Church & Dwight Co., Inc

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

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

.

09/16/2025, 08:12 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Church & Dwight (C&D), founded in 1846, develops, manufactures and markets a broad range of consumer household and personal care products and specialty products focused on animal productivity, chemicals and cleaners. Our consumer products marketing efforts are focused principally on our 14 “power brands.” These well-recognized brand names include ARM & HAMMER baking soda, cat litter, laundry detergent, carpet deodorization and other baking soda based products; TROJAN condoms, lubricants and vibrators; OXICLEAN stain removers, cleaning solutions, laundry detergents and bleach alternatives; SPINBRUSH battery-operated toothbrushes; FIRST RESPONSE home pregnancy and ovulation test kits; NAIR depilatories; ORAJEL oral analgesic; XTRA laundry detergent; L'IL CRITTERS and VITAFUSION gummy dietary supplements for children and adults, respectively; BATISTE™ dry shampoo; WATERPIK water flossers and showerheads; ZICAM cold relief and shortening products; THERABREATH alcohol-free mouthwash; and HERO acne treatments. C&D is a publicly traded company (CHD) listed and traded on the New York Stock Exchange. C&D has operations in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom as well as major offices in Australia, Mexico, China, and France. C&D is reporting its emissions from all global operations in 2024. C&D supports a climate change goal of being carbon neutral by 2025 for our Scope 1, Scope 2, and targeted Scope 3 emissions. In July 2022 C&D science based targets to SBTi were approved and we continue to work towards those goals. More information on our goals and strategy can be found in our 2025 Sustainability Report which was issued in May 2025 and is available on the C&D website at www.churchdwight.com/responsibility. It is noted that this CDP report includes correcting methodology and data entry errors, and the reported GHG emissions in the CSR differ from this report. The values reported herein are correct and verified. See Section 7.9. In 2024 estimated total emissions

are 2,163,922 MT CO2e with Scope 1 Emissions (71,085 MT CO2e) representing 3.3%, Scope 2 [location based] Emissions (62,761 MT CO2e) representing 2.9%, and Scope 3 Emissions (2,030,075 MT CO2e) representing 93.8 %.
[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
	12/31/2024	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

6107100000

(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

US1713401024

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

CHD

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

001211952

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
☑ India
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Panama
☑ Germany
☑ Australia
☑ Singapore
☑ New Zealand

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some facilities

(1.8.2) Comment

Included 12 primary manufacturing operating locations plus our Corporate offices in Ewing, NJ and principal R&D facility in Princeton, NJ. Many of the countries listed where we operate consist of a sales office or similar support operations including Germany, India, Panama and Singapore.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 8 - Folkestone UK

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.661646

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

1.197207

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Personal Care product mnf facility

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 6 - Victorville, CA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.486607

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-117.286789

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Household product mnf facility

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 2 - Harrisonville, MO

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.870521

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-94.364919

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Household product mnf facility

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 1 - York, PA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.935971

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.850081

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Household and Vitamin and Mineral Supplement Mnf facility

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 9 - Colonial Heights, VA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.300275

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-77.38453

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Personal Care and Household mnf facility

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 4 - Green River, WY

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.528576

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-109.466246

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Sodium Bicarbonate and household mnf facility

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 7 - Vancouver, WA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.640316

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-122.606101

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Vitamin/Mineral Supplement mnf facility. Packaging and distribution facility in Ridgefield, WA is affiliated with this Vancouver, WA location.

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 3 - Old Fort, OH

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.240462

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.118106

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Sodium bicarbonate and household mnf facility

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 5 - Lakewood, NJ

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.061226

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.180716

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Personal Care and Household mnf facility

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 10 - Mason City, IA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.142395

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-93.191071

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2 Locations in Mason City. SPD Animal Nutrition mnf facility. Location data is for the controlling office location.

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 11 - Montreal, QC

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.49432

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.66245

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Personal Care mnf facility

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 12 - Oskaloosa, IA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.2973

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-92.61048

(1.8.1.4) Comment

SPD Animal Nutrition mnf facility

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

HQ - Ewing, NJ

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.28713

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.78697

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Corporate HQ

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

R&D Princeton, NJ

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.37025

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.65501

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Primary R&D facility
[Add row]

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

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Trading

(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)

114600

(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

☑ Other, please specify :Eaches of fiberboard packaging units

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

Estimated mass of fiberboard packaging/unit (on an individual sku (sales unit) basis x 2024 unit sales = total mass of fiberboard packaging used in 2024.

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Paper

☑ Primary packaging

☑ Sawn timber, veneer, chips

☑ Secondary packaging

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ 1-5%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

Although we use wood fiber-based paper in all our product cartons and corrugate packages, our focus to date has been on palm oil policies, practices and sustainability targets. In 2024, we achieved 98.6% certified sustainable board against a target of 100%. Compliance standards are in place with paperboard suppliers to ensure that the corrugated and carton board we use in our packaging is derived from 100% recycled board materials or sustainably sourced forests and is handled through the supply chain in a responsible manner. We are planning on conducting a full risk assessment with regard to wood fiber use in our value chain at the appropriate time to determine if we should disclose on its use in the future.

(1.22.19) Please explain

Other than 100% recycled board/sustainably sourced wood target criteria established with our packaging suppliers we do not have specific "no deforestation/no forest conversion" targets or goals because our board sourcing requirements, by default, minimize deforestation and conversion through mandated use of recycled or certified sustainable wood pulp for our packaging.

Palm oil

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

6900

(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

☑ Pounds

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

Divided total pounds/2000 pounds/short ton = Short tons Multiplied Short tons x 0.90718474 MT/Short ton = MT

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil derivatives

(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

Most of our direct palm oil derivative procurement is associated with a single animal nutrition product. Sales of the product line were declining in recent years due to external competition and in 2024 we exited that business line. Future use of palm oil derivatives is expected to be minimal with limited, smaller volume use across several other product lines. Due to the substantial reduction in direct palm derivative use, we are evaluating continuation of our Palm Sustainable Sourcing program.

Soy

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ We do not know if we source embedded soy

(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)

4800

(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

☑ Pounds

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

Divided total pounds/2000 pounds/short ton = Short tons Multiplied Short tons x 0.90718474 MT/Short ton = MT

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy derivatives

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 21-30%

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

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

☑ Small volume

☑ Small procurement spend

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

We use negligible amounts of soy derivatives across many of our product lines, primarily across our liquid laundry as soy derived glycerin. A very small fraction of soy fatty acid is also used in an animal nutrition product line. Our focus to date has been on palm oil policies, practices and sustainability targets. We are planning on conducting a full risk assessment with regard to the use of soy derivatives in our products at an appropriate time to determine if we should disclose on soy in the future.

(1.22.19) Please explain

An extremely small volume of soy fatty acid was used in 2024 (<500 tons) in an animal nutrition product that was also discontinued along with the associated palm oil product mentioned in the palm oil section above. The remaining soy volume reported assumes all glycerin used in our liquid laundry products are soy derived. We are still examining and mapping our supply chain to verify and identify any soy based derivatives. While glycerin may be impactful to our laundry business, it is still a relatively small volume and spend. Because it can be derived from multiple sources, assessing our impact on soy derived commodities has not been an immediate priority. As our primary focus on palm oil declines as we reduce its use, we are planning on conducting a full risk assessment with regard to the use of soy and soy derivatives in our value chain at an appropriate time to determine if we should disclose further on soy in the future.

Rubber

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

550

(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

☑ Pounds

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

Divided total pounds/2000 pounds/short ton = Short tons Multiplied Short tons x 0.90718474 MT/Short ton = MT

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Latex

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

☑ Small procurement spend

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

While we use latex in our condom business, our focus to date has been on palm oil policies, practices and sustainability targets. In addition, as we have built resiliency into our supply chain our direct purchases of latex have declined. Latex represents approximately 0.05% of our global procurement spend. We are planning on conducting a full risk assessment with regard to latex in our value chain at the appropriate time to determine if we should disclose on its use in the future.

(1.22.19) Please explain

Our direct procurement of latex has decreased as we have outsourced condom production to contract manufacturers as part of business continuity programs. As our primary focus on palm oil declines as we reduce its use, we are planning on conducting a full risk assessment with regard to the use of latex in our value chain at an appropriate time to determine if we should disclose further on latex in the future.
[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Unknown whether smallholders are relevant, so not included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

All Tier 1 suppliers are mapped with respect to supplier locations and material provided. Select materials may be mapped to higher Tier 2 or 3 depending upon the material and significance (e.g. Palm oil). Our high risk supplier determinations are based on geography where certain geographies are assigned higher or lower risk that trigger direct assessments through SEDEX. Our supply chain resiliency also includes a geographic mapping component to understand and assess potential risks within the supply chain. We know and understand our customer operations and locations. As primarily a consumer product company we examine the end of life aspects of our consumer products and packaging. Our Specialty Products Division includes technical support and interactions with commercial/industrial customers to advise on sodium bicarbonate uses and processing, including if the use/processing will evolve CO2 emissions. Technical product & packaging aspects are primarily managed by R&D/Product Stewardship functions while Procurement and Logistics manage the detailed geographic components.
[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:

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

(1.24.1.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End-of-life management

(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

Select all that apply

☑ Recycling

☑ Landfill

[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

[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)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

Corporate vision is on a 5-year plan. The 2025 vision includes short-term action on sustainability and climate change issues. Near-term goals and objectives under the vision should be executed within 3 years. The developing 2030 vision, to be released in 2026, will transition across both the short-term and medium-term horizons. Our site level sustainability planning efforts focus on the three year project pipeline for site level projects and initiatives.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

4

(2.1.3) To (years)

7

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

Action plans that focus on meeting our science-based target commitments include activities and milestones in the 2025-2030 timeframe. The developing 2030 corporate vision to be released in 2026 includes sustainability and climate change issues and will transition across both the short-term and medium-term horizons. Our strategic planning efforts typically span a 5 to 10 plus year timeframe. Sustainability initiatives included would straddle the medium-term to long-term horizons.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

8

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

20

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

Our long-term business planning extends to a time horizon 20 years in the future.
[Fixed row]

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ Other commercially/publicly available tools, please specify :SEDEX; WRI

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods
☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Drought
☑ Wildfires
☑ Heat waves
☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical
☑ Water stress
☑ Sea level rise
☑ Change in land-use
☑ Temperature variability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits

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

Reputation
☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We recently completed a scenario analysis facilitated by an outside consultant. The analysis included physical risk scenario analysis and transition risk & opportunity scenario analysis. The analysis included both low warming and high warming scenarios using industry-accepted methodologies across different time horizons (SSP1-2.6 and SSP3-7.0 for physical risks and IEA STEPS (business-as-usual) and IEA Net Zero Emissions (NZE) for transition risks). Risks and opportunities identified in the analysis aligned well with those previously identified in our internal process. We plan to refresh the scenario analysis every 2 years moving forward. Our internal process is designed to identify and rank the most significant risks that affect our Company and provide updates on status of execution for climate-related risks and sustainability-related concerns by considering the risks specific to Church & Dwight or associated with companies in the consumer products industry. On an asset level, facility managers are responsible for understanding and addressing site-specific risks such as extreme weather event frequency and for ensuring that plans and procedures are in place to mitigate such risks through a documented business continuity plan. Facilities can access corporate-level assistance and resources for support as needed. Facility-specific risks such as extreme weather impacts and water availability in the medium term are taken into account in the process of

identifying and planning capital investments. Defining our material issues is an ongoing process influenced by the standards and guidelines of GRI, SASB, TCFD and by our stakeholders and developing regulatory requirements. The Corporate Issues Council ranks risks and opportunities, to show relative impact and likelihood. Appropriate company functions are assigned responsibility for significant sustainability issues, risks and opportunities. We regularly receive input from customers, consumers, employees, shareholders and investor groups, government agencies, non-governmental agencies and trade associations. Stakeholder issues are included on the agenda for each Corporate Issues Council meeting, and sustainability issues raised by investors and other stakeholders are reviewed with the Board's Governance, Nominating & Corporate Responsibility Committee at each of its quarterly meetings. The Corporate Issues Council and the Governance, Nominating & Corporate Responsibility Committee may consider risks that occur in the short-term, medium-term and/or long-term time horizons since the company's goals and targets address these risks and extend across multiple timeframes. Our Internal Audit Director meets quarterly with our executive officers to assess any changes in the magnitude of identified risks, as well as the status of mitigation activities for the most significant risks. Mitigation activities may be assigned to the CIC or individual departments. The Internal Audit Director reports directly to the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(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
☑ SEDEX
☑ WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management
☑ Internal company methods

Other
☑ External consultants
☑ Internal company methods
☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Source Water Vulnerability Assessment
☑ Other, please specify :We specifically focus on sites that are most water dependent

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Drought
☑ Tornado
☑ Wildfires
☑ Heat waves
☑ Toxic spills
☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical
☑ Water stress
☑ Sea level rise
☑ Groundwater depletion
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Declining water quality
☑ Rationing of municipal water supply
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability

Policy

☑ Increased pricing of water
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation
☑ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards
☑ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

Market

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

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)
☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

Technology

☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products
☑ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources
☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities
☑ Water utilities at a local level
☑ Other water users at the basin/catchment level

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We recently completed a scenario analysis with an outside consultant, covering physical and transition risks using industry-accepted methodologies. This included low and high warming scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP3-7.0 for physical risks; IEA STEPS and IEA NZE for transition risks). We identified water-related risks and opportunities as part of this analysis. We annually review our WRI Aqueduct location rankings for our Sustainability Report to understand water risks at our sites. The assessments focus on capacity, availability, and quality of water and wastewater resources including understanding of other significant water users supplied by our water source/purveyor or dischargers to the POTW who service our wastewaters and/or who discharge to our same receiving waters. Outcomes from the assessments are used to prioritize location risk and drive water management initiatives that often include consideration of new technologies to reclaim or otherwise improve our water management practices and efficiencies. Our Environmental & Safety Operations (ESO) Department coordinates with local management on emerging water issues, escalating significant ones to Operations management or the Corporate Issues Council (CIC) for resource allocation. We engage third-party consultants to update water resource reports for new and high-risk locations, considering a 5-year horizon. These assessments focus on water capacity, availability, and quality, including other significant users of our water source. Outcomes are used to prioritize risks and drive water management initiatives, often incorporating new technologies for efficiency. The ESO Department, alongside site management, handles water regulatory and compliance aspects. Our Office of Corporate Stewardship engages stakeholders, including NGOs and customers, on sustainability issues, championing products with improved water profiles. Stakeholder interactions inform our water management practices and reporting. Significant issues are escalated to the CIC and the Board Governance, Nominating, and Corporate Responsibility Committee for resource allocation. These bodies consider risks across short, medium, and long-term horizons in line with company goals. Water-related risks and opportunities are part of our climate resilience strategy, enhancing our capacity to adapt to impacts. Our Internal Audit process identifies and ranks significant risks, including sustainability, economic, and operational risks. The Internal Audit department annually creates a project plan to mitigate business and financial risks, subject to Audit Committee approval. The Internal Audit Director meets quarterly with executives to assess risk changes and mitigation status, reporting directly to the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(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

(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

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Corporate Issues Council and sustainability contract language in select supplier contracts

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Other market, please specify :quality of forest risk commodities

Reputation

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Other commodity users/producers at a local level

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The Company has a company-wide risk assessment process, which is overseen by the Board. Under this global risk mapping system, deforestation risk has not been identified by management and the Board as being a significant risk of the Company. However, sustainable sourcing of Palm Oil, specifically direct palm oil derivatives used in our animal nutrition business, has been identified as a risk to that specific part of the business. Our Board, acting principally through the Audit Committee, is actively involved in the oversight of the significant risks affecting our business. Our Internal Audit Group facilitates a vigorous risk assessment effort every other year, in collaboration with all of our directors and executives and annually in collaboration with all of our executives. This process is designed to identify and rank the most

significant risks that affect our Company. Internal Audit meets quarterly with our executive officers to assess any changes in the status and magnitude of identified risks, as well as the status of any mitigation activities with regard to the most significant risks. Our Internal Audit Director reports directly to the Audit Committee, who reports to the Board quarterly and, advises the Audit Committee on a quarterly basis regarding management's risk assessment process and the progress of any mitigation activities. Our Board through our Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee overseas our sustainability program. Internal company methods was selected because (i) the Company holds its primary supplier accountable through contract language and quarterly reviews; that supplier is expected to adhere to the Company's Global Operating Guiding Principles which encompasses our Palm Oil Sustainability Sourcing Commitment, as well as practices and objectives set forth on the supplier's website and (ii) the Company's risks are continually being reviewed and evaluated by the Company's Corporate Issues Council ("CIC").The CIC and Internal Audit Group review the availability of data on commodities risk such as quantity of forest risk commodities, impact on ecosystems and habitats, regulations, climate change, tariff or price increases, loss of markets and impact on water security. They also consider stakeholder issues associated with customers, employees, investors, local communities, NGOs, regulators, suppliers and other users and producers at the local level in identifying, assessing and analyzing forest related risk to the Company. In 2024 we exited the portion of our animal nutrition business reliant upon palm derivatives and greatly reduced our purchase of these materials. We are in the process of evaluating our sustainable palm oil sourcing program going forward.

