the production of acrylate monomers. The company is disclosing information of 4 of the main feedstocks*

*[Add row]*

## (7.31.2) State the percentage, by mass, of primary resource from which your chemical feedstocks derive.

**Oil**

**(7.31.2.1) Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)**

*90.5*

**(7.31.2.2) Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

**Natural Gas**

**(7.31.2.1) Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)**

*9.5*

**(7.31.2.2) Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

**Coal**

**(7.31.2.1) Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)**

*0*

**(7.31.2.2) Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

**Biomass**

**(7.31.2.1) Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)**

*0*

**(7.31.2.2) Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

**Waste (non-biomass)**

**(7.31.2.1) Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)**

*0*

**(7.31.2.2) Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

**Fossil fuel (where coal, gas, oil cannot be distinguished)**

**(7.31.2.1) Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)**

*0*

**(7.31.2.2) Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

**Unknown source or unable to disaggregate**

**(7.31.2.1) Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)**

*0*

**(7.31.2.2) Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year**

*Select from:*

☑ No change

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.39) Provide details on your organization’s chemical products.

**Row 1**

**(7.39.1) Output product**

*Select from:*

☑ Polymers

**(7.39.2) Production (metric tons)**

*632333*

**(7.39.3) Capacity (metric tons)**

*859427*

**(7.39.4) Direct emissions intensity (metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product)**

*0.083*

**(7.39.5) Electricity intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0.161*

**(7.39.6) Steam intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0.134*

**(7.39.7) Steam/ heat recovered (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0*

**(7.39.8) Comment**

*Information corresponds to Coating and Construction Division. Steam intensity figures reported against data on imported steam. Most sites dont import steam but generate it using Natural Gas. Natural gas intensity (MWh per tonne) for this line of products was 0.442. Considering an average boiler efficiency of 80% this would result in 0.35 MWh of steam generated per tonne on top of the imported steam*

**Row 2**

**(7.39.1) Output product**

*Select from:*

☑ Polymers

**(7.39.2) Production (metric tons)**

*654079*

**(7.39.3) Capacity (metric tons)**

*865426*

**(7.39.4) Direct emissions intensity (metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product)**

*0.134*

**(7.39.5) Electricity intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0.249*

**(7.39.6) Steam intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0.249*

**(7.39.7) Steam/ heat recovered (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0*

**(7.39.8) Comment**

*Information corresponds to Health protection and Performance Materials Division. Steam intensity figures reported against data on imported steam. Most sites dont import steam but generate it using Natural Gas. Natural gas intensity (MWh per tonne) for this line of products was 0.473. Considering an average boiler efficiency of 80% this would result in 0.378 MWh of steam generated per tonne on top of the imported steam*

**Row 3**

**(7.39.1) Output product**

*Select from:*

☑ Specialty chemicals

**(7.39.2) Production (metric tons)**

*112068*

**(7.39.3) Capacity (metric tons)**

*168700*

**(7.39.4) Direct emissions intensity (metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product)**

*0.808*

**(7.39.5) Electricity intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0.636*

**(7.39.6) Steam intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0*

**(7.39.7) Steam/ heat recovered (MWh per metric ton of product)**

*0*

**(7.39.8) Comment**

*Information corresponds to Adhesives Solutions Division. Steam intensity figures reported against data on imported steam. Sites in this Division dont import steam but generate it using Natural Gas. Natural gas intensity (MWh per tonne) for this line of products was 2.919. Considering an average boiler efficiency of 80% this would result in 2.335 MWh of steam generated per tonne on top of the imported steam*

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(7.45.1) Intensity figure**

*0.000167*

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

*328781*

**(7.45.3) Metric denominator**

*Select from:*

☑ unit total revenue

**(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total**

*1970900000*

**(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used**

*Select from:*

☑ Market-based

**(7.45.6) % change from previous year**

*22*

**(7.45.7) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

☑ Increased

**(7.45.8) Reasons for change**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Change in output

**(7.45.9) Please explain**

*Main reason for increase was a decrease of revenue over 15%. The 2022 figure considered has been modified to include the Adhesive Solution business*

**Row 2**

**(7.45.1) Intensity figure**

*0.235*

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

*328781*

**(7.45.3) Metric denominator**

*Select from:*

☑ metric ton of product

**(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total**

*1398480*

**(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used**

*Select from:*

☑ Market-based

**(7.45.6) % change from previous year**

*2*

**(7.45.7) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

**(7.45.8) Reasons for change**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

**(7.45.9) Please explain**

*Different factors contributed to the reduction of emissions per tonne even if the production was 11% lower what usually have a negative impact in the indicator, e.g.: % of electricity consumption from renewable sources increased 1%, a part of imported steam (some of them sourced from coal) was replaced by internal production from Natural Gas. There were also additional initiatives to reduce energy consumption.*

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(7.52.1) Description**

*Select from:*

☑ Waste

**(7.52.2) Metric value**

*9.13*

**(7.52.3) Metric numerator**

*kg of waste to landfill*

**(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)**

*Produced metric tons*

**(7.52.5) % change from previous year**

*17*

**(7.52.6) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

**(7.52.7) Please explain**

*2 main reasons for the decrease: the disposal during 2022 of some one-offs (production unrelated) at various sites and the reduction during 2023 of waste to landfill due to some waste reclassification*

**Row 3**

**(7.52.1) Description**

*Select from:*

☑ Energy usage

**(7.52.2) Metric value**

*4.06*

**(7.52.3) Metric numerator**

*Gigajoules (metered)*

**(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)**

*Produced metric tons*

**(7.52.5) % change from previous year**

*2.8*

**(7.52.6) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

☑ Increased

**(7.52.7) Please explain**

*The main reason for the increase is the reduction in production (11%). Our plants are designed to be more energy efficient at certain level of productions. With low levels of production the energy consumed per tonne increases because certain equipments need to still be running. The increase could have been higher without the implementation of some projects during 2023*

**Row 4**

**(7.52.1) Description**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Water withdrawal

**(7.52.2) Metric value**

*5.05*

**(7.52.3) Metric numerator**

*m3 of water withdrawal*

**(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)**

*Produced metric tons*

**(7.52.5) % change from previous year**

*2*

**(7.52.6) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

**(7.52.7) Please explain**

*The main reason for the decrease is the implementation of water withdrawal reduction projects in some sites including leaks repairing and reducing water withdrawal during low demand periods.*

*[Add row]*

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Absolute target

## (7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

**Row 1**

**(7.53.1.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Abs 1

**(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?**

*Select from:*

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

**(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

*SBTi Certificate Synthomer plc.pdf*

**(7.53.1.4) Target ambition**

*Select from:*

☑ 1.5°C aligned

**(7.53.1.5) Date target was set**

*03/08/2022*

**(7.53.1.6) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Organization-wide

**(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Methane (CH4) ☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O) ☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

**(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**

*12/30/2019*

**(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

*309645*

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

*259040*

**(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)**

*568685.000*

**(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**

*12/30/2030*

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

*46.2*

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

*305952.530*

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

*230798*

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

*97984*

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

*328782.000*

**(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**

*91.31*

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Underway

**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Target coverage is 100%. No exclusions*

**(7.53.1.83) Target objective**

*This target was set both as an internal commitment to reduce our emissions in line with climate science, and to hold our organization publicly accountable to our investors and other stakeholders.*