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Every two years

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Sub-national

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Other, please specify :Encore Nature Impacts/Dependency Tool

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We recently completed a specific impact and dependency review so the "process" is new. We used the Encore (encorenature.org) online tool to assess natural capital opportunities, risks and exposure. We ran the assessment tool for the manufacture of chemicals and chemical products which we believe best fits our business. The profile identified both impacts and dependencies associated with our industry. We reviewed the materiality rankings for the various ecosystem services and exerted pressures. For the most significant (either ranked high, very high, medium or otherwise considered a primary issue) we used the tool to do a deeper dive on the relative rankings for our 3 largest locations (highest GHG emissions and highest water withdrawal). This included assessing each significant ecosystem component (ranked as high importance for our identified significant ecosystem services) and the associated mechanisms of change using Encore's mapping tools.

Row 5

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Every two years

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Sub-national

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Other, please specify :Encore Nature Impact Dependency Tool

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We recently completed a specific impact and dependency review so the "process" is new. We used the Encore (encorenature.org) online tool to assess natural capital opportunities, risks and exposure. We ran the assessment tool for the manufacture of chemicals and chemical products which we believe best fits our business. The profile identified both impacts and dependencies associated with our industry. We reviewed the materiality rankings for the various ecosystem services and exerted pressures. For the most significant (either ranked high, very high, medium or otherwise considered a primary issue) we used the tool to do a deeper dive on the relative rankings for our 3 largest locations (highest GHG emissions and highest water withdrawal). This included assessing each significant ecosystem component (ranked as high importance for our identified significant ecosystem services) and the associated mechanisms of change using Encore's mapping tools.

Row 6

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Every two years

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Sub-national

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Other, please specify :Encore Nature Impact Dependency Tool

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We recently completed a specific impact and dependency review so the "process" is new. We used the Encore (encorenature.org) online tool to assess natural capital opportunities, risks and exposure. We ran the assessment tool for the manufacture of chemicals and chemical products which we believe best fits our business. The profile identified both impacts and dependencies associated with our industry. We reviewed the materiality rankings for the various ecosystem services and exerted pressures. For the most significant (either ranked high, very high, medium or otherwise considered a primary issue) we used the tool to do a deeper dive on the relative rankings for our 3 largest locations (highest GHG emissions and highest water withdrawal). This included assessing each significant ecosystem component (ranked as high importance for our identified significant ecosystem services) and the associated mechanisms of change using Encore's mapping tools.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

Interconnections between dependencies and impacts and risks and opportunities are assessed during our risk management processes, primarily within our Corporate Issues Council. Upon completing our recent dependency and impact assessment we were able to align that understanding with our risks and opportunities. As part of this process, the Council ranks various risks and opportunities to show relative impact and likelihood. Discussing emerging risks/opportunities and current risks/opportunities allows the company to understand relevant issues and mitigate existing concerns while preparing appropriate risk mitigation actions for longer-term

issues. Incorporating dependencies/impacts helped verify most of our sustainability actions around managing our risks and opportunities align with those dependencies and impacts; however, some gaps were identified which can now be raised within the Council for future action or more in-depth evaluation. [Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

☑ Areas of rapid decline in ecosystem integrity

☑ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

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

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

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Climate: We prioritize our operating sites based on relative energy use and Scope 1 & 2 CO2e emissions. We prioritize key supplier Scope 3 engagement based on spend and relative CO2 contribution to our total Scope 3 emissions. Palm oil: A large proportion of deforestation in the oil palm landscape occurs outside oil palm concessions. The Production and Protection Beyond Concessions action group (PPBC) defines a proactive approach to address forest loss through interventions,

targeted monitoring and livelihood enhancement. Efforts focus on where action is needed through geospatial analysis, stakeholder engagement and initiative mapping to develop and implement action and monitoring protocols for oil palm priority areas, mainly in Indonesia and Malaysia. Our primary supplier participates in PPBC, uses satellite monitoring system and other industry tracking tools to proactively monitor its own concession and conservation areas, and of its suppliers. This collaboration with our primary supplier allows us to identify and prioritize at risk locations. Due to business changes, we have exited the business in 2024 that was the primary user of palm oil derivatives. Water: We assess and rank sites on World Resources Institute (WRI) Water risk ranking. These ratings are reviewed annually for water and wastewater risk evaluations. The WRI water risk evaluation identifies areas with higher exposure to water-related risks, and is an aggregated measure of all selected indicators from the physical quantity, quality and regulatory & reputational risk categories. Our 2025 update of the overall baseline water risk associated with our operating locations used the most recent version of the Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas, Global Maps Data found on the WRI website (https://www.wri.org/aqueduct). This most recent review found that the overall baseline water-stress risk classification improved from medium-high risk to low-medium risk at one location and remained at the same classification for our other locations. Two of our North American locations are considered high overall baseline water risk while 3 other locations are considered medium to high overall baseline water risk. These are our water priority locations along with our largest water use locations.

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

When identifying or assessing climate-related risks, we define substantive financial or strategic impacts to be those that are somewhat likely to occur (more than about a 15% chance) within our global operations, with a magnitude that would impact on the order of 1% of our sales or greater, or approximately $60 million; or the effect on revenue is $10-$60 million and the probability of occurrence is high (>75%).

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:
☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply
☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

When identifying or assessing climate-related opportunities, we define substantive financial or strategic impacts to be those that are somewhat likely to occur (more than about a 15% chance) within our global operations, with a magnitude that would impact on the order of 1% of our sales or greater, or approximately $60 million; or the effect on revenue is $10-$60 million and the probability of occurrence is high (>75%).
[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

Day to day operational water impacts are identified and managed at the site level, with corporate assistance and direction from our Environmental & Safety Department, taking into consideration plant specific regulatory, operational, and local needs. Significant issues and policy level decisions are raised to the Corporate Issues Council. Our industrial operations often require both industrial process wastewater discharge permits or stormwater discharge permits. Through these regulatory programs and our understanding of our operations and resulting wastewaters, we identified, classified, and control potential water pollutants and developed

appropriate regulatory compliance and management programs on a per site basis. Operations have a strong understanding of their specific chemicals stored, used, and related wastewater risks. As a good corporate neighbor, water stewardship management practices dictate we control the chemical and physical characteristics of our wastewater and stormwater discharges, regardless of regulatory drivers, to preserve the integrity of the water bodies surrounding where we operate. In addition to our water management/regulatory programs, all locations maintain spill management programs that prevent uncontrolled discharges from reaching surface or groundwaters. Change management practices include an evaluation of impact of process/site modifications on wastewater or stormwater discharges and associated permits and management programs. Some of our operations are classified as categorical pretreatment sources under the US Clean Water Act and have either zero industrial discharge or specific limits that must be met. Management programs and treatment practices are in place to address these requirements. Sampling and analysis of our discharge is required by these permits. While some of our raw materials and products may be considered hazardous materials or substances, few are required to be directly monitored in our wastewater. Based on operation, monitoring of wastewaters include pH, oil & grease, biological or chemical oxygen demand, total or dissolved solids, or site specific parameters like metals, surfactants, and others. In addition to these management practices we have programs to assess technologies to reclaim/reuse wastewaters and employ research efforts in product design to eliminate compounds of concern in our consumer products. These efforts help minimize potential water pollutant impacts.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:
☑ Other physical pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

pH and solids in a wastewater discharge can impact water quality and affect aquatic life in the receiving water. Our operations often include acids and bases that can impact discharge pH and total or dissolved solids which can affect water quality. If these materials are not properly stored, handled, and processed, potential exists for upsets including spills to our wastewater or stormwater. Maintenance of associated material handling and emergency equipment is a key component. In addition to these management practices, we have programs to assess potential technologies to reclaim/reuse wastewaters and employ research efforts in product design to eliminate compounds of concern in our consumer products. These efforts help minimize potential water pollutant impacts from both our operations and in the product use phase.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Water recycling

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Greater than 99% of our wastewater is discharged to local municipal wastewater treatment plants, transported off-site for appropriate disposal, used for irrigation, or treated on-site prior to discharge. Ten of our manufacturing plants (56%) operate WW treatment systems with monitoring representing 71% of our process and cooling wastewater. The remaining wastewater discharges are from non-industrial sources, are not considered significant industrial discharges by local regulation, or are transported off-site for appropriate disposal. Plants routinely operate their wastewater systems in accordance with regulatory permit requirements to meet established limits and monitor for pH, total dissolved solids and/or total suspended solids to ensure our discharge is not disruptive of either the POTW operations or receiving waters. Established chemical receiving, storage, handling, housekeeping, and spill procedures are employed to prevent accidental chemical discharge to the site stormwater or nearby water bodies. Our Operating Principles require all suppliers to remain in compliance with all applicable regulatory regulations, including those related to water and wastewater. Products include consumer use instructions to avoid over dosing detergents or similar misuse.

Row 2

(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

Biological oxygen demanding and chemical oxygen demanding pollutants may include organic or inorganic chemicals that provide food or sustenance for microbes or chemical processes which will consume oxygen in the aquatic environment. Depleted available oxygen in the aquatic environment can kill fish and aquatic organisms if sufficiently severe. Significant oxygen depleting material discharges in our waste water could also have potential to disrupt biological treatment processes at third party treatment facilities, inhibiting their ability to treat our wastewater. Organic materials and chemistry at certain plants may result in elevated oxygen depleting discharges, if not properly managed. If these materials are not properly stored, handled, and processed, potential exists for upsets including spills to our wastewater or stormwater. Maintenance of associated material handling and emergency equipment is a key component. In addition to these management practices, we have programs to assess potential technologies to reclaim/reuse wastewaters and employ research efforts in product design to eliminate compounds of concern in our consumer products. These efforts help minimize potential water pollutant impacts from both our operations and in the product use phase.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Water recycling

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Greater than 99% of our wastewater is discharged to local municipal wastewater treatment plants, transported off-site for appropriate disposal, used for irrigation, or treated on-site prior to discharge. Ten of our manufacturing plants (56%) operate WW treatment systems with monitoring representing 71% of our process and cooling wastewater. The remaining wastewater discharges are from non-industrial sources, are not considered significant industrial discharges by local regulation, or are transported off-site for appropriate disposal. Plants routinely operate their wastewater systems in accordance with regulatory permit requirements to minimize oxygen depleting discharges and monitor BOD or COD to ensure our discharge is not disruptive of either the POTW operations or receiving waters. Established chemical receiving, storage, handling, housekeeping, and spill procedures are employed to prevent accidental chemical discharge to the site stormwater or nearby

water bodies. Our Operating Principles require all suppliers to remain in compliance with all applicable regulatory regulations, including those related to water and wastewater. Products include consumer use instructions to avoid over dosing detergents or similar misuse.

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Oil

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Most of our site operations store or use oil, or oil-like substances. Oil spills are detrimental to surface water body health and aquatic life. A large portion of our oil storage and use is as fuel and for maintenance, but many of our products either contain an oil (e.g. mineral oil) or materials we classify as oil (e.g. fragrances or synthetic/silicone lubricants). If these materials are not properly stored, handled, and processed, potential exists for upsets including spills to our wastewater or stormwater. Maintenance of associated material handling and emergency equipment is a key component. In addition to these management practices, we have programs to assess potential technologies to reclaim/reuse wastewaters and employ research efforts in product design to eliminate compounds of concern in our consumer products. These efforts help minimize potential water pollutant impacts from both our operations and in the product use phase.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Resource recovery

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Greater than 99% of our wastewater is discharged to local municipal wastewater treatment plants, transported off-site for appropriate disposal, used for irrigation, or treated on-site prior to discharge. Plants routinely operate their wastewater systems in accordance with regulatory/permit requirements to minimize oily discharges so our discharge is not disruptive of either the POTW operations or receiving waters. Established chemical receiving, storage, handling, housekeeping, and spill procedures are employed to prevent accidental chemical discharge to site stormwater or nearby water bodies. Our owned and controlled sites monitor operations to assess the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants and maintain compliance with the Company SOPs and local regulatory requirements for spill prevention. Sites maintain SPCC Plans which help facilities define control of oil handling and storage, and prevent oil spills and control a spill should one occur. Success of these procedures is determined by the frequency of spills and efficacy of our clean up efforts. Our stormwater and industrial discharges are subject to oil and grease monitoring to minimize discharge of oily materials. Our Operating Principles require all suppliers to remain in compliance with all applicable regulatory regulations, including those related to water and wastewater. Products include consumer use instructions to avoid over dosing detergents or similar misuse.

Row 4

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Nitrates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Some of our site have nitrate compounds or must monitor for nitrate compounds based on their industry category. Nitrates, if not controlled contribute to eutrophication due to excess nutrients in the receiving water body. If these materials are not properly stored, handled, and processed, potential exists for upsets including spills to our wastewater or stormwater. Maintenance of associated material handling and emergency equipment is a key component. In addition to these management practices, we have programs to assess potential technologies to reclaim/reuse wastewaters and employ research efforts in product design to eliminate compounds of concern in our consumer products. These efforts help minimize potential water pollutant impacts from both our operations and in the product use phase.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Water recycling

☑ Resource recovery

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Greater than 99% of our wastewater is discharged to local municipal wastewater treatment plants, transported off-site for appropriate disposal, used for irrigation, or treated on-site prior to discharge. On a site specific basis, plants routinely operate their wastewater systems in accordance with regulatory permit requirements to minimize phosphate discharges to ensure our discharge is not disruptive of either the POTW operations or receiving waters. Established chemical receiving, storage, handling, housekeeping, and spill procedures are employed to prevent accidental chemical discharge to the site stormwater or nearby water bodies. All our owned and controlled sites are required to monitor operations to assess the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants and maintain compliance with the Standard Operating Procedures and local regulatory requirements for spill prevention. Success of these procedures is determined by the frequency of spills and efficacy of our cleanup efforts. Certain of our stormwater and industrial discharges are subject to nitrate/nitrite monitoring to ensure minimization of nitrates in our wastewater. Our Operating Principles require all suppliers to remain in compliance with all applicable regulatory regulations, including those related to water and wastewater. Products include consumer use instructions to avoid over dosing detergents or similar misuse.

Row 5

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Phosphates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Some of our site have phosphate compounds or must monitor for phosphate compounds based on their industry category. Phosphates, if not controlled contribute to eutrophication due to excess nutrients in the receiving water body. If these materials are not properly stored, handled, and processed, potential exists for upsets including spills to our wastewater or stormwater. Maintenance of associated material handling and emergency equipment is a key component. In addition to these

management practices, we have programs to assess potential technologies to reclaim/reuse wastewaters and employ research efforts in product design to eliminate compounds of concern in our consumer products. These efforts help minimize potential water pollutant impacts from both our operations and in the product use phase. Church & Dwight detergents have been phosphate free since the 1970s.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Resource recovery

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Greater than 99% of our wastewater is discharged to local municipal wastewater treatment plants, transported off-site for appropriate disposal, used for irrigation, or treated on-site prior to discharge. On a site specific basis, our plants routinely operate their wastewater systems in accordance with regulatory permit requirements to minimize phosphate discharges to ensure our discharge is not disruptive of either the POTW operations or receiving waters. Established chemical receiving, storage, handling, housekeeping, and spill procedures are employed to prevent accidental chemical discharge to the site stormwater or nearby water bodies. All our owned and controlled sites are required to monitor operations to assess the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants and maintain compliance with the Company's Standard Operating Procedures and/or local regulatory requirements for spill prevention. Success of these procedures is determined by the frequency of spills and efficacy of our clean up efforts. Certain of our stormwater and industrial discharges are subject to phosphate monitoring to ensure minimization of phosphate in our wastewater. Our Operating Principles require all suppliers to remain in compliance with all applicable regulatory regulations, including those related to water and wastewater. Products include consumer use instructions to avoid over dosing detergents or similar misuse.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Panama
☑ Germany
☑ Australia
☑ Singapore
☑ New Zealand

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

As climate change, land use, water use, deforestation, recyclability or recoverability of packaging, ingredients and other sustainability concerns become more prevalent, federal, state and local governments, non-governmental organizations and our customers, consumers and investors are increasingly sensitive to these issues. This increased focus on sustainability may result in new laws, regulations and requirements that could negatively affect us. This could cause us to incur additional costs or to make changes to our operations to comply with these requirements. We could also lose revenue if our consumers change brands or our customers move business from us because we have not complied with their sustainability requirements. As part of our business strategy, C&D engages with major retailers who are our direct customers, to understand and align with their climate-related requirements. In the future, if we are unable to continue meeting these requirements, there is a risk of losing some of our customer base. Again in 2024, additional customers have made climate related information requests. In total, customers that are engaging with us on climate-related topics represent approximately 33% of our global sales. Selected countries are those where we indicate we have operations, but in fact this risk is present in any country in which we have sales.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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 could lose revenue if our consumers change brands, major retailers delist our products or our retail customers move business from us because we have not effectively responded to regulatory requirements, complied with their ESG requirements or met their expectations related to our sustainability efforts, including with respect to DEI, climate change, plastic usage, or ingredients. In addition, our actual or perceived failure to achieve or make sufficient progress towards our stated ESG goals or comply with ESG related regulations could result in litigation, regulatory scrutiny, or adverse publicity, which could damage our reputation, reduce consumer demand, and devalue our brand equity. Further, ESG-conscious investors may choose not to invest in our securities if we do not comply with their expectations, and investment managers may not include our securities in ESG-designated funds