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

*Progress made to end of 2023 (Reporting year) has been significant (42% reduction vs. 46.2% reduction target) but has been influenced by low production rates vs. 2019 that automatically translate in lower energy consumptions and lower emissions. There are various initiatives to achieve the 2030 target: Synthomer intend on investing on the electrification of equipment within its chemical production sites to replace scope 1 fuel usage with renewable electricity. In addition, Synthomer intend on improving energy efficiency across its production sites and looking to procure low carbon energy sources on sites to reduce scope 1 fuels. For scope 2, Synthomer also intend to improve energy efficiency across its production sites as well as look to procure high quality renewable electricity and potentially explore on site generation. The above-mentioned initiatives are combined in decarbonisation roadmaps for 3 Tier 1 (or High) priority sites, followed by the remaining 7 Tier 1 (or High) priority sites. Alternative energy sources to replace heat generation (e.g. hydrogen) will be incorporated as they become available. Alternative technologies for existing high energy intensive processes, such as drying, are being scoped and will be piloted within the next 5 years*

**(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**Row 2**

**(7.53.1.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Abs 2

**(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?**

*Select from:*

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

**(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

*Certificate Synthomer plc.pdf*

**(7.53.1.4) Target ambition**

*Select from:*

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

**(7.53.1.5) Date target was set**

*08/03/2022*

**(7.53.1.6) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Organization-wide

**(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Methane (CH4) ☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O) ☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

**(7.53.1.8) Scopes**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Scope 3

**(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

**(7.53.1.11) End date of base year**

*12/30/2019*

**(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

*2781165*

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

*2781165.000*

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

*2781165.000*

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

*92.9*

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

*93.7*

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

*93.7*

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

*12/31/2030*

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

*27.5*

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

*2016344.625*

**(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

*2216688*

**(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

*2216688.000*

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

*2216688.000*

**(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**

*73.81*

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Underway

**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*This company-wide target covers 85% of all our reported Scope 3 emissions. The coverage of this target including only category 1 Purchased Goods and Services was approved by the Science-based Targets Initiative (SBTi) so as to focus on the largest category most relevant to our business activities with the greatest potential for driving improvement. We have excluded several minor categories which we aim to reduce through separate measures.*

**(7.53.1.83) Target objective**

*This target was set both as an internal commitment to reduce our emissions in line with climate science, and to hold our organization publicly accountable to our investors and other stakeholders.*

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

*We have begun to engage suppliers of our key raw materials. Our immediate focus is to explore how to work with suppliers that can make the lowest-carbon monomers from existing feedstocks. This is where we have the potential to make the most immediate impact on our Scope 3 Category 1 emissions. In the medium term, we are also working to identify and introduce alternative feedstocks, including those from bio-based or circular sources where they offer a lower-carbon solution, although we may have to consider trade-offs with other environmental factors, such as land use change. These actions allow us to continue to create and respond to demand from our customers for more sustainable products. In 2023, we revised our product sustainability scorecard to support the further prioritisation of lower-carbon product development for commercialisation in the medium term.*

**(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach**

*Select from:*

☑ No

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 2**

**(7.53.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Int 1

**(7.53.2.8) Scopes**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

**(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric**

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product

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

*100.0*

**(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)

*[Add row]*

## (7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

*Select all that apply*

☑ Other climate-related targets

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

**Row 1**

**(7.54.1.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Low 1

**(7.54.1.2) Date target was set**

*12/30/2022*

**(7.54.1.3) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Organization-wide

**(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier**

*Select from:*

☑ All energy carriers

**(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity**

*Select from:*

☑ Consumption

**(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source**

*Select from:*

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(7.54.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Oth 2

**(7.54.2.2) Date target was set**

*12/30/2022*

**(7.54.2.3) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Organization-wide

**(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity**

*Select from:*

☑ Intensity

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

**Energy consumption or efficiency**  
☑ GJ

**(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)**

*Select from:*

☑ metric ton of product

**(7.54.2.7) End date of base year**

*12/30/2022*

**(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year**

*3.95*

**(7.54.2.9) End date of target**

*12/30/2025*

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

*3.75*

**(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year**

*4.06*

**(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year**

*-55.0000000000*

**(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Underway

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

*Yes, this target contributes to Emission target*

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

*Select all that apply*

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

**(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Covers full company. No exclusions.*

**(7.54.2.19) Target objective**

*Targeting a 5% improvement in specific energy consumption (GJ/t sales volume) by end 2025 versus 2022 baseline.*

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

*No progress has been made so far in part due to the reduction of production that affects negatively to the energy intensity*

**Row 3**

**(7.54.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Oth 1

**(7.54.2.2) Date target was set**

*12/30/2022*

**(7.54.2.3) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Organization-wide

**(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity**

*Select from:*

☑ Intensity

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

**Waste management**  
☑ metric tons of waste generated

**(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)**

*Select from:*

☑ metric ton of product

**(7.54.2.7) End date of base year**

*12/30/2022*

**(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year**

*0.0398*

**(7.54.2.9) End date of target**

*12/30/2025*

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

*0.0378*

**(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year**

*0.036*

**(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year**

*190.0000000000*

**(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Underway

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

*No*

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

*Select all that apply*

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

**(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Covers full company. No exclusions*

**(7.54.2.19) Target objective**

*Targeting a 5% reduction in waste intensity (total waste generated per tonne sales volume produced), based on 3 year average (2020-2022) to target period (2023-2025).*

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

*Significant progress performed but partly due to the low production and lower amount of related waste and to the lack of one-offs during 2023. There are various projects ongoing to reduce waste (e.g. Reduction of solid waste from Waste Water Treatment Plants that will help to achieve the targets*

*[Add row]*

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

|  | **Number of initiatives** | **Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked \*)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Under investigation | *11* | *`Numeric input* |
| To be implemented | *8* | *408* |
| Implementation commenced | *29* | *7382* |
| Implemented | *6* | *5171* |
| Not to be implemented | *0* | *`Numeric input* |

*[Fixed row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type**

**Energy efficiency in production processes**  
☑ Process optimization

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

*604*

**(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)**

*272331*

**(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:*

☑ >30 years

**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

*Project to optimise steam usage in Marl site in Germany: the project consists in the Optimization of waste water stripping column operation and the introduction of chemical post-activation in 1 product*

**Row 2**

**(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)**

*670*

**(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)**

*419000*

**(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:*

☑ >30 years

**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

*Project to reduce natural gas usage in Middelburg site in Netherlands: the project consists in keeping one waste steam supply always active and in increasing the efficiency of a new steam line to reuse waste steam*

**Row 3**

**(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type**

**Energy efficiency in production processes**  
☑ Automation

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

*2029*

**(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)**

*246315*

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

*80000*

**(7.55.2.7) Payback period**

*Select from:*

☑ 4-10 years

**(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

*Select from:*

☑ 16-20 years

**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

*Project to reduce electricity usage in Pasir Gudang site in Malaysia: the project consists mainly in the automation of pumps*

**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)**

*1091*

**(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)**

*201000*

**(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:*

☑ >30 years

**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

*Project to reduce natural gas usage in Pasir Gudang site in Malaysia: the project consists in the optimization of natural gas usage for Waste and Shell boilers through Reduction of standby temperature, reduction of steam pressure and reduction of waste gas flowrate*

**Row 5**

**(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)**

*367*

**(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)**

*87177*

**(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:*

☑ >30 years

**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

*Project to reduce natural gas usage in Ribecourt site in France: the project consists in the optimization of natural gas usage for the spray dryers*

**Row 6**

**(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)**

*410*

**(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)**

*31400*

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

*369880*

**(7.55.2.7) Payback period**

*Select from:*

☑ 11-15 years

**(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

*Select from:*

☑ 16-20 years

**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

*Project to reduce natural gas usage in Sokolov site in Czech Republic: the project consists in the replacement of vacuum system to reduce the amount of steam required*

*[Add row]*

## (7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

**Row 1**

**(7.55.3.1) Method**

*Select from:*

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

**(7.55.3.2) Comment**

*It is Synthomer Policy to ensure that it fully complies with all regulatory requirements and standards in the countries where it operates*

**Row 3**

**(7.55.3.1) Method**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower return on investment (ROI) specification

**(7.55.3.2) Comment**

*General capital project must demonstrate a payback of 2-3 years. Since 2021 projects linked to energy efficiency improvements and by inference emissions reductions will be considered if the payback is up to 5-6 years.*

**Row 4**

**(7.55.3.1) Method**

*Select from:*

☑ Internal price on carbon

**(7.55.3.2) Comment**

*In 2022 Synthomer has set a shadow carbon price, set at 85 per tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent to be used in supporting Scope 1 and 2 energy / carbon reduction related projects. This will be applied globally so that opportunities in each region are assessed on an equal basis. The theoretical monetary saving of the carbon saved will be used to support the payback case for these projects.It will also be applied to significant growth projects (1m investment) to determine the potential negative impact of any increase in carbon emissions, and thereby support growth projects with enhanced energy efficiency.*

*[Add row]*

## (7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?

*Select from:*

☑ No, I am not providing data

## (7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

## (7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

**Row 1**

**(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation**

*Select from:*

☑ Product or service

**(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**LCA in accordance to ISO 14040 and ISO 14044

**(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)**

**Chemicals and plastics**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Olefinic Modifier for PP

**(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)**

*Plastvance T is a hydrocarbon modifier for polypropylene that is used as an additive in manufacturing of PP sheets for thermoformed rigid packaging. It is designed to enable the replacement of polystyrene or PET by polypropylene in the manufacturing of thermoformed rigid food packaging containers. Besides enabling the use of PP instead of PS in form-fill-seal packaging lines that were designed for the use of PS, Plastvance also allows for downgauging of the container compared to unmodified PP, so that the same properties can be achieved while reducing the amount of PP needed by about 10%. Next to the material substitution and base weight reduction, Plastvance also allows processing of PP at lower temperatures, leading to additional energy savings during the thermoforming process. In comparison to PS, the same container can be manufactured from modified PP with 48% lower CO2 emissions. In comparison to PET, emissions are 55% lower. The product was launched in September 2022, and has been technically approved at several food brands. Trial production has been carried out at several major food brands, and we expect this product to grow significantly in volume over the coming 5 years.*

**(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 **:**ISO 14040 and ISO 14044

**(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**

*Product million cup: 1 cup is equivalent to 22 ml*

**(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used**

*LCA analysis was carried out comparing PP Plastvance cup vs PS cup and vs PET cup*

**(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**

*1.52*

**(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions**

*Avoided emissions refer to 1 year and have been calculated comparing amount of material required to achieve equivalent physical properties (stiffness, top load). A mixture of PP Plastvance have been compared with PS and PET. PP, PS and PET emissions have been calculated using Global Warming Potentials from Gabi Database. The avoided emissions provided are vs PS and are the most unfavourable, avoided emissions vs. PET are even higher*

**(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year**

*0.01*

**Row 2**

**(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation**

*Select from:*

☑ Group of products or services

**(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon**

*Select from:*

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

**(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)**

**Power**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Lower carbon insulation materials

**(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)**

*The continuing urbanization and the necessity for energy efficient housing require façade systems that shield the interiors from the influence of outside temperatures as well as properly waterproofed roofings for both residential and commercial buildings. Polymer dispersions and lattices provide the glass fiber meshes and roofing felts mechanical stability against thermal shrinkage and expansion, chemical resistance and water resistance.To deliver the required performance, these polymers often contain cross-linking mechanisms that release formaldehyde, a material classified as hazardous. In order to eliminate formaldehyde during the impregnation process, Synthomer has launched its SHIELD platform technology, offering LITEX AlkaShield, LITEX QuickShield and LITEX SkyShield range of SBRs for exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) and polyester roofing felt impregnation mats that meet end-use industry performance standards using a patent pending formaldehyde-free cross-linking mechanism. The new SBR family also offers customers substantial energy cost savings via lower drying temperatures during glass fiber and polyester felt impregnation.As sustainability continues to be a key focused initiative in many regions (eg. EU Green Deal, US Green New Deal etc.) especially emphasizing on improving building energy conservation, we expect the SHIELD platform to continuously grow and allow Synthomer to be part of the contributors to reduce the carbon footprint.*

**(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year**

*0.81*

**Row 3**

**(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation**

*Select from:*

☑ Group of products or services

**(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon**

*Select from:*

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

**(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)**

**Power**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Low VOC binders for textiles

**(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)**

*Reports show that on average we spend 90% of our time indoor every day. Therefore, indoor air quality has been a frequently discussed health and environment topic where volatile organic compounds (VOC) as well as formaldehyde are constantly under the lime light. As EU Commission reclassified formaldehyde as H350 carcinogenic 1B and H341 mutagen 2, the demand of having formaldehyde-free and low VOC products for household applications have once again surged. While Europe and Americas had made significant progress in moving away from solvent based polymers where urea/melamine formaldehyde resins are often used as crosslinker, there are still products which release formaldehyde during fabrication processes. These products are often used in furniture, kitchen top, kitchen cabinet and glass fiber wall coverings.Knowledge from the development of the Shield Platform was applied to develop a formaldehyde-free, low VOC acrylic binder system for technical textiles for use in household applications. Marketed under the REVACRYL Design brand, these products can be used for impregnation or coating applications of woven or non-woven textiles where a medium stiff hand is desired. It can also be used for binding fibers or powdery materials of all typesAs sustainability continues to be a key initiative in many regions especially emphasizing on improving building energy conservation, we expect the REVACRYL Design platform to continuously grow*

**(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year**

*0.05*

**Row 4**

**(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation**

*Select from:*

☑ Group of products or services

**(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon**

*Select from:*

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

**(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)**

**Power**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Low VOC products for paper tapes and release liners

**(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)**

*Suncryl HP 114 is one of a family of new products produced with a new class of polymers made via a proprietary monomer system with over 65% bio-content. This technology offers a water-based alternative to solvent-based release coatings for packaging tape, thus reducing the amount of solvents released to the environment.The outstanding release performance allows for replacement of silicone containing coatings in many applications which improves the recyclability and repulpability of paper tapes and release liners.*

**(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year**

*0.08*

**Row 5**

**(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation**

*Select from:*

☑ Product or service

**(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**LCA in accordance to ISO 14040 and ISO 14044

**(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)**

**Power**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Latex for lower carbon gloves production

**(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)**

*Synovus is a synthetic Nitrile-Butadiene Rubber latex (NBR) used to produce medical gloves. The technology used allows the glove manufacturer to avoid the use of harmful curing agents and cure the rubber material at a significantly lower temperature (ca. 70-80C vs 120C) during the glove manufacturing process, whilst retaining glove performance.The technology primarily enables avoided emissions through the reduction of energy, combined with the reduction in glove weight when compared to other technologies. When compared to conventional NBR latex, the primary reduction of carbon emissions at the glove producer comes from the lower curing temperature. Working with a world class supplier of gloves, real time measurements have demonstrated a reduction in energy usage during manufacture of ca. 20%.Full LCA analysis was also carried out comparing Synovus, standard NBR latex, natural rubber latex and PVC based gloves using a cradle to grave process. Assessment for carbon emissions demonstrated a ca. 30% reduction in green house gas profile compared to natural rubber latex and a ca. 25% reduction compared to PVC gloves. When compared to NBR latex giving a glove of a similar weight/thickness, there was a total carbon emission reduction of ca. 11%.Product was launched in late 2018 and is technically approved at several world scale glove producers. Commercial sales are expected to grow significantly over the next 5 years as glove producers switch to the technology.*