(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)

2100000000

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

2400000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This range represents loss of the approximate sales to our largest customers in 2024 who have made information requests and are actively engaging with us to promote climate change issues and management. We have estimated the sales at risk if we were to lose access to these retail outlets. Other reputational losses also exist but were not quantified.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

40000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

C&D engages on a continuous basis with our key customers and maintains dialogue on climate-related issues with a wide range of stakeholders. This order of magnitude cost estimate for management of risk includes 2024 cost of maintaining our sustainability programs including purchase of carbon offsets and RECs; labor and expense for management of programs for gathering data, tracking key metrics, reporting, engagement with relevant stakeholders; R&D investment in products offering climate/environmental benefits; capital investments associated with new products and maintaining or improving our sustainability/climate change position and direct costs associated with preparation of our Corporate Sustainability Report, CDP reporting and similar ESG reporting efforts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The timescale of implementation is annual for developing our sustainability reporting, because we produce these updates every year for our stakeholders. For longer-term actions, such as R&D investments in products that offer environmental benefits, including reduced packaging or increased recyclability, these actions may require a timescale of implementation that extends to multiple years to ensure we maintain quality of our products while researching potential opportunities for improvement. R&D timescale for implementation and product launch may be 3-7 years. While capital spending typically is considered to be within the short to medium time horizon, capital planning, especially for decarbonization projects, extends into the long- term horizon. 2024 cost of response to risk was down due to a less

investment due the fewer of projects implemented in 2024 compared to 2023. 2024 efforts included R&D packaging improvements, multiple water management projects, increased cost per REC/carbon credits, GHG feasibility and engineering studies in support of our SBT targets, and related management costs.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Not applicable

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Indonesia

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

If nature based raw materials, including palm oil derivatives, timber (wood fiber for packaging), soy derivatives, latex and select other raw materials were not readily available and we were required to pay higher unit costs or transition to synthetic or alternate materials it would have an impact on our cost of raw materials or in the worst case scenario result in inability to manufacture some products. In the case of corrugate/wood fiber packaging, this already represents >5% of our total procurement spend in 2024. Increased costs for certified sustainable wood fiber could increase the cost of maintaining our 100% recycled or sustainable wood fiber board packaging commitment.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

If nature based raw materials, including palm oil derivatives, timber (wood fiber for packaging), soy derivatives, latex and select other raw materials were not readily available and we were required to pay higher unit costs or transition to synthetic or alternate materials it would have an impact on our cost of raw materials or in the worst case scenario result in inability to manufacture some products. In the case of corrugate/wood fiber packaging, this already represents >5% of our total procurement spend in 2024. Increased costs for certified sustainable wood fiber could increase the cost of maintaining our 100% recycled or sustainable wood fiber board packaging commitment.

(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 suppliers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Order of magnitude cost estimate associated with indirect spend to implement our RSPO palm oil initiatives and Responsible Sourcing program. It does not include internal labor or raw material/commodity price impacts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

By maintaining our expectation for responsibly sources raw material, especially for nature-based commodities it helps maintain demand for certified and responsibly sources materials and supports continued and expanded sustainable production of these materials.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(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

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Mississippi River

☑ Susquehanna River

☑ Other, please specify :Mojave

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water is a critical raw material and component in many of our products including liquid laundry detergent. Risks of increased water scarcity in some parts of the world, or worsening seasonal droughts, may increase our operating and capital costs by making it more difficult to procure reliable, high-quality water supplies. Capital expenditures to maintain operational access to high quality water is considered the larger of these two likely impacts. For example, in 2023 we were required to better defend our water use renewal request with the local authority for our York, PA laundry detergent plant. This was a renewal with the authority that did not include a volume increase for the daily flows to support our current and anticipated future facility production. The renewal challenge signals the increasing water demand in the region and increased pressure to minimize our water consumption. Our risk described here is a long term risk assuming we would be forced to relocate one of our three main laundry plants due to unavailability of adequate water supply.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased capital expenditures

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

If we were unable to continue operation of one of our laundry detergent plants due to the lack of adequate water resources we would anticipate incurring increasing operational costs related to either increasing water management costs and/or incremental costs to shift production in the short term. But over the medium to long term time horizon we would likely incur substantial incremental capital cost to relocate the plant to a location with adequate water resources. Depending upon the timing of such a relocation there are also potential impacts to production capability, product output/sales, raw material and product transportation costs that could impact financial performance and cash flow. For purposes of this estimate we are assuming a planned transition that would minimize these other impacts, but includes impact on long term capital planning to replace one manufacturing plant.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

230000000

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

290000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Order-of-magnitude estimate for range of capital expenditure required to relocate one water-intensive operation. These are hypothetical estimates and do not correspond to any specific Church & Dwight facilities. At this time, Church & Dwight has not identified any facility-specific risks of water shortage in the medium-term planning horizon (4-7 years) so the given horizon for this risk is in the long-term planning horizon (8-20 years). This cost does not include any potential production or sales impacts that may be incurred when closing a facility and opening another.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

19000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Order of magnitude cost estimate based on actual 2024 capital spend on all water related projects and apportioned estimate of management labor (R&D and Operations) directed towards water reduction product development and improved water use efficiency.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Water projects include eliminating single pass-through cooling uses, optimizing water reclaim/recycling systems and improving efficiency monitoring in our water handling and treatment equipment, especially at our most water-intensive plants. Church & Dwight periodically updates third-party reviews of water availability and water risks at key locations. We track water use metrics on an ongoing basis and pursue water use minimization programs and targets, and we monitor chronic conditions, such as sea level rise, temperature increases, water quality and availability, as we have locations near oceans. We have an established corporate water goal of 10% reduction of normalized water intake (water intake/product shipped). We did not achieve this goal in 2024 as water intake normalized per million pounds of product shipped was about a 2% increase. To further support water efforts, we established an additional goal to evaluate reductions in our water footprint in high water-stressed regions. In the most recent WRI risk rating 5 locations were ranked high or medium to high WRI overall risk, including one laundry detergent plant. We are assessing specific actions to mitigate water risk at these locations including application of successful water conservation projects and practices implemented at other locations such as wastewater reclaim for non-process uses. We also installed a new processing technology at the affected laundry detergent plant that may potentially improve water efficiency/reduce water waste. We are currently studying the impact on our 2025 water use.

Plastics

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of recycled or renewable content

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We are have established targets and goals for use of recycled plastics in our packaging to both increase use of recycled material and increase the recyclability of our packaging. We do not source plastic resin directly and our ability to hit our targets is dependent upon our suppliers having access to suitable virgin and recycled plastic resin streams to meet our packaging specification and associated goals and targets. Our cost per packaging unit may increase if recycled plastic materials are not readily available or experience increase in cost to satisfy our requirements.

(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

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Increase recycled resin costs could impact our unit cost per plastic packaging assuming our packaging suppliers pass the increase to us. While many of our contracts are fixed cost, most do not extend into our defined medium or long term time horizons. End of contract term renewals could result in increased unit costs. Because recycled plastic resin costs can be highly variable it may result in overall higher cost to the company to cover this uncertainty by our supplier in order to meet our packaging specification.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with suppliers

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We regularly engage with our main packaging suppliers to communicate and track against our goals and targets. This includes upfront discussion regarding our goals around recycled plastic content and readily recyclable plastic content. Our R&D packaging group has established an innovations program to work with our packaging suppliers to find opportunities to collaborate on packaging reduction and sustainability as well as better understand the suppliers issues, challenges, and ability to meet our packaging specifications and reductions.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We obtain some of our raw materials and intermediate products from suppliers in Asia, South America, the EU and North America. Severe weather has impacted the supply chain in previous years. As a rough estimate, approximately 15% of our supply operations are considered especially vulnerable to increased risks due to extreme weather events. An example would be the potential for severe storms to interrupt port operations in New Orleans, Louisiana, or other major US ports where our materials, intermediates, and products are handled. Revisions to our raw material supply and transportation strategy as well as relevant business continuity planning strengthened the resiliency within our supply chain by qualifying additional secondary suppliers for our key raw materials, and/or sourced from more diverse geographies less likely to be impacted by a single severe weather event. We also coordinated with key suppliers to establish a reserve inventory located in the central US for critical raw materials that would be available should primary supply be disrupted. Fortunately we had minimal disruptions from the 20 named storms in the 2023 Atlantic hurricane season. In addition to these hurricane supply chain risks severe weather in other areas in which we or our suppliers operate (snow, freeze, heavy rain/flood) may disrupt chemical production and the supply of domestic raw materials to our operations.

(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:

☑ Very likely

(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

Some of our coastal facilities may be subject to business interruption due to climate-related risk of storm damage or flooding. In addition, our supply chain relies upon the availability of shipping facilities to bring raw materials and intermediate goods into the U.S. In recent years, hurricanes and tropical storms have affected port operations and severe weather/flooding in the central U.S. has disrupted rail service and chemical production, posing potential business risks in the form of interruption to our raw material availability and transportation of products. This may impact our ability to produce product and/or deliver product to our customers.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

270000000

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

450000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Order-of-magnitude estimate based on total value of goods supplied in 2024, multiplied by 15% estimate of major supply chain elements deemed to be at risk. Range is expanded to accommodate multiple events and smaller volume materials. We assumed only limited impact on sales at risk as this physical impact would likely be localized and temporary in nature.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Increase supplier diversification

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

2500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

We consider a short-term timescale of implementation, because we aim to continually update our contingency plans and enable our teams to mitigate issues as they arise, so the business can maintain resilience and continue to serve our customers. Our contingency plans are scalable to accommodate a broad range of disruption types and durations. Fortunately, material disruptions in 2024 related to weather incidents, were minor, in part due to our ongoing contingency and resiliency planning. The response cost is an order-of-magnitude estimate of the cost for operations staff involved in tracking and managing supply chain disruptions, at the corporate and asset level. It includes actions such as monitoring and updating contingency plans, incremental costs related to supply disruptions based on our 2024 experience, and our 2024 efforts to diversify and build additional resiliency into our supply chain to be better prepared for future events.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We monitor our supply chain risks to develop strong networks and avoid over-dependence on a small number of suppliers. We have invested in supply chain resiliency over the past several years and have dual supply or supplier enabled redundancy for most of our critical raw materials so that we are not constrained by a single supplier. As of December 2024 we estimate approximately > 65% of our supply now has redundancy up from less than 20% a few years ago. We have established a standing reserve supply for select key raw materials so that in the event of a production disruption affecting our supplier(s), we have inventory available to enable us to maintain operations for a period of time. We develop and maintain contingency plans and strategies to minimize impact of disruptions when they occur. We maintain a hurricane contingency plan that immediately engages multiple key suppliers, internal planners, production facilities and transportation entities when hurricane threats arise. The plan includes general outlines and strategies to make rapid changes in our normal supply chain to minimize the immediate impact of business interruptions. For instance, we maintain contracts with various truck and rail transportation companies to allow for flexibility to re-route land shipments in

the event of weather-related disruptions. Between our resiliency planning and our transportation contingency planning we did not experience any significant disruptions (prolonged production outages or costs exceeding planned contingency) due to severe weather events in 2024 including any of the 18 names storms, 5 of which were hurricanes with US landfall, during the 2024 Atlantic hurricane season.
[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)

2300000000

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

Select from:
☑ 31-40%

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

971000000

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

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Transition risk assumes same loss of sales as for Risk 1 in Question 3.1.1 due to less demand for our products if we do not innovate with more environmentally friendly products and implement more sustainable practices. The estimate assumes 100% loss of sales to those customers making sustainability inquiries in 2024. The physical risk estimate assumes loss of the three plants identified as most susceptible to physical climate risk in our most recent climate risk assessment. We did not take into account production contingencies or other mitigating factors for this physical risk estimate, only loss of revenue associated with the three locations output in 2024.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

199260776

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

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

199260776

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This aligns with Forest Risk 2 in Question 3.1.1 and assumes that all of C&D's spend on forest commodities are vulnerable to physical and transition risks. Transitional and physical risk for forest commodities is calculated as the percent of total direct spend from palm derivatives, paper packaging and shipping cases, and the minimal known soy-based products.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

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

260000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

260000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.6) Amount of CAPEX in the reporting year deployed towards risks related to this environmental issue

16300000

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This aligns with Water Risk 3 in Question 3.1.1 and assumes reduced water availability forces us to relocate one water intensive laundry detergent plant. The estimated capital cost for a new laundry detergent plant exceeds our total 2024 capital budget by approximately 157%. Transition and physical risks are assumed the same on a cap ex basis. While this is an asset related issue, it is being considered as a capital cost instead of a portion of overall asset value. In 2024 we invested approximately 1.6 million USD of capital on various water improvement, maintenance, and conservation projects. These company-wide water related capital projects will continue to improve our overall water management capabilities and reduce potential any one location may become significantly at risk due to water issues.
[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

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Other, please specify :Coastal Drainage

(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

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ James River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Columbia River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Susquehanna River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Mississippi River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

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

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

(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

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Metedeconk River/Mid-Atlantic Basin

(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

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Mojave River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Great Lakes Basin

(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

The risk here assumes potential to impact our larger volume water using manufacturing sites through either reduced water availability or access/operations due to severe weather. As such we are including our top 10 water extraction locations that consist of 9 throughout the United States and one in the United Kingdom. While it is not likely that multiple sites would be restricted in water availability and associated product manufacturing for a prolonged, overlapping time period, for purposes of this reporting we are assuming a financial impact estimate equivalent to loss of 50% of our laundry product business, liquid cleaner business and baking soda business, which are our most water intensive product lines. At this time, we have not identified any manufacturing locations at significant immediate risk of water availability restriction. The information listed above is an estimate of the specific facility contribution to the general scenario described here.
[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

☑ Enforcement orders or other penalties but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

Four WW NOVs were received in the 2024 calendar year. One plant exceedance the TSS and pH limit in addition to a missed sampling parameter. Another plant exceeded the ionic surfactant limit. Root cause analysis was performed and corrective actions implemented. No penalties were issued.
[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:

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Reputational capital

☑ Reputational benefits resulting in increased demand for products/services

(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
☑ India
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Panama
☑ Germany
☑ Australia
☑ Singapore
☑ New Zealand

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We have recognized that our customers and consumers are increasingly demanding transparency regarding our efforts to mitigate our impacts on climate change. Many of our customers have made general or specific expectations about our company sustainability performance. Evolving consumer concerns or perceptions regarding environmental, social and governance practices of manufacturers involve areas including packaging materials, such as plastic packaging, and their environmental or climate change impact or sustainability performance. We earned public recognition for our efforts in 2024, including being listed in Time Magazine's Ranking of the World's Most Sustainable Companies, Newsweek Magazine's Ranking of America's Most Responsible Companies, USA Today's Ranking of America's Climate Leaders, EPA's Safer Choice Partner of the Year, FTSE4Good Index Series, amongst others. Activities that help establish and improve this reputation enable the company to maintain existing markets and expand into other markets and consumer segments around the globe where these ideals are also valued. Countries listed are those where we indicate operations, but this opportunity is applicable in any country in which we have sales.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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

By implementing effective sustainability programs we are able to operate a more sustainable company that satisfy our customer and consumer expectations. Activities that help establish and improve this reputation enable the company to maintain existing markets and expand into other markets and consumer segments around the globe where these ideals are also valued, resulting in increased sales and revenues.