**(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 **:**ISO 14040 and ISO 14044

**(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)**

*Select from:*

☑ Cradle-to-grave

**(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used**

*1,000,000 glove units*

**(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used**

*LCA analysis was carried out comparing Synovus, standard NBR latex, natural rubber latex and PVC based gloves*

**(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario**

*Select from:*

☑ Cradle-to-grave

**(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario**

*26.2*

**(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions**

*Avoided emissions provided were calculated as the difference of GHG emissions of natural rubber latex gloves and SyNovus gloves taking into consideration incineration as final disposal treatment*

**(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year**

*0.22*

**Row 6**

**(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation**

*Select from:*

☑ Group of products or services

**(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon**

*Select from:*

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

**(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)**

**Power**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Synthetic rubber lates for production of foam mattresses

**(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)**

*The global demand for latex foam is driving the need for higher productivity in manufacturing processes, whilst reducing their environmental footprint. Lipolan TERRA is Synthomer’s promise towards sustainability, leading the transformation of the latex foam manufacturing industry by innovating on our HS-SBR products to reduce the overall environmental impact in the supply chain. Lipolan Terra SynthomerLipolan TERRA 2022F is the first product under the new sustainable range, with many more products to come.Lipolan TERRA 2022F enables a more sustainable latex foam manufacturing by delivering on higher productivity, material efficiency and reduced carbon footprint.Lipolan Terra- SYNTHOMER 2022FLIPOLAN TERRA 2880F is an aqueous dispersion of a reinforced styrene-butadiene copolymer with high solids content. The emulsifier used is an alkaline salt of fatty acids, which provides superior stability and foamability. LIPOLAN TERRA 2880F is particularly designed to be processed at both, elevated and ambient temperature, providing very low shrinkage and high foam stability. LIPOLAN TERRA 2880F is produced without addition of any antioxidant agent or biocide. Foam made of LIPOLAN TERRA 2880F exhibits a high indentation hardness with a good resilience, which can contribute to reduce the final foam density, thus saving material and Carbon footprint. LIPOLAN TERRA 2880F (synthomer.com)*

**(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year**

*0.04*

*[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:*  ☑ No |

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

|  | **Disclosure volume (metric tons)** | **Volume type** | **Sourced volume (metric tons)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Palm oil | *63.97* | *Select all that apply*  ☑ Sourced | *63.97* |
| Soy | *4602.18* | *Select all that apply*  ☑ Sourced | *4602.18* |

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

**Palm oil**

**(8.5.1) Country/area of origin**

*Select from:*

☑ Malaysia

**(8.5.2) First level administrative division**

*Select from:*

☑ Unknown

**(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)**

*63.97*

**(8.5.5) Source**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

**(8.5.7) Please explain**

*Synthomer buys RBD (refined, bleached, and deodorized) palm oil & Glycerol from local refiner. Refiner will source crude palm oil from Malaysia*

**Soy**

**(8.5.1) Country/area of origin**

*Select from:*

☑ United States of America

**(8.5.2) First level administrative division**

*Select from:*

☑ Unknown

**(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)**

*3015.53*

**(8.5.5) Source**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

**(8.5.7) Please explain**

*Synthomer buys soybean oil and soya fatty acid sourced from north & south America*

**Soy**

**(8.5.1) Country/area of origin**

*Select from:*

☑ Portugal

**(8.5.2) First level administrative division**

*Select from:*

☑ Unknown

**(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)**

*1586.65*

**(8.5.5) Source**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Sovena is an agricultural business holding company.

**(8.5.7) Please explain**

*Total volume we buy for Mem Martins (Europe) is 1,586 Tons in 2023*

*[Add row]*

## (8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel?

*Select from:*

☑ No

## (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:*

☑ No, and we do not plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

**(8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year**

*Due to the small amount of affected commodities used, the company have very limited impact in deforestation. Targets have been defined at company level for the significant environmental aspects identified as GHG emissions or water consumption. We are reviewing whether to introduce minimum standards or 3rd party certification for some of these products that we do buy.*

**(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target**

*Select from:*

☑ No, and we do not plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

**(8.7.6) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.7.7) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year**

*Due to the limited amount of affected commodities used, the forest- related issues have very limited impact on business and strategy. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. However, we are making our suppliers comply with the EU Deforestation directive.*

**Soy**

**(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target**

*Select from:*

☑ No, and we do not plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

**(8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year**

*Due to the small amount of affected commodities used, the company have very limited impact in deforestation. Targets have been defined at company level for the significant environmental aspects identified as GHG emissions or water consumption. We are reviewing whether to introduce minimum standards or 3rd party certification for some of these products that we do buy.*

**(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target**

*Select from:*

☑ No, and we do not plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

**(8.7.6) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.7.7) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year**

*Due to the limited amount of affected commodities used, the forest- related issues have very limited impact on business and strategy. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. However, we are making our suppliers comply with the EU Deforestation directive.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

**Palm oil**

**(8.8.1) Traceability system**

*Select from:*

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

**(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system**

*This business is a very small part of Synthomer total business. We are buying palm oil as RBD (Refined, Bleached, Deodorized) oil from refiners. At this point we are not asking for RSPO certification grade as it comes with Premium Price and has not been requested by customers. Our forest related products will come under the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) which comes into force at the end of 2024.*

**Soy**

**(8.8.1) Traceability system**

*Select from:*

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

**(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system**

*We are buying soy oil as RBD (Refined, Bleached, Deodorized) oil and soy fatty acid from refiners/millers. Our local refiners are buying from big soy traders. At this point we are not asking for RTRS certification grade as it comes with Premium Price and has not been requested by customersOur forest related products will come under the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) which comes into force at the end of 2024.*

*[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:*

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

**(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status**

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

**(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status**

*We haven’t evaluated the status of DF/DCF due to their minimal impact on forests, given our limited use of these commodities in our portfolio. We will evaluate the needs based on recommendations from the EUDR.*

**Soy**

**(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity**

*Select from:*

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

**(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status**

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

**(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status**

*We haven’t evaluated the status of DF/DCF due to their minimal impact on forests, given our limited use of these commodities in our portfolio. We will evaluate the needs based on recommendations from the EUDR.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

**Palm oil**

**(8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint**

*Select from:*

☑ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

**(8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint**

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

**(8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint**

*We do not monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint due to the small quantity of affected commodities used. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. However, we will evaluate the needs based on recommendations from the EUDR.*

**Soy**

**(8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint**

*Select from:*

☑ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

**(8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint**

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

**(8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint**

*We do not monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint due to the small quantity of affected commodities used. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. However, we will evaluate the needs based on recommendations from the EUDR.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

|  | **Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes** |
| --- | --- |
| Palm oil | *Select from:*  ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years |
| Soy | *Select from:*  ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years |

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.

**Palm oil**

**(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted**

*Select from:*

☑ No, but we plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years

**(8.12.5) Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.12.6) Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted**

*Synthomer adopts third-party certification through the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) for our customers. However, none of the certified volumes are sold to CDP Supply Chain members who request them.*

**Soy**

**(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted**

*Select from:*

☑ No, but we plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years

**(8.12.5) Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.12.6) Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted**

*Third party cerfication has not been adopted due to the small quantity of affected commodities used. The amount spent in this product is below 0.01%. However, we will evaluate the needs based on recommendations from the EUDR*

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.12.1) Provide details of the certified volumes sold to each requesting CDP Supply Chain member.

**Row 1**

**(8.12.1.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(8.12.1.2) Commodity**

*Select from:*

☑ Palm oil

**(8.12.1.3) Form of commodity**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Crude palm kernel oil (CPKO)

☑ Refined palm oil

**(8.12.1.4) Total volume of commodity sold to requesting member**

*0*

**(8.12.1.5) Metric**

*Select from:*

☑ Metric tons

**(8.12.1.6) Third-party certification scheme**

**Chain-of-custody certification**  
☑ RSPO supply chain certification – Segregated

*[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?

**Palm oil**

**(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated**

*Select from:*

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

**(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*We do not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change due to the limited amount of affected commodities used and the limited impact on business and strategy. Also the amount spent in this product is below 0.01%.*

**Soy**

**(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated**

*Select from:*

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

**(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*We do not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change due to the limited amount of affected commodities used and the limited impact on business and strategy. Also the amount spent in this product is below 0.01%.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

**(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations**

*Select from:*

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

**(8.14.5) Please explain**

*We will asses the needs via recommendations from the EUDR. We are making our suppliers comply with the EU Deforestation directive. All of Synthomer suppliers are requested to comply with any law or regulation. See page 17 of the Sustainable Procurement Policy: https://www.synthomer.com/media/51egkk4u/sustainable\_procurement\_policy\_and\_strategy.pdf*

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

**(8.15.1) Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives**

*Select from:*

☑ No, we do not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives, and we do not plan to within the next two years

**(8.15.2) Primary reason for not engaging in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives**

*Select from:*

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

**(8.15.3) Explain why your organization does not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives**

*Although important in general terms as landscape is key to support biodiversity, due to the limited amount of affected commodities and small proportion of overall raw materials used the topic is not a priority for Synthomer.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

*Select from:*

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

## (8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

*Select from:*

☑ No, but we plan to implement a project(s) within the next two years

# C9. Environmental performance - Water security

## (9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

## (9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

**Row 1**

**(9.1.1.1) Exclusion**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Small leased offices

**(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion**

*Small leased office spaces (fewer than 50 employees) where water is provided through the lease and is managed by our landlord*

**(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion**

*Select from:*

☑ Small volume [rainwater]

**(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 1%

**(9.1.1.8) Please explain**

*Water estimations have been made for these small offices based on available data from big offices. The big office (over 150 employees) with the highest water consumption accounts for 0.01% of company water consumption that is already neglectable. Small offices are estimated to account for less than 0.004%. Based on that, small offices have been left out of scope*

*[Add row]*

## (9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

**Water withdrawals – total volumes**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Monthly

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*It depends on the site and water source: it can be direct metering through owned metering devices or taking into consideration the readings from the third party water invoices*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*All our sites monitor their total volume water withdrawals and these are reported yearly in the company Annual Report, as well as monthly as part of internal sustainability performance tracking. This includes river water used for once through cooling that is returned to source with only a minor temperature increase*

**Water withdrawals – volumes by source**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Yearly

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*It depends on the site and water source: it can be direct metering through owned metering devices or taking into consideration the readings from the third party water invoices*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*Water withdrawal by source (Public supply, river, borehole, sea, canal,..) is collected individually by sites and then collected annually and reported at a corporate level*

**Water withdrawals quality**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ Not monitored

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*The quality of water withdrawals is not monitored at company level*

**Water discharges – total volumes**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Monthly

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Usually is metered directly through owned metering devices*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*All our sites monitor their total volume water discharges (in terms of effluent) and report centrally so that the total group volume can be determined. This data is reported yearly in the company Annual Report, as well as monthly as part of internal sustainability performance tracking.*

**Water discharges – volumes by destination**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Yearly

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Discharges are a combination of direct metered streams (e.g. effluent outlet to municipal drain, condensate return), tankered volumes of effluent sent for 3rd party treatment, or estimates in some cases of rainwater run-off*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*Water "discharged" will either be initially treated at onsite effluent treatment facilities or else discharged to trade effluent sewers for offsite treatment, with metering on final discharge. On occasion wastewater may be taken by tanker for offsite treatment if internal testing determines release to trade effluent is not possible.*

**Water discharges – volumes by treatment method**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ Not monitored

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*We currently do not quantify discharge volumes by treatment method. Most treatment is at least secondary with some tertiary treatment. Where onsite facilities exist treatment is usually chemical (e.g. pH correction, coagulation and flocculation) with some sites additionally undertaking biological treatment. This approach may get revised as we review compliance with best practice under GRI water metrics.*

**Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Yearly

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*It depends on the site, the parameter and the authority requirements. Measurements can be done using internal laboratories or by external certified third parties*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*All sites individually measure and monitor at different frequencies (even continuously) pH and in most cases COD levels in their effluent. Where required to meet environmental consent limits set out in permits or municipal bylaws additional periodic testing takes place to determine levels of, for example, phosphates, nitrates and heavy metals. Information is communicated to the company annually*

**Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Yearly

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Usually by external certified third parties*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*Where and when required to meet environmental consent limits set out in permits or municipal laws, periodic testing takes place to determine levels of, for example, phosphates, nitrates and heavy metals. Information is communicated to the company annually*

**Water discharge quality – temperature**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Continuously

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Direct measurement and control of return temperature in cooling water discharge from site with once through river water cooling in Germany to ensure temperature meets permitted limits.*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*Where required to meet permit requirements sites are monitoring water discharge temperature but the information is not monitored continuously at company level. Any permit exceedance would be reported and tracked.*

**Water consumption – total volume**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Monthly

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Water consumption is calculated as the difference between water withdrawal and water discharge*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*All our sites monitor their total volumes of water withdrawal and discharges and report centrally so that the total group volumes can be determined. These data are reported yearly in the company Annual Report, as well as monthly as part of internal sustainability performance tracking.*

**Water recycled/reused**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ Not monitored

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*The amount of water recycled/reused is not tracked at company level*

**The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers**

**(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☑ 100%

**(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

☑ Continuously

**(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*The water is supplied by third parties that ensure adequate quality*

**(9.2.4) Please explain**

*Synthomer is dedicated to providing a safe and hygienic workplace for all staff and requires all sites to ensure that there are adequate wash facilities available for all workers.*

*[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)**

*7066*

**(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

**(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

**(9.2.2.6) Please explain**

*Water withdrawal decreased a 12% compared with previous year. The main reason for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives as the optimisation of water usage during low demand periods in one of our sites in Malaysia or repairing of water network leaks in one of our sites in France. The 11% reduction in production has also have an impact. Reduction planned for next years is based in the implementation of additional projects as optimisation of cooling systems and water and leaks reduction.*