(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)

480000000

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

725000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Financial impact estimate is based on market research indicating "mainstream" green companies like Church & Dwight may receive up to 40% of consumer sales from consumers who value companies and products that exhibit favorable sustainable and climate change behaviors. We assume we have not yet realized this market share and could expand our sales by 10% if fully realized. The indicated range represents incremental sales of between 8%-12% over current year sales volume.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

32000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Estimated cost of Op Ex and Cap Ex spend in 2024 for implementation of various sustainability program elements including R&D product development, performance tracking and reporting, sustainability efficiency program and project implementation.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our strategy is to continue on our sustainability journey and pursue our goals to reduce our climate impact, reduce our water consumption, reduce the impact of our packaging and use of plastic, improve management of nature based raw materials, and eliminate chemicals of concern while making products our customers and consumers love and to transparently communicate with our stakeholders with respect to our progress. We earned public recognition for our sustainability efforts in 2024 from various third parties including being listed on Time Magazine's Ranking of the World's Most Sustainable Companies, Newsweek Magazine's Ranking of America's Most Responsible Companies, USA Today's Ranking of America's Climate Leaders, EPA's Safer Choice Partner of the Year, FTSE4Good Index Series, amongst others. Activities that help establish and improve this reputation enable the company to maintain existing markets and expand into other markets and consumer segments where these ideals are also valued.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(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

☑ Increased value chain transparency

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Indonesia

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

There is an opportunity to increase the Company's social responsibility profile with its stakeholders. In addition, the Company will increase transparency and trust with its stakeholders which may provide opportunities for increased sales and revenues. Even as a small player in the palm oil derivative sector, we believe that by increasing our demand for sustainable palm oil derivatives and supporting deforestation-free supply chains, we can have a small impact on the sustainable palm oil industry that does not cause deforestation, respects human rights, and contributes to better well-being of local communities, all of which we articulate in our Global Operations Guiding Principles. As an end-user company, we are closely connected to our consumers and can actively respond to their needs by offering them the opportunity to make sustainable choices during their product purchases. Our role is therefore to set the direction and clear expectations and to encourage our primary supplier to continue its focus on its No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation Policy that it has had in place since 2013. According to our supplier's 2024 sustainability report, they can trace 98.5% of their palm products to the mill and all material is in compliance with their NDNPE policy. In addition, as customer demands for products derived from sustainable sources continue to increase, this could provide an opportunity for the Company to obtain more business from current and new customers.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

By implementing effective sustainability programs we are able to operate a more sustainable company that satisfy our customer and consumer expectations. Activities that help establish and improve this reputation enable the company to maintain existing markets and expand into other markets and consumer segments around the globe where these ideals are also valued, resulting in increased sales and revenues.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

200000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost to realize opportunity is based on order of magnitude estimate of total direct spend in 2024 on products that are nature based and or certified sustainable. Expectation is that this amount of spend may increase in the medium to long term horizons as our procurement practices continue to mature and focus on certified

sustainable raw materials. This includes palm derivatives included in our Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing Program as well as estimated spend on other nature based materials procured outside that program.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

In 2024 we exited a product line that historically represented the majority of our palm oil derivative use. We still have a small amount of palm oil derivative use in our product lines. As we evaluate our supply chain and reduced use of palm oil derivatives, we will continue to source through our primary supplier and pursue our objective is to secure 100% of certified sustainable palm oil derivatives through RSPO from mass balance sources by the end of 2025. Expectation is that spend on certified sustainable raw materials will increase in the medium to long term horizons as our procurement practices continue to mature and focus on other key materials in this arena. By relying upon and expanding our supply chain transparency we are able to maintain our reputation. Activities that help establish and improve this reputation enable the company to maintain existing markets and expand into other markets and consumer segments where these ideals are also valued.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Reputational capital

☑ Reputational benefits resulting in increased demand for products/services

(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

☑ India

☑ Panama

☑ Germany

☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Australia
☑ New Zealand
☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Not applicable; covers multiple geographies where ever company products may be made or sold

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Opportunities for new products and packaging formulated to minimize water or energy requirements in manufacture or consumer use, increase recyclability of packaging, and decrease input materials, such as plastics, to drive our circular economy efforts (Packaging Recyclability, page 51 of our 2023 CSR). As customer and consumer demand for these products continue to grow, introduction of new products within this category provide incremental sales and growth for the company. Examples include dry shampoo, laundry products tailored to high-efficiency appliances, concentrated laundry products made with less water, and improvements in the recyclability of our products and packaging. Countries listed are those where we indicate operations, but this opportunity is applicable in any country in which we have sales.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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

Development of new products with water or climate friendly aspects will continue to expand our product portfolio and contribute incremental sales over the short and medium time horizon. This satisfies our customer and consumer expectations. Activities that help improve this reputation enable the company to maintain existing markets and expand into other markets and consumer segments around the globe where these ideals are also valued, resulting in increased sales and revenues. We have selected medium time horizon because, while we are seeing growth in our current product lines such as concentrated laundry detergents and dry shampoo, the time to develop and launch new products is estimated to typically be 3 or more years, extending into our medium time horizon.

(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)

480000000

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

725000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Financial impact estimate is based on market research indicating "mainstream" green companies like Church & Dwight may receive up to 40% of consumer sales from consumers who value companies and products that exhibit favorable sustainable and climate change behaviors. We assume we have not yet realized this market share and could expand our sales by 10% if fully realized. The indicated range represents incremental sales of between 8%-12% over current year sales volume.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

32000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Estimated cost of Op Ex and Cap Ex spend in 2024 for implementation of various sustainability program elements including R&D product development, performance tracking and reporting, sustainability efficiency program and project implementation.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Opportunities exist for new products and packaging formulated to minimize water requirements in manufacture or consumer use phase or increased recyclability of packaging. Examples include dry shampoo, concentrated laundry products and laundry products tailored to high-efficiency appliances, and improvements in the recyclability of our product packaging. We have continued our design efforts to remove water from product through emphasis on laundry pods and more concentrated detergents as well as to minimize packaging in our products through efforts to meet customer demand for "ship in own container" products that can eliminate need for secondary packaging (e.g. cat litter) and increased our packaging recyclability and engagement efforts through expanding "how to recycle" labelling on more product labels. In 2024 we made progress in all these areas. We have recognized that our customers and consumers are increasingly demanding transparency regarding our efforts to mitigate water risk and manage our water resources. Many of our customers have made general or specific expectations and inquiries about our company sustainability performance. Evolving consumer concerns or perceptions regarding environmental, social, and governance practices of manufacturers involve areas including their environmental or water impacts, or packaging materials, such as plastic packaging, or other sustainability performance. In 2024, our continued progress in key areas of sustainability earned recognition from various third parties including being listed on Time Magazine's Ranking of the World's Most Sustainable Companies, Newsweek Magazine's Ranking of America's Most Responsible Companies, USA Today's Ranking of America's Climate Leaders, EPA's Safer Choice Partner of the Year, FTSE4Good Index Series, amongst others.
[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:
☑ Other, please specify :Combined estimate for Op Ex and Cap Ex associated with sustainability program implementation

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

32000000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

The reported value is the approximate order of magnitude amount invested in both Op Ex and Cap Ex associated with implementation of sustainability related activities in 2024. Sustainability program implementation and success are critical to realizing the opportunity to develop and sell new products and enter or expand markets that value the climate and environmental benefits associated with our practices and products. This is divided by the sum of cost of sales, marketing and SG&A expenses.

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

199260776

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

The figure represents approximate 2024 spend on nature based raw materials including palm, soy, wood fiber, and rubber, divided by total direct spend.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

16800000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

The figure represents a 2024 estimate of R&D spend on new product and sustainability initiatives. It does not include cost associated with producing, marketing, or selling new products or other costs associated with implementation of operational sustainability initiatives such as energy reduction or water conservation. This is divided by the sum of cost of sales, marketing and SG&A expenses.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ 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

When evaluating the recommendations of the Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee, the Board should consider whether individual directors possess the following personal characteristics: integrity, education, commitment to the Board, business judgment, business experience, accounting and financial expertise, diversity (which may include differences of viewpoint, professional experience, education, skills, race, gender, national origin or other individual qualities and attributes that contribute to board heterogeneity), reputation, civic and community relationships, high performance standards and the ability to act on behalf of stockholders. The Board as a whole should possess all of the following core competencies: accounting & finance, senior executive leadership & strategic

planning, mergers & acquisitions/business development, CPG industry, supply chain, information technology/cyber security, R&D/Innovation, marketing and sales, human capital management, inclusion and diversity, public company governance, and global business, among others.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

Church & Dwight Corp Governance Guidelines_3_18_25.pdf,Church & Dwight_BOD Gov Nom Committee Charter_2025.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Biodiversity is not a critical priority at the board level at this time.*

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee Charter - governance-and-nominating-committee-charter (q4cdn.com).

(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

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ 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

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board, through its Governance, Nominating & Corporate Responsibility Committee, oversees the Company's sustainability program. At each meeting of the Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee, the committee reviews elements of the Company's sustainability objectives, key short and long-term strategy, key issues and status, including those related to the environmental impact of our global operations. The objectives include, among others, the achievement of our science-based targets and carbon neutral status for all global operations by end of 2025, as well as solid waste recycling and water reduction goals. At each meeting of the Committee, a different sustainability pillar is reviewed in detail. At least once a year, the overall sustainability objectives and progress against them are reviewed in detail. Our sustainability goals regarding greenhouse gas reductions, approach to achieving carbon neutral status, water and solid waste reductions were presented to the Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee of our Board of Directors for comments and approval.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee Charter - governance-and-nominating-committee-charter (q4cdn.com).

(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
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ 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
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board, through its Governance, Nominating & Corporate Responsibility Committee, oversees the Company's sustainability program. At each meeting of the Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee, the committee reviews elements of the Company's sustainability objectives, key short and long-term strategy, key issues and status, including those related to the environmental impact of our global operations. In addition, the Board reviews risks periodically, and the committee reviews status of sustainable goals each quarter to ensure that we are on track to achieve these goals. Moreover, the Board and/or Governance, Nominating & Corporate Responsibility Committee of the Board reviews shareholder communications directed to the Board as they occur. Shareholder communications on sustainability matters are reviewed by a Governance, Nominating & Corporate Responsibility Committee of the Board and that Committee reports its evaluations and recommendations to the Board. Progress concerning our palm oil derivatives sourcing practices is an important Company initiative and the employees responsible for that progress are evaluated in part based on the progress achieved. The Company also conducts quarterly reviews of its primary vendor to ensure that progress is being made to achieve the targets published in the Company's Palm Oil Sustainability Sourcing Commitment.

Water

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

Select all that apply
☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Governance, Nominating and Corporate Responsibility Committee Charter - governance-and-nominating-committee-charter (q4cdn.com).

(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

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Our Board of Directors, through its Governance, Nominating, and Corporate Responsibility Committee, oversees our sustainability program, including water-related activities. Their focus is on oversight of management's risk assessment and management processes, and our ethics and compliance program supported by our Internal Audit Department and the Board of Directors' Audit Committee. This process is designed to identify and rank the most significant risks that affect our Company, including water risk and other sustainability related concerns, by considering the risks associated with companies in the consumer products industry. Our Corporate Issues Council, which has direct management responsibility for Church & Dwight's sustainability program, reports directly to the Governance, Nominating, and Corporate Responsibility Committee. This framework for Board oversight is designed to facilitate the integration of sustainability risks, including water, into our overall strategic processes. In 2021, the Governance, Nominating, and Corporate Responsibility Committee, reviewed our 10% normalized annual water reduction goal. That goal remained in place for 2024. Water risk may be identified, assessed, and managed at multiple levels within the organization. These include site level, department level and corporate levels. Significant issues are elevated to the Corporate Issues Council and Board as appropriate. Updates on progress against goals or newly identified risks or issues are communicated quarterly from the CIC to the Board Governance, Nominating, and Corporate Responsibility Committee.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :(Corporate Issues Council).The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R&D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Below the Board level, the Company's Corporate Issues Council ("CIC") has responsibility for climate-related issues. The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R & D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel. The CIC takes the lead in defining, evolving and implementing our sustainability strategies across the six pillars of our global sustainability program: Our Brands, Products, Packaging, Employees & Communities, Responsible Sourcing and Environment & Climate Change. The CIC's duties include allocating resources to appropriately address sustainability issues, including climate-related issues; reporting on our progress to drive performance improvements; and monitoring, prioritizing and addressing evolving standards and stakeholder

requirements. The CIC structure and membership composition ensure that key climate-related decisions are made with input and buy-in across all functional areas of the organization. The CIC meets every other month and monitors our adherence to various Company policies, including our climate related commitments. The Company has a company-wide risk assessment process, which is overseen by the Board. Our EVP and General Counsel, who is a member of the CIC, regularly reports to the Governance, Nominating, Corporate & Responsibility Committee, who in turn reports out to the Board. We monitor climate-related issues such as emerging regulations, extreme weather and business continuity and changing market forces on an ongoing basis. We regularly receive communications and inquiries from our stakeholders regarding our sustainability practices and our management of climate-related issues, and this also informs our understanding of important areas to address. The CIC evaluates and discusses the most significant sustainability issues, risks and opportunities we face (including climate-related issues) and the functions within the company that should be accountable for them.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :(Corporate Issues Council).The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R&D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Below the Board level, the Company's Corporate Issues Council ("CIC") has responsibility for forest-related issues. The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R & D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel. The remaining members of the CIC consists of leaders representing functional areas across the enterprise. The CIC takes the lead in defining and implementing our sustainability strategies in our operations and supply chain, among other things. The CIC meets every other month and monitors our adherence to various Company policies, including our Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing Commitment. In addition, the Company has a company-wide risk assessment process, which is overseen by the Board. Our EVP and General Counsel, who is a member of the CIC, regularly reports to the Governance, Nominating, Corporate & Responsibility Committee, who in turn reports out to the Board. See additional information in Module 3.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :(Corporate Issues Council).The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R&D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Below the Board level, the Company's Corporate Issues Council ("CIC") has responsibility for water-related issues. The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R & D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel. The remaining members of the CIC consists of leaders representing functional areas across the enterprise. The CIC takes the lead in defining and implementing our sustainability strategies. The CIC meets every other month and monitors our adherence to various Company policies, including our progress against our water-related targets and objectives. In addition, the Company has a company-wide risk assessment process, which is overseen by the Board. Our EVP and General Counsel, who is a member of the CIC, regularly reports to the Governance, Nominating, Corporate & Responsibility Committee, who in turn reports out to the Board.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :(Corporate Issues Council).The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R&D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(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:

☑ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Below the Board level, the Company's Corporate Issues Council ("CIC") has responsibility for sustainability-related issues. The CIC is led by four of the Company's Executive Vice Presidents--R & D, Supply Chain, Chief Human Resources Officer and General Counsel. The remaining members of the CIC consists senior leaders from functional areas across the enterprise. The CIC leads in defining and implementing our sustainability strategies in our operations and supply chain. The Company has a company-wide risk assessment process overseen by the Board. Our EVP and General Counsel, a member of the CIC, regularly reports to the Governance, Nominating, Corporate & Responsibility Committee, who in turn reports out to the Board. To date we have focused on climate, water and responsible sourcing but biodiversity has not specifically been identified as a material issue through our risk assessment and stakeholder assessment practices. At this time we are closely monitoring key biodiversity frameworks and are reviewing key frameworks for assessment and future participation. Though biodiversity is not a current pillar of our sustainability efforts, we are keenly sensitive to our raw materials and ingredients procurement as we source our packaging board materials from recycled sources and sustainably managed forests. We source our palm oil derivative from RSPO certified sources. C&D supports various land preservation and habitat preservation actions by donations and employee volunteer activities through our Employee Giving Fund with local land preservation organizations in the regions where we operate, as well as donations to environmental preservation organizations through the Church & Dwight Philanthropic Foundation. We acquire about 1/3 of our purchased carbon credits from nature-based preservation and forest management projects. We are actively assessing our position, actions, potential commitments, and management of biodiversity issues related to our operations.

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

EVP of Supply Chain, a Member of the Corporate Issues Council (CIC) is specifically responsible for management of supply chain operations including management of operational and capital budgets associated with procurement, manufacturing and transportation. They have overall responsibility for development and implementation of company environmental and ESG policies and operations, as directed by the CIC.

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :EVP Human Resources

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The EVP of Human Resources is responsible for all aspect of compensation. This includes the Strategic Initiatives metric portion of the bonus program that contains sustainability-related performance such as attaining Corporate ESG goals and accounts for 20% of the determination of an individual's bonus multiplier.
[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

20

(4.5.3) Please explain

Our CEO has a performance target calling for achievement of carbon-neutral status as a corporation. A portion of his compensation is affected by the Company's progress toward that goal and ultimately achieving the carbon-neutral milestone. Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Sustainability goals including climate initiatives are established by our CEO and cascaded throughout the organization. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include achieving stated sustainability goals. The Strategic Initiatives metric portion of the bonus program includes sustainability-related performance such as ESG goals and accounts for 20% of the determination of an individual's bonus multiplier.

Forests

(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

20

(4.5.3) Please explain

Our CEO has a performance target calling for achievement of carbon-neutral status as a corporation. A portion of his compensation is affected by the Company's progress toward that goal and ultimately achieving the carbon-neutral milestone. Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Sustainability goals including climate initiatives are established by our CEO and cascaded throughout the organization. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include achieving stated sustainability goals. The Strategic Initiatives metric portion of the bonus program includes sustainability-related performance such as ESG goals and accounts for 20% of the determination of an individual's bonus multiplier.

Water

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

20

(4.5.3) Please explain

Our CEO has a performance target calling for achievement of carbon-neutral status as a corporation. A portion of his compensation is affected by the Company's progress toward that goal and ultimately achieving the carbon-neutral milestone. Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Sustainability goals including climate initiatives are established by our CEO and cascaded throughout the organization. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include achieving stated sustainability goals. The Strategic Initiatives metric portion of the bonus program includes sustainability-related performance such as ESG goals and accounts for 20% of the determination of an individual's bonus multiplier.
[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

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Our CEO has a performance target calling for achievement of carbon-neutral status as a corporation. A portion of his compensation is affected by the Company's progress toward that goal and ultimately achieving the carbon-neutral milestone. In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Sustainability goals, including climate change initiatives, are overseen by the Board and cascaded by the CEO throughout the organization. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Forests

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Eliminating deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems in direct operations and/or other parts of the value chain

Engagement

☑ Increased value chain visibility (traceability, mapping)

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Achieving responsible sourcing goals including our Palm Oil related targets are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals – direct operations

☑ Reduction in water consumption volumes – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – downstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include meeting climate and water reduction and efficiency targets. In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's

Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Sustainability goals including water initiatives are established by our CEO and cascaded throughout the organization. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards include achieving stated sustainability goals.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Executive Vice President, Chief Supply Chain Officer, Operations

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

For the Executive Vice President of Global Operations, key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include energy reductions, efficiency projects and emissions reductions. In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and D&I process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Executive Vice President Global Research & Development

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Increased investment in environmental R&D and innovation

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

For the Executive Vice President of Research & Development key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include packaging reductions and product development that assist meeting climate or energy efficiency projects and emissions reductions. In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, the following changes were made for 2023 Annual Incentive Plan metrics: A Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which focuses on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals)--the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Forests

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Eliminating deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems in direct operations and/or other parts of the value chain

Engagement

☑ Increased value chain visibility (traceability, mapping)

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Achieving responsible sourcing goals including our Palm Oil related targets are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – downstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include meeting climate and water reduction and efficiency targets. In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and Diversity and Inclusion ("D&I") process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and D&I process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Sustainability goals including water initiatives are established by our CEO and cascaded throughout the organization. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards include achieving stated sustainability goals.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Facility/Unit/Site management

☑ Other facility/unit/site manager, please specify :All employees of the organization

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – downstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include meeting climate and water reduction and efficiency targets. In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Sustainability goals including water initiatives are established by our CEO and cascaded throughout the organization. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards include achieving stated sustainability goals.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Facility/Unit/Site management

☑ Other facility/unit/site manager, please specify :All employees

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

For all employees, achieving designated sustainability targets is part of their performance review. In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Executive Vice President and General Counsel

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals)--the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Buyers/purchasers

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Procurement manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Process operation manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Environment/Sustainability manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and Diversity and Inclusion ("D&I") process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and D&I process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Environmental, Health, and Safety manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

In connection with the Compensation & Human Capital Committee's review of market practices, a Strategic Initiatives metric was added, which includes on Sustainability (i.e., environmental and equality process related goals) -- the addition of new Strategic Initiatives metric includes the measurement of progress towards the Company's Environmental and equality process related goals. This impacts all employees that participate in the Company's Annual Incentive Plan and is one of five metrics representing 20% of the Annual Incentive Plan potential payout.

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

Our annual bonus program pays bonuses to individuals based on corporate performance as well as individual performance against critical success drivers. Emissions reductions, energy reductions and efficiency projects across the Supply Chain/Operations enterprise are key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations against the Strategic Initiatives metric and associated monetary rewards
[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

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Church & Dwight's environmental policy states the company's commitment to conduct business in an environmentally responsible and sustainable manner while ensuring compliance with the company's policies, programs and environmental laws and regulations. Additionally, it states commitments to maintain the environmental management system, provide adequate resources including training on environmental topics, minimize impacts on environment, promote sustainability to outside stakeholders, and require employees to participate in corporate policies and programs.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :Acknowledge impacts of climate change and its impacts Promote environmental sustainability through concepts of reduce, recycle, reuse, replenish.

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Environmental-Policy.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Church & Dwight's Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing Commitment demonstrates our compliance with the following specific sourcing practices: · Ending our contributions to deforestation by conserving and protecting primary and secondary forests, High Carbon Stock and High Conservation Value forests across all supplier landholdings. · Ending new development on peatlands, regardless of depth. · Leveraging best management practices for existing palm oil plantations on peat soils. · Prohibiting the use of fire for preparation or clearing of land areas. · Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and existing operations. · Complying with existing RSPO Principles and Criteria or other equivalent standards. · Ending any exploitation of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. To accomplish these goals, we require our primary supplier to meet or exceed the standards set forth in its No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation Policy, provide quarterly reports on its supply chain mapping and progress against the commitments set forth in its policy, and meet or exceed RSPO standards for RSPO certification. We review the goals in our policy on an annual basis to inform changes we may need to make to ensure that we are on the path to reach our stated goals. Our policy specifically states our sustainability goals as it relates to palm oil and is closely aligned with the United Nations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to conduct or support restoration and/or compensation to remedy for past deforestation or conversion

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

☑ Commitment to no land clearance by burning or clearcutting

Social commitments
☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
☑ Commitment to secure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous people and local communities

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

Select all that apply
☑ No, and we do not plan to align in the next two years

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing Commitment_2025.pdf

Row 3

(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

Church & Dwight's water policy states the company's commitment to conduct business in an environmentally responsible and sustainable manner while ensuring compliance with the company's policies, programs and environmental laws and regulations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

☑ Other water-related commitment, please specify :Responsible company management of water resources

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Water-Policy.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply
☑ Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member
☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

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

Science Based Targets Network: Church & Dwight's science-based target was approved in 2022. As part of this target, we will seek to engage our suppliers to set their own science-based targets; Global Reporting Initiative: Church & Dwight has aligned our annual Corporate Sustainability Report with Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards for the past 10 years. Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures: Church & Dwight has aligned our annual Corporate Sustainability Report with the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related (TCFD) Framework since 2020. As part of this disclosure, we describe our approach to assess and manage physical and transition risks that climate change may pose to our business; Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil: In 2024, we continued our membership with the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and completed our fourth Annual Communication of Progress (for 2023 results). While we are not RSPO Supply Chain Certified, we purchased virtually all our palm fatty acid distillate (PFAD) and palm kernel fatty acid (PKFA) raw material from one RSPO member supplier that has represented to us that this material meets our internal goal of over 97% traceable to the mill (98.5% in 2024).
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Church & Dwight Corporate Issues Council subgroup on Sustainability Strategy is tasked with monitoring and tracking our corporate engagement with trade associations and NGOs. As part of this function, the subgroup tracks development and requirements of these associations as well as their positions on topics relevant to sustainability and climate change.
[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

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :American Cleaning Institute

(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

☑ Forests

☑ 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

ACI supports alignment with the 1.5 degrees trajectory of the Paris Agreement and highlights its members' actions toward implementing science-based targets.

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

375000

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

Maintaining annual membership

(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 voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status metrics

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Water pollution indicators

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Environment and Climate Change Section (Page 55-83)

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024-Sustainability-Report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

The CSR covers many sustainability related topics.

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In other regulatory filings

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(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

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Sustainability Strategy and ESG Pillars (Page 10-12); Risk Factors, Changing Consumer Preferences Risk (Page 16), Market Categories Decline (Page 18), Availability of Transportation Risk (Page 22), Damage to Reputation Risk (Page 22), Environmental Matter Potential Liability Risk (Page 25), ESG Issues Increased Cost and Compliance Risk (Page 26), Failure to Achieve ESG Goals Risk (Page 26), Stockholder Activism Risk (Page 34)

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

(4.12.1.8) Comment

We provide key updates in our annual disclosures.
[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:

☑ First time carrying out analysis

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 business strategy does not utilize a specific forests-related scenario analysis. We are in the process of first evaluating our approach for climate-related scenario analysis, which requires substantial input. Climate-related risks and opportunities are more directly relevant for our business and products.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios
☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 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

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :Climate requirements of our retail customers

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IEA NZE 2050 scenario assumes rapid decarbonization of the global energy system, with carbon prices rising sharply across regions and a major shift to renewables. Outcomes are contingent on policy alignment, market adoption of low-carbon technologies, and grid decarbonization rates, which may differ materially from projections. The NZA scenario assumes all entities (governments, public companies, private companies and individuals) do all they can to achieve net zero in a very aggressive manner. These efforts are assumed to become increasingly aggressive by the 2030 time horizon and more so by 2050. A limitation is that the scenario does not fully quantify secondary market effects, such as changes in raw material costs or demand for carbon-intensive products. There may also be some uncertainty with respect to the IEA models as they do not address recent 2024/2025 geopolitical shifts and changes with respect to climate issues.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The IEA NZA methodology was selected because it is a commonly used methodology, has good data availability suitable for our business, was succinct and considered appropriate for our needs. This scenario is the highest risk one, as it delineates the implementation of highly ambitious targets and policies. By focusing on access to clean energy, emissions reductions, and energy-related UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), NZE delineates a pathway for the energy sector to limit global warming to 1.5 °C above preindustrial levels in 2100. This scenario helps us understand the effort required to accelerate a global transition to a lower carbon economy and the anticipated changes in policy, consumer behavior, and market demand that could impact our business

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(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
☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)
☑ Other local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts driving forces, please specify :Relative increase in water risk by location

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

We rank all our manufacturing sites based on water withdrawal volume and then assess the WRI Aquaduct water risk ranking for that location in the current year compared to the previous year. The goal is to understand where water risk may be increasing. The assessment is limited to the parameters included in the AWI Aqueduct platform and their projections from current year through 2050. For our year on year analysis we consider the individual ranking component changes (overall, physical quantity, physical quality, reputation/regulation) for each site to better understand immediate potential risks or changes. For the longer term assessment we consider only the overall risk classification in the 2030 and 2050 in "business as usual" and "optimistic" scenarios.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We have chosen the WRI Aqueduct tool to assess our relative water risk because it is commonly used, has good data availability, and includes multiple parameters significant to us that could affect water quality and availability at our operating locations. It is succinct and considered appropriate for our needs. We continue to use to tool for consistency in methodology in our assessment updates. Our annual WRI Aquaduct review is further supplemented by periodic deeper dive studies into water supply and wastewater issues at our key locations. These further studies occur about every 3-5 years, based on perceived increased risk or other need.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 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
☑ Consumer attention to impact
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation
☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :Climate requirements of our retail customers

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The analysis is built upon IEA assumptions and outputs. The STEPs scenario assumes somewhat less aggressive action toward climate change with some, but not all entities doing all they can to reduce carbon emissions. The Stated Policies Scenario from the IEA assumes a continuation of policy and market transition to a low carbon economy (as of Aug 2024), with only slow shifts in consumer and corporate behavior. There may be some uncertainty with respect to the IEA models as they do not address recent 2024/2025 geopolitical shifts and changes with respect to climate issues.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The IEA STEPs methodology was selected because it is a commonly used methodology, has good data availability suitable for our business, was succinct and considered appropriate for our needs. This scenario is based on existing policies and measures as well as those under development. It is the lowest risk transition scenario produced by the IEA and used for this analysis as a business-as-usual scenario. The average temperature warming by 2100 associated with this scenario is 2.4oC – it is therefore not aligned with the Paris Agreement. This scenario helps us understand the risks and opportunities for our business that may occur with a slower pathway to a low carbon economy.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 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)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IPCC SSP modeling scenarios from CMIP6 including High Carbon World Risks SSP1-2.6 (Optimistic) and SSP3-7.0 (Business as Usual) to both 2030 and 2050 horizons typically uses output ranges. For simplification we have used single value outputs for our rankings instead of wider range distributions. The analysis relies upon published industrial research standards and outputs and is not customized for specific facility operations, facility immediate location features, or other circumstances. This represents a relatively low-emissions scenario aligned with ambitious climate action and limited warming. Physical risk scenarios rely on location data to evaluate associated risk based on climate hazard exposure and how risks may evolve across that specific area.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The IPSS SSP was selected because it is a commonly used methodology, has good data availability suitable for our location assessments, was succinct and considered appropriate for our needs. This optimistic, Paris Agreement-aligned scenario assumes CO2 emissions are cut significantly, reaching 1.8°C of warming by 2100. This scenario provides a lower bound to understand potential physical risks to businesses.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 7.0

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 3.5ºC - 3.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 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)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IPCC SSP modeling scenarios from CMIP6 including High Carbon World Risks SSP1-2.6 (Optimistic) and SSP3-7.0 (Business as Usual) to both 2030 and 2050 horizons typically uses output ranges. For simplification we have used single value outputs for our rankings instead of wider range distributions. The analysis relies upon published industrial research standards and outputs and is not customized for specific facility operations, facility immediate location features, or other circumstances. This represents a relatively high-emissions scenario characterized by limited mitigation and high physical climate risk. Physical risk scenarios rely on location data to evaluate associated risk based on climate hazard exposure and how risks may evolve across that specific area.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The IPSS SSP was selected because it is a commonly used methodology, has good data availability suitable for our location assessments, was succinct and considered appropriate for our needs. This reflects the estimated global current trajectory where global emissions will double by the end of the century. This represents the current trajectory of physical risks and a worst-case scenario for physical risk impacts to businesses. The scenario helps to improve our understanding of potential risks to our operations and informs our resilience measures.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 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)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IPCC SSP modeling scenarios from CMIP6 including High Carbon World Risks SSP1-2.6 (Optimistic) and SSP3-7.0 (Business as Usual) to both 2030 and 2050 horizons typically uses output ranges. For simplification we have used single value outputs for our rankings instead of wider range distributions. The analysis relies upon published industrial research standards and outputs and is not customized for specific facility operations, facility immediate location features, or other circumstances. This represents a relatively low-emissions scenario aligned with ambitious climate action and limited warming. Physical risk scenarios rely on location data to evaluate associated risk based on climate hazard exposure and how risks may evolve across that specific area.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The IPSS SSP was selected because it is a commonly used methodology, has good data availability suitable for our location assessments, was succinct and considered appropriate for our needs. This optimistic, Paris Agreement-aligned scenario assumes CO2 emissions are cut significantly, reaching 1.8°C of warming by 2100. This scenario provides a lower bound to understand potential physical risks to businesses, particularly looking at water stress and flood risk.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 7.0

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 3.5ºC - 3.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2000

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 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)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IPCC SSP modeling scenarios from CMIP6 including High Carbon World Risks SSP1-2.6 (Optimistic) and SSP3-7.0 (Business as Usual) to both 2030 and 2050 horizons typically uses output ranges. For simplification we have used single value outputs for our rankings instead of wider range distributions. The analysis relies upon published industrial research standards and outputs and is not customized for specific facility operations, facility immediate location features, or other circumstances. This represents a relatively high-emissions scenario characterized by limited mitigation and high physical climate risk. Physical risk scenarios rely on location data to evaluate associated risk based on climate hazard exposure and how risks may evolve across that specific area.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The IPSS SSP was selected because it is a commonly used methodology, has good data availability suitable for our location assessments, was succinct and considered appropriate for our needs. This reflects the estimated global current trajectory where global emissions will double by the end of the century. This represents the current trajectory of physical risks and a worst-case scenario for physical risk impacts to businesses. The scenario helps to improve our understanding of potential risks to our operations and informs our resilience measures
[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

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

Outcomes of the transitional climate risk scenario analysis identified primary risks from both direct/indirect carbon pricing, change in consumer behavior away from company products, if not innovating more responsible products and sustainable company behaviors, and increased customer (retailer) climate requirements. These risks were more material and likely in NZE 2050 scenario, but substantially less under the STEPS 2050 scenario and both 2030 scenarios. While carbon price is not an immediate concern or current driver of our decarbonization efforts, our existing commitments to carbon reduction will mitigate carbon pricing risk in the event it becomes significant. Overall the risks aligned well with those identified and managed through our previous internal processes. Likewise opportunities identified in the transitional climate risk scenario analysis aligned well with those identified through our past internal processes. These included engaging supply chain on energy reduction, adopting new vehicle/transportation technologies, and revenue increase from product innovation to a more climate friendly product portfolio. As with the risks, the opportunities became more material and likely under the NZE 2050 scenario, but less so under the STEPs and 2030 scenarios. The physical risk scenario analysis was run on the top 20 high value locations identified through our property casualty insurer and included 12 owned/operated locations and 8 key suppliers and co-manufacturers. The analysis outcome showed our current most common and significant climate physical risk is pluvial (rain induced) flooding. Looking at both 2030 and 2050 time horizons pluvial flooding remains our most pervasive and impactful risk, however wildfire weather and water stress risks present increasing significance in 2030 to 2050 across the portfolio of locations studied. The analysis also identified the 5 most at risk locations within the 2050 scenario, most driven by pluvial or fluvial flooding plus slightly increased risk to wildfire, water stress and a lesser degree wind. The results again aligned with physical risks previously identified via internal processes and are those being mitigated, at least in part, by our business continuity and water risk management programs. Through internal processes and our insurer's climate risk management programs we are also engaging both our facilities and high value supplier/co-manufacturers to examine and implement mitigation measures including best practices and engineering improvements to reduce potential impacts from flooding, wind, and fire.

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

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

The most recent review showed no change in risk ranking for our locations from the previous year. Approximately 93% of our total water extraction is from locations classified as a low or low to medium overall water-stress risk. However, when considering only WRI physical quantity risk, approximately 48% of our water extraction is from sites located in areas of medium to high, high, or extremely high water risk for physical quantity. These are mainly in developed areas with significant water use and demand on regional water resources. Two locations were ranked as high overall water risk. One is mostly R&D and not a large volume water user. The second is a manufacturing plant that had historically been ranked low risk. As a result we have put specific focus on water use and conservation at this location as we investigate the cause of the change. To date we have not identified any specific indication from our water supplier that water supply is at risk and in 2024 the local supplier approved in increased intake volume at our plant to support an expansion project. We continue to work closely with the local authorities to manage water risks that may arise.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

In 2022, our science-based targets were validated by the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). These targets align with SBTi's latest criteria for maintaining global temperature rise to 1.5°C for Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions and well below 2°C for Scope 3. We do not yet have a published low carbon transition plan beyond our stated goals and objectives as we prioritize actions in support of our science-based targets. As part of these targets, we have committed to working with our supplier base representing 75% of our suppliers' emissions to develop associated science-based targets by 2026. We are simultaneously progressing towards our near-term, climate-related goal that our Scope 1 and 2 emissions related to the global operations we own and control will be carbon neutral by 2025. Performing a structured scenario analysis of the financial impacts of a 1.5°C temperature increase would be the next step to show we put climate change firmly within the context of our overall business strategy and financial planning. We plan to develop a transition plan within the next two years to outline risks and opportunities related to scenario analysis findings.
[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

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

We continue to respond to increased customer demand for sustainable products, and we advanced our business strategy in this area during 2024. We have improved the recyclability of our product portfolio to 88.5%, which equates to 350 million pounds of packaging accepted into the recycling stream. We maintained carbon neutral manufacturing and development for consumer baking soda products and continued to develop less resource-intensive products, such as concentrated liquid laundry detergents, while aiming to decrease our total water intake each year. In 2024 Church & Dwight was honored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's 2024 Safer Choice Partner of the Year Award. The ARM & HAMMER brand was recognized for utilizing safer ingredients without sacrificing quality or performance, while furthering the EPA's commitment to making Safer Choice products more affordable and accessible to all. By continuing our legacy as a friend to the environment through offering products with a sustainability benefit and operating our company in a sustainable way, we are able to maintain our reputation and minimize risk of lost business through not meeting our retail customer and consumer expectations while at the same time realizing opportunities associated with increased benefits associated with our products.