**Total discharges**

**(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)**

*5046*

**(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

**(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

**(9.2.2.6) Please explain**

*Water discharges decreased an 8% compared with previous year. As with water withdrawal, the main reason for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives, in this case, initiatives affecting reduction of water used in cooling systems as the optimization of cooling circuit make-up water by replacement of obsolete equipment in one of our sites in France. The 11% reduction in production has also have an impact. Reduction planned for next years is based in the implementation of different projects as optimisation of cooling systems and water and leaks reduction.*

**Total consumption**

**(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)**

*2020*

**(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:*

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

**(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

**(9.2.2.6) Please explain**

*Water consumption decreased a 21% compared with previous year. The 2 main factors were the reduction in water withdrawal due to the implementation of reduction projects (some of them mentioned above) and the reduction of 11% on production as many of the consumed water is incorporated in our final product. Reduction planned for next years is based in the implementation of different projects as optimisation of cooling systems and water and leaks reduction.*

*[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)**

*878*

**(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Much lower

**(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify **:**Change in WRI Aquaduct Database

**(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast**

*Select from:*

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

**(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress**

*12.43*

**(9.2.4.8) Identification tool**

*Select all that apply*

☑ WRI Aqueduct

**(9.2.4.9) Please explain**

*We carried out an updated water risk assessment using version 4 of the WRI Aqueduct model. This found 12 production sites in areas with High or Extremely High Water Stress (7 the previous year). There has been a significant change vs. previous year as 2 sites are no longer classified as High/Extremely High Water Stress according to WRI Aqueduct v4 compared to v3, and 6 new sites have been included. There is 1 Technical Center also in a High Water Stress Area. Even if the number of sites in high water stress areas has increased, the 2 sites that are no longer classified as High/Extremely High were withdrawing most of the water. As a consequence of the changes in WRI Aqueduct, the Water withdrawn from high water stress areas has been reduced 46%. There are several projects to reduce water withdrawal in sites located in High/Extremely High water stress areas. One of the sites now with Med-High water stress does have forecast high water stress for most scenarios in Aqueduct, so remains a focus for water reduction activity.*

*[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)**

*4178*

**(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

**(9.2.7.5) Please explain**

*Water withdrawal from fresh surface is mainly obtained from rivers, the amount decreased a 13% compared with previous year. The main reason for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives as the optimisation of cooling circuit make-up and filter cleaning frequency in one of our sites in France. The 11% reduction in production has also have an impact. Reduction planned for next years is based in the implementation of additional projects as optimisation of cooling systems and water and leaks reduction*

**Brackish surface water/Seawater**

**(9.2.7.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

**(9.2.7.5) Please explain**

*NA*

**Groundwater – renewable**

**(9.2.7.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

**(9.2.7.5) Please explain**

*NA*

**Groundwater – non-renewable**

**(9.2.7.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Relevant

**(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

*783*

**(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Much lower

**(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

**(9.2.7.5) Please explain**

*Water withdrawal from borehole decreased a 26% compared with previous year. The main reason for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives as the optimisation of underground water pumping in one of our sites in France. The 11% reduction in production has also have an impact. Reduction planned for next years is based in the implementation of additional projects as optimisation of cooling systems and water and leaks reduction*

**Produced/Entrained water**

**(9.2.7.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

**(9.2.7.5) Please explain**

*NA*

**Third party sources**

**(9.2.7.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Relevant

**(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

*2105*

**(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

**(9.2.7.5) Please explain**

*Water withdrawal from third party decreased a 5% compared with previous year. The main reason for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives as repairing water network leaks in one of our sites in France or the optimisation of water usage during low demand periods in one of our sites in Malaysia. The 11% reduction in production has also have an impact. Reduction planned for next years is based in the implementation of additional projects as optimisation of cooling systems and water and leaks reduction.*

*[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)**

*3179*

**(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

**(9.2.8.5) Please explain**

*Water discharges to fresh surface water decreased a 12% compared with previous year. The main reason for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives, in this case, initiatives affecting reduction of water used in one-through cooling systems as the optimization of cooling circuit make-up water by replacement of obsolete equipment in one of our sites in France. The 11% reduction in production has also have an impact.*

**Brackish surface water/seawater**

**(9.2.8.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

**(9.2.8.5) Please explain**

*No water discharged*

**Groundwater**

**(9.2.8.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

**(9.2.8.5) Please explain**

*No water discharged*

**Third-party destinations**

**(9.2.8.1) Relevance**

*Select from:*

☑ Relevant

**(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

*1867*

**(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

**(9.2.8.5) Please explain**

*Water discharges to third party decreased a 2% compared with previous year, the main reason for the reduction was the 11% reduction in production*

*[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.

|  | **Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)** | **Categories of substances included** | **Please explain** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *104* | *Select all that apply*  ☑ Nitrates  ☑ Phosphates | *Number refers to any Nitrogen and Phosphorous compounds, not just Nitrates and phosphates* |

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

**Direct operations**

**(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

**(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified**

*5*

**(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents**

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25

**(9.3.4) Please explain**

*As noted in Part 3 we have updated our water risk assessment using v4 of the Aqueduct model to assess sites in high water stress areas or forecast to be so - this gave us at the time a potential 19 locations of concern. Screening further to remove those with low water demand and at least medium term good water availability led to those sites with more substantive risks being identified. This consists of those sites with regulatory risks/demands (2 French sites), one site with significant growth forecasts in Saudi Arabia, a site in Germany where risks from both availability of river water and corrosion risk have been identified, and one site in the UK previously included in CDP returns as at risk in relation to future climate change related coastal flood risk. Of the 4 water stress sites, 2 have baseline high water stress and the other 2 have forecast annual average water stress.*

**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**

*We have initially concentrated in Direct Operations*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

**Row 1**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility 1

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*Le Havre*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

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

**France**  
☑ Seine

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

*49.482818*

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

*0.282804*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

*328*

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

*271*

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

*0*

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

*57*

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

*319*

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

*319*

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

*0*

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

*9*

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Much lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Both withdrawal and releases are metered. Main reason for water withdrawal reduction (19% vs. 2022) that also influenced consumption reduction (82% vs. 2022) was a reduction of a 20% in production. The much lower consumption is also due to heavy rain episodes resulting in stormwater drain shutting down and rain water being sent to the water treatment plant, where it is metered resulting in water releases overestimations. We are working to be able to calculate the amount of rain water diverted to the waste water treatment plant. We consider 0-5% variation as About the Same, 5-20% Lower/Higher, 20% Much Lower/Higher.*

**Row 3**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility 2

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*Stallingborough*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

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

**Afghanistan**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Humber

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

*53.58584*

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

*-0.186296*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

*156*

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

*86*

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

*0*

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

*70*

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

*136*

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

*0*

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

*136*

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

*20*

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Both withdrawal and releases are metered. Water withdrawal was reduced a 3.7% and water consumption about a 4.8%. We consider 0-5% variation as About the Same, 5-20% Lower/Higher, 20% Much Lower/Higher.*

**Row 4**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility 4

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*Dammam*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

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

**Afghanistan**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Arabian Peninsula

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

*26.254447*

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

*49.987681*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

*90*

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

*0*

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

*0*

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

*90*

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

*57*

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

*0*

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

*57*

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

*33*

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Higher

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*In this case withdrawal is metered but releases are estimated. Water withdrawal was reduced a 6.2% vs. 2022 but water consumption increase about a 10% vs. 2022 due to a reduction in water releases of 13.6% vs. 2022. The main reason for water consumption increase was the increase in production (12% vs. 2022). Some differences could also be due to the water releases estimations. In 2024 the water releases will be metered. We consider 0-5% variation as About the Same, 5-20% Lower/Higher, 20% Much Lower/Higher.*