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

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Our business strategy for enhancing customer relationships recognizes the importance of increasing the visibility of managing carbon emissions across the value chain. In recent years, value chain disruptions resulted in identifying and expanding the number of our value chain partners to increase its resiliency and shorten the links in our supply chain. In evaluating methods to better engage with our suppliers we decided to join CDP as a Supply Chain member and in 2024 increased engagement through CDP Supply Chain on both Climate and Water targeting more suppliers representing approximately 90% of our 2023 US domestic direct spend. (Approximately 58% of 2024 Scope 3, Category 1 CO2e emissions). We continue to expand this engagement in 2025 to include suppliers representing 80% of our 2024 purchased goods and services Scope 3 emissions. We are also working with our main palm oil derivative supplier to achieve our objective of achieving >97% traceability to the mills in 2024. We believe that doing so will assist us in achieving our goal of ensuring that the ingredients used in our products are from responsible sources. Since 2018 we have sourced our primary palm oil-based ingredients through RSPO certified sources. In 2024 we sourced 93% of palm oil-based ingredients in our Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing Commitment from certified sustainable physical sources through RSPO from mass balance sources. We are progressing toward our 100% goal by the end of 2025. Downstream consumers demand transparency in our value chain and are increasingly interested in opportunities to reduce impacts on the environment. To meet customer and consumer expectations, we have adjusted our strategy by advancing our efforts to increase detergent concentration and reduce water consumption for consumers, as well as reducing plastic packaging and size of products. Concentration with reduced product sizes combined with increased load optimization and intermodal usage help to reduce emissions from transportation.

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

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

As discussed in other sections of this disclosure, we invest in R&D for new products and packaging formulated to minimize water requirements in consumer use, reduce product weight, and increase recyclability of packaging. For example, in 2024, we launched laundry detergent sheets eliminating water in the product and changing the packaging from a plastic bottle to a recyclable fiber board carton. We have made commitments to achieve 100% sustainable or recycled wood fiber in all our fiber board packaging and corrugate. These and similar improvements contribute to decreased emissions associated with product distribution and help minimize plastic use and conserve forest resources. Additionally, no chemicals on our 2024 internal restricted substances list (RSL) will be intentionally added to any of our formulations. Our RSL is managed by a multi-department Chemicals of Concern Team to continuously review and update the list of chemicals as new findings and legislation emerges. We are committed to producing safe and sustainable products for our consumers and the environment. In 2024 Church & Dwight Honored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's 2024 Safer Choice Partner of the Year Award. The ARM & HAMMER brand was recognized for utilizing safer ingredients without sacrificing quality or performance, while furthering the EPA's commitment to making Safer Choice products more affordable and accessible to all. Many of our R&D efforts focus on product development for the near- and medium-term horizon.

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

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

We continue to enact business strategies to make progress towards our goal of achieving carbon-neutral operations by 2025. As part of this goal, our collective facility-level objectives are designed to reduce total energy consumption or at minimum, remain energy neutral on a year-to-year basis. Some of our plants have already implemented a variety of energy efficiency projects as of 2024, such as lighting efficiency, utility and process equipment improvements, and energy monitoring technologies. Implementation of several energy reduction projects has enabled us to minimize increases in our energy use in 2024. We seek to further minimize our carbon footprint by pursuing renewable energy credits, onsite green energy projects, and carbon offsets. We continued to develop detailed engineering and implementation plans for key projects to toward our SBT commitments. In 2024, we invested in further assessment of carbon reduction opportunities. We

completed engineering for a process to capture and reuse fugitive process emissions in our baking soda process at our Old Fort facility that will be installed and become operational in 2025. We also assessed carbon capture technologies from fuel combustion for steam generation. However, total cost and technical limitations proved this opportunity impractical for near term implementation. We continue to implement energy minimization projects at a plant level while assessing and developing engineering for additional larger projects to meet our SBTs. Water is an integral aspect of many of our products, both as an ingredient and in use phase. Continued long-term success of our business relies upon access to suitable water volume and quality by both our operations, our customers, and the communities in which we operate. We regularly assess water risk including availability for our existing operations and water availability is a key element in our selection processes for potential new locations. Facility life span and replacement planning (typically >10 year horizon) includes consideration of appropriate water infrastructure as part of the basic siting needs. We include capital and budget for evaluating and improving our water use efficiency in operations. Responsible water management and water availability is an integral part of our long-term planning with respect to maintaining our operating facility footprint. We have adjusted our strategy by focusing on water efficiency within our operations to align with our reduction in water usage for products, while being able to meet our water discharge permits at the same time. We continue to shift away from use of palm oil derivates in our operations, because we recognize that palm oil has significant impacts on biodiversity, local communities, and climate change. We have made efforts to remove palm oil derivatives from our products in response to market forces and in support of conservation. We continue to assess sustainable sourcing opportunities.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Direct costs

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ 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

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Our revenues, direct costs, indirect costs, capital expenditures and capital allocations are all affected by climate change risks and opportunities. Our financial planning incorporates climate-related impacts to our supply chain from cost of raw materials and transportation, indirect costs for utilities, new product development, and capital costs and allocation for continuous improvement in our energy, water, and waste efficiency efforts. A portion of our corporate financial planning takes into account the cost of pursuing a carbon-neutral strategy by 2025. Over the past few years, our approach to understanding and evaluating climate change risks and opportunities has continued to evolve. As part of this evolution, we evaluate the costs of climate mitigation alternatives at a corporate level. In 2024 we continued to expand our carbon credit purchase program as part of our overall strategy of emission reductions. Achieving carbon neutrality against targeted emissions has become a short-term goal, and maintaining that status is a long-term goal that is incorporated into our financial planning process. In 2022, our proposed science-based climate mitigation targets were validated by the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). The potential financial impact of projects and initiatives necessary to achieve these goals was evaluated and incorporated into company medium- to long-term financial planning. As projects and initiatives are more fully developed in 2024 and 2025, the financial details are incorporated into our short- and medium-term financial planning. Our financial planning also includes capital to implement water management and conservation projects, R&D funding to develop, refine, and advance more sustainable and water friendly products within in our product portfolio, as well as sales and marketing budgets to promote these products to customers and consumers. Having these types of products contribute to company growth and allows continued investment in climate/water efficiency in operations. For forests-related efforts, we have an allocated budget for sustainable palm oil materials, and to enable purchase of materials in line with our responsible sourcing and related ESG goals.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

97

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

-50

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

16

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

7

(5.9.5) Please explain

CapEx was up in 2024 and expected to be down in 2025 because we implemented a major WW treatment project in 2024. This one upgrade project represented 64% of water related capital spend in 2024. There are no equivalently scaled water projects scheduled in 2025. The reduction in water capital for 2025 is approximately 50%. Op Ex costs are estimated based on actual water related expenses reported in 2024 versus 2025 budgetary numbers.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

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

(5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.10.4) Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities

We continue to implement sustainability-related initiatives and respond to stakeholders as part of our approach for managing key risks and opportunities. We focus on efficient use of our internal resources to target areas where we believe we can have the most impact. Pricing environmental externalities is not an immediate strategy priority for the business, because we believe there are other opportunities that can generate greater value for the company and our stakeholders. We are focused on meeting our science-based targets and continuing to develop products that reduce water consumption, forest-related resource use, and emissions as we also work to increase the efficiency of our operations.
[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

While some of our raw material suppliers may engage smallholders, these represent a very small portion of our supply chain spend and occur at the Tier 2 level or higher. We do not directly source through smallholders. As we continue to assess our supply chain and prioritize related engagement strategy we will determine the need for future direct engagement with 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
☑ Forests
☑ Water

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Water
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

We track our direct and indirect supplier (including contract manufacturers) spend and do annual updates on relative contribution to our total Scope 3 Category 1 Purchased Goods and Services greenhouse gas emissions. Vendors, ranked in the top 90% by domestic US direct spend in 2023 were considered to have substantial impacts in 2024.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

77

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Supplier of Palm oil related raw materials are considered as having substantive impacts/dependencies. We currently have 1 supplier that provides us direct palm oil materials within our RSPO program.

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

1

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on water availability

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Suppliers who are included in our top emitters for GHG are also considered likely to have a similar water impact and are therefore classified as having a substantive impact on water.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

77

[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

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Other, please specify :Relative carbon contribution

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our responsible supplier program includes engagement on social and environmental issues. We are collecting information from our contract manufacturers and developing a program for tracking ESG key performance indicators of our suppliers, and we continue to prioritize our engagement through CDP with suppliers based on procurement spend and relative supply chain carbon contribution to evaluate their impacts. While our initial engagement is based on spend, we are prioritizing engagement expansion based on supplier relative carbon contribution our Scope 3 emissions in accordance with our SBTi commitments, as well as assessing maturity of carbon management and mitigation.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our responsible supplier program includes engagement on social and environmental issues. We are collecting information from our contract manufacturers and developing a program for tracking ESG key performance indicators of our suppliers, and we continue to prioritize our engagement through CDP with suppliers based on procurement spend to evaluate their impacts. Our palm oil derivative procurement is driven by supplier RSPO and Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing policy compliance.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Procurement spend

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our responsible supplier program includes engagement on social and environmental issues. We are collecting information from our contract manufacturers and developing a program for tracking ESG key performance indicators of our suppliers, and we continue to prioritize our engagement through CDP with suppliers based on procurement spend and relative supply chain carbon contribution to evaluate their water impacts including water withdrawal, water risk management, and conservation efforts.
[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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

We do not currently have a plan on environmental requirements for our suppliers. We are developing a KPI program with our contract manufacturers that include environmental performance criteria related to energy and GHG management and water management. We are also engaging our primary suppliers through CDP Supply Chain regarding climate and water issues for information gathering. We anticipate this engagement may develop into supplier specific requirements in the future.

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Palm oil suppliers need to have Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) certification. The Company requires that its primary supplier follow its Global Operations Guiding Principles which encompasses the Company's Palm Oil Sustainability Sourcing Commitment. The Guiding Principles were developed based on the principles of internationally recognized human rights and labor conditions and reflect our commitment to sustainable operations. As our use of palm oil continues to decrease we are evaluating continuation of our Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing program. This may involve prioritizing sourcing programs around other key natural sourced materials.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years

(5.11.5.3) Comment

We do not currently have a plan on environmental requirements for our suppliers. We are developing a KPI program with our contract manufacturers that include environmental performance criteria related to energy and GHG management and water management. We are also engaging our primary suppliers through CDP Supply Chain regarding climate and water issues for information gathering. We anticipate this engagement may develop into supplier specific requirements in the future.
[Fixed row]

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

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :RSPO

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Suspend and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Re-integrating suppliers back into upstream value chain based on the successful and verifiable completion of activities

(5.11.6.12) Comment

We source almost all palm fatty acid distillate (PFAD) and palm kernel fatty acid (PKFA) from one supplier. We have had no non-compliance. That supplier's No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation Policy, was updated in 2019 to align with globally recognized frameworks such as, United Nations FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance on Tenure, United Nations Global Compact, International Labour Organization, and RSPO guidance on peat and the integrated HCV-HCSA assessments for new plantings conventions. The Company requires its supplier follow its Global Operations Guiding Principles which encompasses the Company's Palm Oil Sustainability Sourcing Commitment. The Guiding Principles were developed based on the principles of internationally recognized human rights and labor conditions and reflect our commitment to sustainable operations. They are substantially aligned with the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, the International Labor Organization's 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the Labor Principles of the United Nations Global Compact. They are also substantially aligned with the Ethical Trading Initiative Base Code. The Employment Standards within the Guiding Principles provide that "employees must be employed of their own free will," suppliers are not permitted to utilize "forced labor in any form," may not utilize corporal punishment as a form of discipline, and must pay employees wages required by law.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection
☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers
☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts on 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:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

We have engaged with suppliers associated with products sold to our largest customer in direct response to our customer's inquiry regarding profiles of select products. Data collected includes identifying those suppliers who publicly disclose their GHG data as well as select data points on product GHG intensity. We conducted supplier education sessions during 2022 to introduce our science-based target and discuss supplier engagement. In 2023 and 2024 we requested climate-related data from key suppliers through the CDP supply chain network. We estimate the 2024 engagement represents 58% of Scope 3 C1 domestic supplier emissions. Data obtained in 2024 further developed and improved our supplier engagement program which was expanded to ~200 suppliers in 2025 representing 80% of our Scope 3 C1 emissions globally. 2025 response data is currently being collected. Engagement consisted primarily of data gathering; success is measured by the number of suppliers providing positive responses (reporting absolute GHG emissions data, GHG intensity data and/or GHG reduction initiatives and data). As part of our SBT commitment, via expanded participation in the CDP supply chain network in the years of our target period, we will work to improve our understanding of supplier emissions and support their reduction strategies to reduce our Scope 3 emissions.

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

Select from:

☑ No

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Palm oil

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Other innovation and collaboration activity, please specify :RSPO

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

We source almost all of our palm oil derivatives from one supplier. That supplier has had in place since 2013 its No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation Policy, which was updated in 2019 to better align with globally recognized frameworks such as, United Nations FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance on Tenure, United Nations Global Compact, International Labour Organization, and RSPO guidance on peat and the integrated HCV-HCSA assessments for new plantings conventions. The Company requires that its primary supplier follow its Global Operations Guiding Principles which encompasses the Company's Palm Oil Sustainability Sourcing Commitment. The Guiding Principles were developed based on the principles of internationally recognized human rights and labor conditions and reflect our commitment to sustainable operations. They are substantially aligned with the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, the International Labor Organization's 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the Labor Principles of the United Nations Global Compact. They are also substantially aligned with the Ethical Trading Initiative Base Code. The Employment Standards within the Guiding Principles provide that "employees must be

employed of their own free will," suppliers are not permitted to utilize "forced labor in any form," may not utilize corporal punishment as a form of discipline, and must pay employees wages required by law.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Palm Oil RSPO supplier compliance

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Information collection

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect water quantity information at least annually from suppliers (e.g., withdrawal and discharge volumes)

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts on 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:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

We have engaged with suppliers associated with products sold to our largest customer in direct response to our customer's inquiry regarding profiles of select products. Data collected includes identifying those suppliers who publicly disclose their water use information as well as select data points on product water intensity. We conducted supplier education sessions during 2022 to introduce our science-based target and discuss supplier engagement. In 2023 we requested water-related data from key suppliers through the CDP supply chain network and expanded the number of suppliers engaged in 2024. Data obtained in 2024 will further develop and improve our supplier engagement program. Engagement consisted primarily of data gathering; success is measured by the number of suppliers providing positive responses (water use, intensity or management program information). We assume all suppliers have a significant impact/dependency on water. In future we will work to improve our understanding of supplier water use and strategies for reducing water in our value chain through expanded participation in the CDP supply chain network.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

[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:

☑ 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:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

We generate our publicly available annual Corporate Sustainability Report to share with our investors and shareholders our initiatives and progress related to climate change. We are assuming we are able to engage 76-99% of interested investors and shareholders as our disclosures are publicly available but may not be read by 100%. None of our investor/shareholders would be considered directly associated with our scope 3 emissions.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Investors and shareholders understand and continue to support the company, including our climate change related efforts.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

We generate our annual publicly available Corporate Sustainability Report to share with our investors and shareholders our initiatives and progress related to forest related issues, specifically our responsible sourcing and palm oil derivative procurement programs. We are assuming we are able to engage 76-99% of interested investors and shareholders as our disclosures are publicly available but may not be read by 100%.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Investors and shareholders understand and continue to support the company, including our responsible sourcing and palm oil derivative management activities.

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:

☑ 76-99%

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

We generate our annual Corporate Sustainability Report to share with our investors and shareholders our initiatives and progress related to water management. We are assuming we are able to engage 76-99% of interested investors and shareholders as our disclosures are publicly available but may not be read by 100%

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Investors and shareholders understand and continue to support the company, including our water and water security management activities.

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Estimated range for % of stakeholder type engaged represents those customers that engage us directly through CDP Supply Chain, but the actual % of customers we engage with via other methods is likely considerably higher, but not calculated. We directly engage with Walmart's project gigaton related to carbon reductions. We also engage via direct or indirect surveys on our sustainability and carbon efforts through individual customer or broader ESG surveys such as Thesis. We frequently engage the majority of our customers on an individual basis through marketing and sales with respect to products with an improved sustainability footprint. Lastly we communicate our overall sustainability initiatives and performance through our publicly available Corporate Sustainability Report. We assume all downstream Scope 3 emissions could be associated with our customers and their processing, use, and ultimately the industrial or retail sale, use and disposal of our products. These represent <25% of our estimated Scope 3 emissions.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We are able to communicate our sustainability efforts and achievements and receive feedback on aligning with customer expectations. By aligning our efforts with those expectations, not only do we operate a more sustainable company, we maintain reputation with our customers and continue to have opportunities to increase product sales, and ultimately engage with the product consumers.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Estimated range for % of stakeholder type engaged represents those customers that engage us directly through CDP Supply chain, but the actual % of customers we engage with via other methods is likely considerably higher but not calculated. We also engage via direct or indirect surveys on our sustainability efforts through individual customer or broader ESG surveys such as Thesis. We frequently engage the majority of our customers on a individual basis through marketing and sales with respect to products with an improved sustainability footprint. Lastly we communicate our overall sustainability initiatives and performance through our publicly available Corporate Sustainability Report.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We are able to communicate our sustainability efforts and achievements, receive feedback on aligning with customer expectations. By aligning our efforts with those expectations, not only do we operate a more sustainable company, we maintain reputation with our customers and continue to have opportunities to increase product sales, and ultimately engage with the product consumers.
[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

Logistical change

☑ Other logistical change, please specify :Coordinate low emission transportation project

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

Walmart is a major customer representing notable amount of C&D downstream delivery as well as customer pick up for transportation of products. An effort to prioritize lower emission transportation methods could reduce our relative Scope 3 emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction in our downstream scope 3 and customer upstream scope 3 transportation emissions

(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:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

At this time potential savings cannot be calculated, although we estimate our downstream transportation and Walmart upstream transportation emissions related to our operations to be approximately 60,000 MT CO2e

Row 2

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Logistical change

☑ Other logistical change, please specify :Coordinate low emission transportation project

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

Target is a major customer representing notable amount of C&D downstream delivery as well as customer pick up for transportation of products. An effort to prioritize lower emission transportation methods could reduce our relative Scope 3 emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction in our downstream scope 3 and customer upstream scope 3 transportation emissions

(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:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

At this time potential savings cannot be calculated, although we estimate our downstream transportation and Target upstream transportation emissions related to our operations to be approximately 15,000 MT CO2e
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(5.13.1) Specify the CDP Supply Chain members that have prompted your implementation of mutually beneficial environmental initiatives and provide information on the initiatives.

Row 1

(5.13.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.13.1.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(5.13.1.4) Initiative ID

Select from:

☑ Ini1

(5.13.1.5) Initiative category and type

Relationship sustainability assessment

☑ Align goals to feed into customers targets and ambitions

(5.13.1.6) Details of initiative

Church & Dwight participate in Walmart Project Gigaton whereby a portion of any annual GHG reduction is allocated to Walmart's Project Gigaton.

(5.13.1.7) Benefits achieved

Select all that apply

☑ Increased transparency of upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

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

(5.13.1.8) Are you able to provide figures for emissions savings or water savings in the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ Yes, emissions savings only

(5.13.1.9) Estimated savings in the reporting year in metric tons of CO2e

84000

(5.13.1.11) Please explain how success for this initiative is measured

As we progress on our carbon reduction efforts we are able to share that reduction specific to this customer in direct support of their targets and objectives. We complete the Project Gigaton portal for company wide activity. The portal calculates the equivalent CO2e reductions and we apply a % reduction to the calculated total equal to the % of our total CHD sales to Walmart. The value presented here is rounded to the nearest thousand.

(5.13.1.12) Would you be happy for CDP Supply Chain members to highlight this work in their external communication?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*We have selected operational control as our consolidation approach because it aligns with our financial accounting approach.*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*We have selected operational control as our consolidation approach because it aligns with our financial accounting approach.*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*We have selected operational control as our consolidation approach because it aligns with our financial accounting approach.*
Plastics	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*We have selected operational control as our consolidation approach because it aligns with our financial accounting approach.*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*We have selected operational control as our consolidation approach because it aligns with our financial accounting 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?

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ No, but we have discovered significant errors in our previous response(s)

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

In the reporting year, CHD discovered an error in methane calculation for an on-site landfill. This error was inherent in the initial calculation spreadsheet back to 2014. The error resulted in an approximate 90% overestimate in the annual methane emissions from our on-site industrial landfill. The corrected emission calculation has been applied to this year and all historical LF methane estimates.
[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:
☑ No, because we do not have the data yet and plan to recalculate next year

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

CHD has defined an error is materially misleading if its value exceeds 5 percent of the total inventory for the part of the organization being verified. While we recognize the impact of the LF methane calculation may exceed this threshold, we plan to revisit cumulative impacts from miscellaneous smaller changes in our operations and do one recalculation of our 2020 base year in next year's reporting.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:
☑ No
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

We track total Scope 2 location based CO2e associated with kwh electricity purchase and tons steam purchase. We also track market-based Scope 2 emissions as reduced through our Renewable Energy Credit purchases under our carbon neutral by 2025 target and our net carbon reduction SBT.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2016

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

81240

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Based on progress since 2013, our base year was reset to 2016 in CY 2017. Scope 1 includes direct on site combustion at Church & Dwight operated locations, as well as process CO2 losses, onsite landfill emissions, and refrigerant losses where applicable to a specific location.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2016

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

84051.64

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Based on progress since 2013, our base year was reset to 2016 in CY 2017. Scope 2 emissions are associated with electricity purchases for Church & Dwight operated locations. One of our sites also utilizes purchased steam, which is included in Scope 2 emission calculations. The base year Scope 2 shown here is revised to accommodate an incorrect eGrid location emission factor that was discovered in 2022.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18082

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Information is not available to calculate market-based Scope 2 emissions for 2016, which is the base year for our emissions inventory and targets. 2017 was the first year in which we were able to calculate market-based Scope 2 emissions.

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)

1650900

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A hybrid approach was used to estimate emissions from purchased goods and services. Supplier CDP reports for Scope 1, 2, and upstream Scope 3 emissions were utilized to develop a per revenue emission factor for the supplier. Emissions from these suppliers were calculated using supplier specific emission factor and Church & Dwight's FY2019 spend amount for the supplier. LCA data from baking soda was utilized to estimate emissions for soda ash. For suppliers that did not report any or enough data to CDP to develop emissions factors, an Environmental Economic Input Output (EEIO) calculator was used to estimate emissions from purchased goods and services. The purchased good or service was classified based on the supplier industry. Following classification, the spend-based EIO emission factor was applied to each of C&D's top 90% of suppliers (by spend) to calculate total emissions. The remaining 10% of FY2019 spend was assumed to be categorically proportional to the top 90% of suppliers. We used the percentage spend of each category in the top 90% of suppliers and applied those categorizations to the remaining 10% to estimate emissions using the spend based emission factors from the EEIO. Spend data was not provided for all regions where C&D operates, and therefore, revenues per region were used as a proxy to estimate emissions for the remaining areas. Spend and emissions associated with the U.S. and Australia are sourced from provided data from C&D. Spend and associated emissions for the regions without data is estimated from the percent breakdown of total net sales. This approach inherently assumes the same proportional sector breakdown of the categorized and uncategorized spend. Emissions from purchased goods and services account for 75.44% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance. Starting with our Scope 3 inventory update in 2022, we decided to combine capital goods spending with other purchased goods and services. Therefore, we are restating Category 1 here as the sum of Categories 1 and 2 calculated for 2019 (1,637,260 + 13,640).

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A spend-based approach was used to estimate emissions from purchased goods and services. An Environmental Economic Input Output (EEIO) calculator was used to estimate emissions from capital goods. The spend data classified by asset class for FY2019 capital projects. These asset classes were categorized into EEIO broad and detailed sectors to calculate emissions. Following classification, the spend-based EIO emission factor was applied to each asset class to estimate associated emissions. Emissions from capital goods accounted for 0.63% of our Scope 3 inventory (13,640 metric tons), and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance. Starting with our Scope 3 inventory update in 2022, we decided to combine capital goods spending with other purchased goods and services. Therefore, we are restating Category 2 here as zero and including the calculated emissions from capital goods together with Category 1 purchased goods and services.

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)

19869

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The fuel and energy related activities evaluated include: upstream emissions from the fuel C&D uses during its operations, upstream emissions from the electricity C&D uses in its operations, as well as transmission and distribution losses from electricity consumed in FY2019. The specific methodology for these activities is as follows: 1. Upstream emissions from the use of fuels such as Natural Gas, Diesel, Fuel Oil, Gasoline, and Propane. - This evaluated the upstream well to tank emissions from fuels that C&D consumes during its operations. C&D tracks the amount of each of these fuels consumed during operations. An additional amount of natural gas was estimated at 8 sales offices. Total fuel is then multiplied by well to tank emission factors for each fuel, which are sourced from the US DoE Argonne Lab GREET Tool and UK DEFRA. 2. Upstream emissions from purchased electricity usage, steam, heating and cooling. - This evaluated the upstream well to "tank" emissions for C&D's electricity operations. C&D tracks the amount of electricity used during operations. Additional electricity use was estimated for the 8 sales offices based on Church & Dwight provided square footage and energy intensity factors. Total electricity use at each C&D facility is multiplied by UK DEFRA upstream electricity emission factors (g/kWh). 3. Emissions from transmission and distribution losses. - This evaluated the emissions from transmission and distribution losses of the electricity C&D consumes during its operations. Transmission and distribution loss percentages were sourced from EPA eGRID for US locations and The World Bank Open Data for all international locations. Electricity emission factors from eGrid and IEA were used to determine the specific location-based emissions from

transmission and distribution losses for FY2019. This calculation used AR4 GWP's. Emissions from fuel-and-energy-related activities accounted for 0.92% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

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)

309126

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A distance-based approached was used to estimate emissions from upstream transportation and distribution. C&D tracks the mass, distance, and mode of transportation for shipments in North America (US and Canada, and into a distribution center in Mexico). Mileage, freight haulage, or fuel use, data were also gathered for marine and air shipping as well as international product distribution in Australia and United Kingdom, with extrapolations made based on % sales for product distribution in any other regions. Emissions factors from EPA Climate Leaders "Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories" are applied to truck and rail transportation. Emissions factors from UK Defra are applied to air and marine transportation. The value presented here estimates global total for transportation associated with our operations based on FY2019 data. For our data verification presented in Section C10 only the emissions for transport of finished products to first point of customer contact in North America (US and Canada, and to a distribution center in Mexico) is included in the verification. The verified amount in FY2019 for the transport of finished products to first point of customer contact in US and Canada, and to a distribution center in Mexico was 207,989 tonnes. Emissions from upstream transportation and distribution accounted for 14.24% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

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)

12850.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

CHD collects data on the volume of waste generated in our facilities annually. This data is tracked by waste type and material. The quantity of waste generated as well as waste destination was collected for FY2020 and then converted to GHG emissions using emission factors from the EPA's Center for Corporate Climate Leadership. This calculation used AR4 GWP's. Emissions from waste generated in operations accounted for 0.59% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6424.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

All emissions from air travel, rental cars, and hotel stays are provided directly from our travel provider, Direct Travel. Direct Travel provides quarterly summaries of business travel CO2 emissions. For FY2019, as with previous years, only business air travel is included in the data verification as presented in Section C10 (5,903 Tonnes CO2e for 2019). Emissions from business travel accounted for 0.30% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7521.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In FY2019, C&D had about 4,829 total full time equivalent employees globally. Employee commuting emissions were estimated by using commute mode breakdown, commute time and mileage and appropriate emission factors. Commute mode breakdown and commute time were sourced from the US census, UK National Travel Survey, Canadian Census, Australian Census, and the Singapore Department of Statistics. For India, national news sources were used. For China, Sao Paulo,

Mexico City, and Paris transportation studies from Deloitte were used. Regional-based assumptions were made for additional locations where direct data could not be obtained. The average miles by type of transportation (passenger car, public transit, carpooling, motorcycle and active transport) was estimated using average commute distance and time by city, region or country, utilizing the aforementioned data sources. Then, based on commute mode breakdown from census data and number of employees at each office, the total number of miles for each mode at a given office was estimated. This information was converted into GHG emission using emission factors from US EPA and UK DEFRA. These calculations utilize AR4 GWPs. Emissions from employee commuting accounted for 0.35% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not have any upstream leased assets, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with upstream leased assets are zero (0).

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

C&D accounts for all transportation and distribution activities in Category 4.

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)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

C&D does not sell any products that require further processing, transformation, or inclusion in another product before use, and therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with processing of sold products are zero (0).

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)

649

(7.5.3) Methodological details

C&D tracks consumer product sales data, and average prices and quantities sold were used to estimate the total quantity of items sold. Product warranty and specifications were used to determine average energy use per year as well as the lifetime of the product. Average electricity emissions intensity were then used based on the location of sale to determine total emissions. Reported emissions are representative of energy use and associated emissions directly connected to the use of the sold product. C&D also has product offerings that result in secondary, or indirect energy use and emissions resulting from accompanying activities, which are not included in this calculation. Emissions from use of sold products accounted for 0.03% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

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)

143727.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

C&D products are packaged in paper and plastic packaging. Emissions from end of life treatment were estimated for baking soda and laundry detergent packaging based on LCA end of life treatment results. Emissions from end of life treatment for plastic packaging and Church & Dwight products (except laundry detergent and baking soda) are not included, indicating this total is greater than reported. As additional LCA end of life treatment results become available for more Church & Dwight products, we will better refine this estimate. Emissions from end of life treatment account for 6.62% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

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

C&D does not have any downstream leased assets, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with downstream leased assets are zero (0).

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

C&D does not have any franchises, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with franchises are zero (0).

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19220

(7.5.3) Methodological details

C&D owns two joint ventures. Emissions from the joint ventures were estimated using the FY2019 revenue/net sales for each and applying an EEIO emission factors.

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

C&D does not have any other upstream emissions, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with other (upstream) are zero (0).

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(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

C&D does not have any other downstream emissions, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with other (downstream) are zero (0).
[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)

71085

(7.6.3) Methodological details

GHG Scope 1 calculations are performed by Sphera Cloud Corporate Sustainability platform. Activity data is fed into SCCS and emission factors from the most recent SCCS library updates are applied to the activity data to calculate emissions. With the provided data for fuel consumption, the following methodology was used to estimate GHG emissions arising from stationary and mobile combustion: CO2 equivalent (CO2e) Fuel consumption (provided in gallons, therms, pounds, million British thermal units, and standard cubic feet) x Emission factor. CHD calculated CO2e emissions for the following: natural gas, diesel, fuel oil, gasoline and propane. Refrigerants tracked and calculated include R-11, R-22, R-134a, R410a, R143a, R407C, R507A, R404a, R427A, R401, R421a, R417c, R414b. CO2 equivalent (CO2e) Mass of Refrigerant x DEFRA Emission Factor. The production of SBC contributes to CO2 losses through the reaction of soda ash, water, and CO2. CO2 equivalent (CO2e) SBC Production (mass amount) x Actual CO2 stoichiometric conversion. CHD tracks solid waste sent to owned and operated industrial landfill to calculate methane generation. CO2 equivalent (CO2e) = Solid Waste (mass amount) x USEPA Industrial Landfill (40 CFR Part 98: GHG Reporting Subsection TT) CH4 emission factor x DEFRA Emission factor. In addition, C&D manually calculated the emissions from sales offices. Natural gas consumption from the sales offices is estimated using energy intensity factors for office buildings from the US EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey and multiplied by the relevant emission factor in the SCCS library.
[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)

62761

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

16758

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions for CHD include emissions from purchased electricity and purchased steam. CHD deducts electricity generation from site use before calculating Scope 2 emissions. Location-Based Method CHD employs the eGRID emission factors for US locations and IEA for international locations. CHD uses SCCS which applies the total kWh electricity purchased to the appropriate emission factor from the SCCS library. CO2 equivalent (CO2e) Electricity Purchased (kWh) x eGRID or IEA Emission Factor Market-Based Method. In addition, C&D manually calculates the emissions from sales offices. Electricity consumption from the sales offices is estimated using energy intensity factors for office buildings from the US EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey and multiplied by the relevant emission factors in the SCCS library. In the market-based methodology, emissions from all facilities should be estimated in accordance with the GHG Protocol’s Scope 2 Guidance. Where a facility does not have a contractual instrument, a location-based emission factor may be utilized. To estimate emissions using the market-based method, activity data should be collected by electricity supplier. CHD uses the market-based method to calculate Scope 2 emissions via tracking Renewable Energy Credits under the CHD carbon neutral by 2025 target and net carbon reduction SBT. CO2 equivalent (CO2e) [Electricity Purchased (kWh) – Amount of REC Delivered by Utility (kWh)] x Emission Factor.
[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)

1353594

(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

Products include both goods (tangible products) and services (intangible products), representing both direct and indirect spend. Raw data files provided by CHD and included total spend and spend type. Raw data are speciated by geographic location, brand, and/or division. Geographic locations include North America (NA), United Kingdom (UK), Australia, China, and Mexico. Contract manufacturing (CM), our Specialty Products Division, and Waterpik are brands/divisions providing separate data sets for procurement spending within CHD. Emissions were calculated using US EEIO emission factors US Environmentally Extended Input-Output (USEEIO) Models for the US EPA, updated April 21, 2022. Emission factors are applied based on spend type via a supply chain commodity category, and data availability. Historical classifications of vendors and spend type were used as applicable. New vendors were assigned based on largest spend of one material (ex. Cactus: largest spend was "Box", therefore it was mapped to cardboard containers). USEEIO uses AR5 global warming factors. Spend type captured by other categories was excluded from calculations (ex. rail freight was classified as transportation and assumed to be captured in Category 4). Inflation and currency conversions are applied to convert raw spend currency to United States Dollars (USD) as applicable, and to convert the raw spend currency from 2024 USD to 2018 USD to match the USEEIO emission factor data. Inflation adjustments are sourced from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and currency conversions from the IRS. Any negative spend was netted into the calculation. GHG emissions are calculated via the following methodology.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

It was not practical to separate out procurement data for purchased goods and services versus capital goods. Therefore, emissions from capital goods are included within the value presented for Category 1: purchased goods and services, and are not independently reported.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

24173

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ 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

The fuel and energy related activities evaluated include: upstream emissions from the fuel CHD uses during its operations, upstream emissions from the electricity CHD uses in its operations, as well as transmission and distribution losses from electricity consumed in 2024. The specific methodology for these activities is as follows: 1. Upstream emissions from the use of fuels such as Natural Gas, Diesel, Fuel Oil, Gasoline, and Propane. - This evaluated the upstream well to tank emissions from fuels that CHD consumes during its operations. CHD tracks the amount of each of these fuels consumed during operations. An additional amount of natural gas was estimated at 13 sales offices. Total fuel is then multiplied by well to tank emission factors for each fuel, which are sourced from the US EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories and UK DEFRA. 2. Upstream emissions from purchased electricity usage, steam, heating and cooling. - This evaluated the upstream well to "tank" emissions for CHD's electricity operations. CHD tracks the amount of electricity used during operations. Additional electricity use was estimated for the 13 sales offices based on Church & Dwight provided square footage and energy intensity factors. Total electricity use at each CHD facility is multiplied by UK DEFRA upstream emission factors to find emissions from upstream electricity generation. 3. Emissions from transmission and distribution losses. - This evaluated the emissions from transmission and distribution losses of the electricity CHD consumes during its operations. Transmission and distribution loss

percentages were sourced from the IEA provided through CHD's Sphera database and electricity emission factors are sourced from EPA eGRID for US locations, and IEA 2024 emission factor database for all international locations.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

246919

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

☑ Other, please specify :Supplier pre-calculated

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

2.51

(7.8.5) Please explain

A distance-based approached was mainly used to calculate emissions from upstream transportation and distribution. CHD tracks the mass, distance, and mode of transportation for shipments. This includes both shipments inbound to CHD's operations, as well as outbound transport that CHD pays for. CHD has a subset of customers who pay for the transport of their own goods, which was removed from this calculation and included in category 9. Emission factors are sourced from the EPA and UK DEFRA and applied to the total weight-distance by each mode. CHD also receives some data in the form of pre-calculated emissions, fuel based data, and spend based data. The fuel based applies emission factors from UK DEFRA and spend based data applies EEIO emission factors to be incorporated.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

11418

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

CHD collects data on the amount of waste generated in our facilities annually. This data is tracked by waste type/material, destination, and weight. Waste types are then matched with the specific types outlined in the EPA's GHG Emissions Hub to calculate associated emissions from generated waste. Emissions generated from waste for CHD operations are calculated using waste tonnage data for the calendar year. The operations being accounted for in this category are landfill waste, recycled waste, combusted waste, composted waste, and transported waste. CHD receives reports containing waste tonnage per type of waste (i.e. electronic waste, metal waste, organic waste, glass waste, mixed plastics waste, etc.) as well as corresponding destination (i.e. landfilled, recycling). The categorized waste data is then applied to the corresponding emission factor from the US EPA GHG Emissions. Emission factors do not include any avoided emissions. The CO2e factors from the US EPA GHG Emissions Factors Hub use AR4 GWPs. Emissions from waste generated in operations accounted for about 0.5% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

7964

(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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions for CHD from business travel are provided by CHD and sourced directly from reports provided by CHD's travel provider, Direct Travel. Direct Travel only includes US travel. International impacts are extrapolated using US per-employee intensity and total international employee numbers. Direct Travel summaries only include CO2 emissions, and not those from other GHGs. Because CO2 comprises the large majority of GHG emissions measured in CO2e, the reported emissions are assumed to be a sufficient approximation for this category, given overall materiality. Emissions from business travel accounted for 0.4% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

8391

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Employee commuting emissions were estimated by using commute mode breakdown, commute time and mileage and corresponding emission factors. Commute mode breakdown and commute time were sourced from the US census, UK National Travel Survey, Canadian Census, Australian Census, and the Singapore Department of Statistics. For India, national news sources were used. For China, Sao Paulo, Mexico City, and Paris, transportation studies from Deloitte were used. Regional-based assumptions were made for additional locations where direct data could not be obtained. The average miles by type of transportation (passenger car, public transit, carpooling, motorcycle and active transport) was estimated using average commute distance and time by city, region or country, utilizing the aforementioned data sources. Then, based on commute mode breakdown from census data and number of employees at each office, the total number of miles for each mode at a given office was estimated. This information was converted into GHG emission using emission factors from US EPA and UK DEFRA. Emissions from employee commuting accounted for about 0.4% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

CHD does not have any upstream leased assets, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with upstream leased assets are zero (0).

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

75022

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes emissions that occurred in the calendar year from transportation and distribution of sold products in vehicles such as vans, trucks, and trains. Raw data files for this category indicated weight, distance, and mode of transportation. Assumptions were employed when specific data was unavailable; historical data was used in place of raw data for average distance by mode of transport. Additionally, transport classified as intermodal was assumed to be rail, while transport classified as road was assumed to be truck, for the purposes of GHG calculation. Data marked as "collect" or "pickup" were assumed to be paid for customers and are included in this category. Weight, mode of transportation, and the distance are used to calculate short-ton miles. Emissions are calculated using US EPA Emissions Factors Hub and UK DEFRA and AR5 impacts. Emissions from downstream transportation and distribution accounted for about 3.7% of our Scope 3 inventory.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

143178

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Direct CO2 process emissions from sodium bicarbonate processing

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

One of CHD's primary consumer and industrial products is baking soda, or sodium bicarbonate. When processed or used in certain settings (e.g., the presence of heat, water, acid, etc.), sodium bicarbonate evolves to CO2. These process CO2 emissions from sodium bicarbonate processing are captured within this category. CHD sells sodium bicarbonate to a large number of customers through our Specialty Products Division (SPD) and Consumer Product business lines. Based on the customer of the sodium bicarbonate, sales quantity (by product number and/or mass) were delineated between either being relevant to category 10 (processed) or category 11 (used), based on how the customer was using the sodium bicarbonate, and whether it was processed or transformed in a subsequent process, or utilized as an end use. After this delineation, process CO2 emissions associated with the processing of sodium bicarbonate were calculated based on the mass of sodium bicarbonate sold in the reporting period, assumed end use (e.g., deodorizer, baking, swimming pools, etc.), and CHD's LCA results, which provide a CO2e factor per functional unit of product sold. A current exclusion from this category are the emissions associated with the energy that is required in certain applications for processing of sodium bicarbonate. For example, in certain processes, heat is added, which contributes to the evolution of sodium bicarbonate to CO2. Due to a lack of appropriate information, the indirect emissions associated with this heating are not currently included in this calculation, but may be something that CHD can quantify in the future. Emissions from processing of sold products accounted for about 7% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

66090

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :1. Direct CO2 process emissions from sodium bicarbonate end use 2. Products that directly consume energy (electricity) during use

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

CHD calculates direct use phase emissions from (1) process CO2 emissions associated with sodium bicarbonate and (2) energy-related emissions from products that directly consume electricity. One of CHD's primary consumer product bands is baking soda, or sodium bicarbonate. When processed or used in certain settings (e.g., the presence of heat, water, acid etc.), sodium bicarbonate evolves to CO2. These CO2 emissions from sodium bicarbonate use are captured within this category. CHD sells sodium bicarbonate to a large number of customers through our Specialty Products Division (SPD) and Consumer Product business lines. Based on the customer of the sodium bicarbonate, sales quantity (by product number and/or mass) were delineated between either being relevant to category 10 or category 11, based on how the customer was using the sodium bicarbonate, and whether it was processed or transformed in a subsequent process, or utilized as an end use. After this delineation, process CO2 emissions associated with the use of sodium bicarbonate were calculated based on the mass of sodium bicarbonate sold in the reporting period, assumed end use (e.g., deodorizer, baking, swimming pools, etc.), and CHD's LCA results, which provide a CO2e factor per functional unit of product sold. CHD also tracks consumer product sales data, including actual and estimated quantities sold. This data was used to determine the number of products that CHD sells that directly consume electricity during the use phase, and where these products were sold. Product warranty and specifications were used to determine average energy use per year as well as the lifetime of the product. Average electricity emissions intensity were then used based on the location of sale to determine total emissions. Reported emissions are representative of energy use and associated emissions directly connected to the use of the sold product. CHD also has product offerings that result in secondary, or indirect energy use and emissions resulting from accompanying activities, which are not included in this calculation. Emissions from use of sold products accounted for about 3.3% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

91675

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions are calculated based on the disposal of both CHD product packaging CHD product that are not consumed in use and ultimately disposed. CHD has datasets related to the amount, by quantity sold, of products sold, as well as the weight of packaging associated with the products sold. For packaging, CHD also provided assumptions around the waste destination. Based on this information, and reviewing CHD's sold products to determine which would be disposed of, products and packaging were classified based on waste type and waste destination, and then matched to corresponding emission factors sourced from the EPA's GHG Emissions Factor Hub to determine total emissions. Emissions from end of life treatment accounted for about 4.5% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

CHD does not have any downstream leased assets, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with downstream leased assets are zero (0).

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

CHD does not have any franchises, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with franchises are zero (0).

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

1650

(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

CHD is an owner in two joint ventures. Emissions from the joint ventures were estimated using the 2024 net sales for each and applying a corresponding EEIO emission factor sourced from the US EPA. Emissions from investments accounted for 0.1% of our Scope 3 inventory, and are therefore considered not relevant. A threshold of 1% of total Scope 3 emissions is used to determine relevance

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

CHD does not have any other upstream emissions, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with other (upstream) are zero (0).

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

CHD does not have any other downstream emissions, therefore Scope 3 GHG emissions associated with other (downstream) are zero (0).
[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

SGS_GHGEV_USESG_000365_EN.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

SGS Independent Assurance Statement to Church & Dwight Co., Inc., 3 pages

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

SGS_GHGEV_USESG_000365_EN.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

SGS Independent Assurance Statement to Church & Dwight Co., Inc., 3 pages

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

SGS_GHGEV_USESG_000365_EN.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Franchises
☑ Scope 3: Investments
☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
☑ Scope 3: Business travel
☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Upstream leased assets
☑ Scope 3: Downstream leased assets
☑ Scope 3: Processing of sold products
☑ 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

SGS_GHGEV_USESG_000365_EN.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

SGS Independent Assurance Statement to Church & Dwight Co., Inc., 3 pages

(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)

136

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

This represents the emissions reduction due to the delta in generated electricity and increased RECs purchased in 2024. A second facility with larger solar capacity came online in 2024. 283 MWH additional electricity generated in 2024. A total of 162 MWH additional RECs were claimed against emissions in 2024. Total new renewable MWH (445) x Avg CO2e/MWH (0.3049) = 232.64 MT CO2e. 0.1% of our 2023 Scope 1/2 emissions reported in our 2024 CDP filing.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

692

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.4

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Estimated sum of GHG reductions associated with energy/GHG reduction projects in 2024. 0.4% of our 2023 Scope 1/2 emissions reported in our 2024 CDP filing.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

212

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

This represents difference in S1 + S2 20024 emissions associated with facility that was closed in March 2024 vs CY2023 S1 + S2 emissions associated with that facility. 0.1% of our 2023 Scope 1/2 emissions reported in our 2024 CDP filing.

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

No acqusitions

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No mergers

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

800

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

A 0.5% CO2e reduction estimate associated with approximately 0.5% reduction in company energy use for production in 2024 is partially offset by increased fugitive CO2 losses associated with increased bicarbonate production. 0.5% of our 2023 Scope 1/2 emissions reported in our 2024 CDP filing.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

14.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Discovered a calculation error in our methane estimate spreadsheet for our onsite landfill. 40 CFR 98 Subpart TT Industrial Waste Landfill Equation TT-1 Formula was incorrectly entered. Corrected CH4 emissions are much lower. Calculation here represents "old" MT CH4 estimate from 2024 minus "corrected" MT CH4

estimate for 2024 x 28 (CH4 GWP EF). Note that this correction is being applied to all historic data. Revised base year calculations will be prepared for next year's CDP submittal. 14.9% of our 2023 Scope 1/2 emissions reported in our 2024 CDP filing.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change

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

No change

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4500

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Sum of CO2e for increased HVAC incidents with refrigerant loss (mass refrigerant x refrigerant GWP). 2.9% of our 2023 Scope 1/2 emissions reported in our 2024 CDP filing.
[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:
☑ Location-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)

64499

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

1769

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

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

2.73

(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:

☑ HFCs

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

4720

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 5

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :R-22 Losses

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

75.6

(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.

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

24.6

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

0

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1157

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

84.9

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

0

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.47

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

99.9

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

0

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

25.8

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

20.2

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

0

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

13.5

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

0

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

10

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

0

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

14.3

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

0

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100

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

4.98

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

0

Panama

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

5.21

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

0

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.15

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

16.2

(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)

956

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

979

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

0

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

68835

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

61488

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

16758
[Fixed row]

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply
☑ By facility

(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Colonial Heights, VA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3654

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

37.300275

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-77.38453

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Fort Collins, CO

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

290

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.568755

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-105.045696

Row 3

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Green River, WY

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11453

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.528576

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-109.466246

Row 4

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Harrisonville, MO

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1434

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

38.637745

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-94.364919

Row 5

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Revel, France

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.87

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

43.455202

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

1.986685

Row 6

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Lakewood, NJ

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3526

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.061226

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-74.180716

Row 7

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Madera, CA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16.3

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

36.922327

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-119.980045

Row 8

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Mason City (SC), IA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

805

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

43.142395

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-93.191071

Row 9

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Mason City (SB), IA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2724

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

43.140114

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-93.228806

Row 10

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Old Fort, OH

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

25796

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.240462

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.118106

Row 11

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Fostoria, OH

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

911

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.183339

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.412164

Row 12

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Oskaloosa, IA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1809

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.269816

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-92.609913

Row 13

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Vancouver, WA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8177

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

45.640316

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-122.606101

Row 14

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Victorville, CA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

235

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

34.486607

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-117.286789

Row 15

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Waukesha, WI

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

44.5

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

43.04038

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-88.201007

Row 16

(7.17.2.1) Facility

York, PA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5710

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

39.935971

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-76.850081

Row 17

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ewing, NJ

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

82.6

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.286898

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-74.78707

Row 18

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Princeton, NJ

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1390

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.37028

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-74.65495

Row 19

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Montreal, Canada

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

823

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

45.494145

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-73.662445

Row 20

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Mississauga, Canada

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

335

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

43.660191

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-79.698303

Row 21

(7.17.2.1) Facility

New Plymouth, NZ

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

43.661646

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-79.696969

Row 22

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Folkestone, UK

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

950

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

51.086832

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

1.197207

Row 23

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ridgefield, WA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

691

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

45.813952

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-122.688932

Row 24

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Rogers, Arizona

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10.5

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

36.30212

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-94.18853

Row 26

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Target Sales Team

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

44.97927

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-93.27174

Row 27

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Europe - Frankfurt Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

50.11684

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

8.72599

Row 28

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Europe - Perret Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18.9

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.89696

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

2.29585

Row 29

(7.17.2.1) Facility

APAC - Singapore Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.15

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

1.27821

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

103.84753

Row 30

(7.17.2.1) Facility

CHINA - Shanghai Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.32917

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

121.51649

Row 31

(7.17.2.1) Facility

LATAM - Panama Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

8.99345

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-79.51591

Row 32

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Mumbai

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

19.2911

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

74.5735

Row 33

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Rocky Hill R&D/Pilot plant

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

48.2

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.39985

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-74.63943

Row 34

(7.17.2.1) Facility

China - Xiamen

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.47

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

24.59018

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

117.99562

Row 36

(7.17.2.1) Facility

UK London Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5.54

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

51.52607

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-0.12892

Row 37

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Frenchs Forest

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-33.75492

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

151.24819

Row 38

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Mexico City

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

19.4414

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-99.19992

Row 39

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guangzhou

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

23.13279

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

113.33257

Row 40

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Arizona

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.76

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

33.634181

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-111.883326

Row 42

(7.17.2.1) Facility

New Delhi

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

28.2636

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

77.399

Row 43

(7.17.2.1) Facility

New York

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.23

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.720874

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-73.998034

Row 44