**Row 5**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility 3

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*Ribecourt*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

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

**France**  
☑ Seine

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

*49.508027*

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

*2.940462*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

*117*

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Much lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

*39*

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

*76*

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

*0*

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

*2*

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

*110*

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

*110*

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

*0*

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

*8*

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Much lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Both withdrawal and releases are metered. Water withdrawal was reduced a 32% vs. 2022 and water consumption an 88 % vs. 2022 The main reason for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives, in this case, leaks repairs and initiatives reducing water used in one-through cooling systems as the optimization of cooling circuit make-up water by replacement of obsolete equipment. The 11% reduction in production has also have an impact. We consider 0-5% variation as About the Same, 5-20% Lower/Higher, 20% Much Lower/Higher.*

**Row 6**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility 5

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*Langelsheim*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select from:*

☑ Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

☑ Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

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

**Germany**  
☑ Other, please specify **:**Ems-Weser

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

*51.931721*

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

*10.323354*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

*1040*

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

*952*

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

*0*

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

*0*

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

*88*

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

*1001*

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

*927*

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

*0*

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

*74*

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

*39*

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Much lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Both withdrawal and releases are metered. Water withdrawal was reduced a 14% vs. 2022 and water consumption a 46% vs. 2022. One of the reasons for the reduction was the implementation of water reduction initiatives, in this case, leaks repairs. The 21% reduction in production has also have an impact. We consider 0-5% variation as About the Same, 5-20% Lower/Higher, 20% Much Lower/Higher.*

*[Add row]*

## (9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

**Water withdrawals – total volumes**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Water not verified by third party*

**Water withdrawals – volume by source**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Water not verified by third party*

**Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Water not verified by third party*

**Water discharges – total volumes**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Water not verified by third party*

**Water discharges – volume by destination**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Water not verified by third party*

**Water discharges – volume by final treatment level**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Water not verified by third party*

**Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ 1-25

**(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used**

*Effluent sampling methods subject to MCERTS compliance at the UK sites under IED Permit requirements.*

**Water consumption – total volume**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Water not verified by third party*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, CDP supply chain members buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

## (9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member.

**Row 1**

**(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility 1

**(9.4.1.2) Facility name**

*Le Havre*

**(9.4.1.3) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member**

*Very limited impact as the customer is mainly purchasing from other sites*

**(9.4.1.5) Comment**

*It refers to a single facility*

**Row 2**

**(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Facility 1

**(9.4.1.2) Facility name**

*Le Havre*

**(9.4.1.3) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

**(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member**

*Very limited impact as the customer is mainly purchasing from other sites*

**(9.4.1.5) Comment**

*It refers to a single facility*

*[Add row]*

## (9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

**(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)**

*1970900000*

**(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency**

*278927.26*

**(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend**

*The future trend is to an improved water withdrawal efficiency as we have plans to reduce water withdrawal through priority projects at 3 of the 5 sites listed (Le Havre, Ribecourt and Langelsheim) in 9.4 and forecasting to increase revenue in line with the business strategy.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.6) Do you calculate water intensity for your activities in the chemical sector?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

## (9.6.1) For your top five products by production weight/volume, provide the following water intensity information associated with your activities in the chemical sector.

**Row 1**

**(9.6.1.1) Product type**

**Bulk organic chemicals**  
☑ Polymers

**(9.6.1.2) Product name**

*All company products*

**(9.6.1.3) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)**

*5.05*

**(9.6.1.4) Numerator: water aspect**

*Select from:*

☑ Total water withdrawals

**(9.6.1.5) Denominator**

*Select from:*

☑ Ton

**(9.6.1.6) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.6.1.7) Please explain**

*Due to the nature of Synthomer operations, there is no available information to split water withdrawal per product. All company products have been considered. The water withdrawal per ton decreased around 2% compared with previous year: The numerator (water withdrawal) decreased about 13% vs. previous year due. The denominator (production) also decreased resulting in an small decrease of the intensity value. Variance is also expected year-on-year since a majority of our products are water-based dispersions with some changes down to product mix and volumes. In terms of strategy, using the World Resources Institute (WRI) Aqueduct tool, we identified a number of sites with high baseline water stress and/or high forecast water stress as noted in the response to 3.1 and 9.2.4. Following site surveys, we identified the need to develop context-based water stewardship goals at three of them. We have already started this work, with two sites in France working to establish alternative production plans and controls to maintain operations during periods classified by local regulators as drought conditions. One site in Germany has also begun to implement the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) standard, alongside a significant capital project to re-engineer its cooling system, which we estimate could reduce overall Group water consumption by 12% when complete. Our sites have continued to drive improvement projects in areas like demand management, leak repairs and cooling system management, which have helped reduce water use significantly. At our site in Sokolov, Czech Republic, for example, the team has reduced the use of river water by more than 200,000 m³ as a result of ending the use of coal in our boilers in 2022.*

**Row 2**

**(9.6.1.1) Product type**

**Bulk organic chemicals**  
☑ Polymers

**(9.6.1.2) Product name**

*All company products*

**(9.6.1.3) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)**

*1.44*

**(9.6.1.4) Numerator: water aspect**

*Select from:*

☑ Total water consumption

**(9.6.1.5) Denominator**

*Select from:*

☑ Ton

**(9.6.1.6) Comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Lower

**(9.6.1.7) Please explain**

*Due to the nature of Synthomer operations, there is no available information to split water consumption per product. All company products have been considered. The water consumption per ton decreased around 12% compared with previous year: The numerator (water consumption) decreased about 21% vs. previous year. The denominator (production) also decreased resulting in an smaller decrease of the intensity value. Variance is also expected year-on-year since a majority of our products are water-based dispersions with some changes down to product mix and volumes and water in product forms a large part of the net consumption total. In terms of strategy, using the World Resources Institute (WRI) Aqueduct tool, we identified several sites with high baseline water stress and/or high forecast water stress. Following site surveys, we identified the need to develop context-based water stewardship goals at three of them. We have already started this work, with two sites in France working to establish alternative production plans and controls to maintain operations during periods classified by local regulators as drought conditions. One site in Germany has also begun to implement the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) standard, alongside a significant capital project to re-engineer its cooling system. System improvements should reduce leaks and losses and therefore overall Group water consumption. Our sites have continued to drive improvement projects in areas like demand management, leak repairs and cooling system management, which have helped reduce water use significantly. At our site in Sokolov, Czech Republic, for example, the team has reduced the use of river water by more than 200,000 m³ as a result of ending the use of coal in our boilers in 2022.*

*[Add row]*

## (9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

**Row 1**

**(9.12.1) Product name**

*Products sold to Ansell*

**(9.12.2) Water intensity value**

*2.8*

**(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect**

*Select from:*

☑ Water consumed

**(9.12.4) Denominator**

*Produced Tonne*

**(9.12.5) Comment**

*Calculations have been made taking into consideration the amount of products sold to Ansell and average water consumption per tonne of the sites where they are produced*

*[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 XIV of UK REACH Regulation

**(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list**

*Select from:*

☑ Less than 10%

**(9.13.1.3) Please explain**

*Synthomer is committed to protecting human health and the environment and takes this responsibility seriously. We provide products that are safe for their intended use with respect to human health and the environment and comply with all applicable chemical management regulations. As a global supplier of specialty chemicals and polymers we must comply with varying chemical management regulations around the world. Our global team of product safety specialists monitor new developments in these regulations and new scientific findings, to guide decisions on which materials are acceptable for use. To ensure that our products are safe for their intended use, Synthomer has established controls to avoid any new uses of substances included on the EU (or UK) REACH ANNEX XIV list. This ensures that SVHCs and substances subject to authorization, • Fully react onto the polymer backbone with a residual monomer significantly below 0.1% w/w, • Are not generated as part of any manufacturing process. Any products that may contain SVHC’s are appropriately labelled, documented and registered for use as per the EU REACH guidelines allowing the global portfolio Synthomer products to be available to our customers. Less than 2% of the products in Synthomer’s current portfolio by volume contain substances listed within EU REACH ANNEX XIV. We are working to eliminate the presence of any substance listed on Annex XIV*

*[Add row]*

## (9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

|  | **Products and/or services classified as low water impact** | **Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact** | **Please explain** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Select from:*  ☑ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years | *Select from:*  ☑ Important but not an immediate business priority | *Taking into consideration the company potential impacts and markets, the initial focus has been in low carbon products.* |

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

## (9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

**Water pollution**

**(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category**

*Select from:*

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

**(9.15.1.2) Please explain**

*Site effluent is either treated onsite or sent for offsite treatment, and water pollution is not considered a priority at this point. Water withdrawal and consumption are the water related priorities. We track any environmental related incidents and permitted release exceedances, but have not had any water pollution incidents for several years.*

**Water withdrawals**

**(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services**

**(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category**

*Select from:*

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

**(9.15.1.2) Please explain**

*All our sites have WASH services so internally at 100%.*

**Other**

**(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

**Row 1**

**(9.15.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Target 1

**(9.15.2.2) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Site/facility

**(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

**Water withdrawals**  
☑ Reduction in total water withdrawals

**(9.15.2.4) Date target was set**

*02/27/2022*

**(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

*12/30/2019*

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

*151374*

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

*12/30/2025*

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

*136237*

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

*116501*

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Underway

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

*230*

**(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**

*This covers 1 single site in France (Ribecourt) that has been identified as one of the priority sites in terms of water risks (high volume, water stress area). Water withdrawal includes water from any source: third party and raw water. Regulator target is for a 10% absolute reduction by end 2025 versus 2019 baseline, and a 25% reduction by 2034. The site also has to develop clear plans for short term water consumption management against 4 different potential water alert levels.*

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

*Different actions are ongoing to reduce water withdrawal including: replacement of steam boilers to reduce steam loss, leaks repairing, process optimisation. Significant progress has been made by the end of 2023 but the limited production has had an impact in water withdrawal reduction, it is necessary to wait until having the production levels recovered to mark the target as achieved*

**(9.15.2.16) Further details of target**

*Target has been defined considering all sources of water withdrawal. The target is part of a regulatory requirement. Significant progress has been made by the end of 2023 but the limited production has had an impact in water withdrawal reduction, it is necessary to wait until having the production levels recovered to mark the target as achieved*

**Row 2**

**(9.15.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☑ Target 2

**(9.15.2.2) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☑ Site/facility

**(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

**Other**  
☑ Other, please specify   **:**Identification of opportunities to reduce water withdrawal by 20% against 2020 baseline

**(9.15.2.4) Date target was set**

*07/20/2021*

**(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

*12/30/2022*

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

*406652*

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

*12/30/2026*

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

*325322*

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

*327725*

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

*Select from:*

☑ Underway

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

*97*

**(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**

*Local prefecture requires the site to propose measures to reduce absolute water withdrawal by 20% against 2022 baseline “as soon as possible”. Practically this means the site has employed a third party to complete a full site diagnostic and identified opportunities for reduction. Site has to send its proposal to the prefecture by 31st December 2024, the prefecture will then review and agreed a final timeline. Provisionally the target date defined is 31st December 2026. The review will define a final target date The reduction seen in 2023 is mainly due to production reduction.*

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

*The prepared plan includes a combination of technical and organisational measures*

**(9.15.2.16) Further details of target**

*20% target defined by local prefecture due to the area being recognised as high water stress*

*[Add row]*

# C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

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

|  | **Targets in place** |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Select from:*  ☑ Yes |

*[Fixed row]*

# C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

## (11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

|  | **Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments** |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Select from:*  ☑ No, we are not taking any actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments, but we plan to within the next two years |

*[Fixed row]*

## (11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

|  | **Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?** |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Select from:*  ☑ No |

*[Fixed row]*

## (11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

**Legally protected areas**

**(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity**

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*Natura 2000 network of protected areas. The biodiversity- sensitive area is called Sintra-Cascais Natural Park PTCON0008. Adopted a landfill in the area of the Natural Park by suggestion of Cascais Municipality. In this landfill we make volunteer actions to eradicate invasive species, plant trees, clean the landfill. We also do in a less regular basis other landfill cleanings and trees or flowers planting invited by social institutions from our municipality or surrounding municipalities.*

**UNESCO World Heritage sites**

**(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*Biodiversity is not considered a material topic for Synthomer at group level. Biodiversity is typically a local issue. We started by identifying our sites within less than 10 km from environmental protected areas (EPA) as defined by local authorities. From these, the sites which already have actions regarding Nature protection have been spotted.*

**UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves**

**(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*Biodiversity is not considered a material topic for Synthomer at group level. Biodiversity is typically a local issue. We started by identifying our sites within less than 10 km from environmental protected areas (EPA) as defined by local authorities. From these, the sites which already have actions regarding Nature protection have been spotted.*

**Ramsar sites**

**(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*Biodiversity is not considered a material topic for Synthomer at group level. Biodiversity is typically a local issue. We started by identifying our sites within less than 10 km from environmental protected areas (EPA) as defined by local authorities. From these, the sites which already have actions regarding Nature protection have been spotted.*

**Key Biodiversity Areas**

**(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*Biodiversity is not considered a material topic for Synthomer at group level. Biodiversity is typically a local issue. We started by identifying our sites within less than 10 km from environmental protected areas (EPA) as defined by local authorities. From these, the sites which already have actions regarding Nature protection have been spotted.*

**Other areas important for biodiversity**

**(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(11.4.2) Comment**

*Biodiversity is not considered a material topic for Synthomer at group level. Biodiversity is typically a local issue. We started by identifying our sites within less than 10 km from environmental protected areas (EPA) as defined by local authorities. From these, the sites which already have actions regarding Nature protection have been spotted.*

*[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:*

☑ Portugal

**(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity**

*Sintra-Cascais Natural Park PTCON0008*

**(11.4.1.6) Proximity**

*Select from:*

☑ Up to 10 km

**(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area**

*Adopted a landfill in the area of the Natural Park by suggestion of Cascais Municipality. In this landfill we make volunteer actions to eradicate invasive species, plant trees, clean the landfill. We also do in a less regular basis other landfill cleanings and trees or flowers planting invited by social institutions from our municipality or surrounding municipalities*

**(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity**

*Select from:*

☑ No

**(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented**

*Synthomers' activities located in or near to Sintra-Cascais Natural Park have no negative affects on biodiversity.*

*[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**

*The environmental information in our CDP responses (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is not yet verified or assured by a third party. However, we will need to obtain third-party assurance for those l topics identified as material through the double materiality assessment requirements of the EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) for FY25.*

*[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** |
| --- | --- |
|  | *No additional information at this point* |

*[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 Financial Officer*

**(13.3.2) Corresponding job category**

*Select from:*

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

*[Fixed row]*

## (13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute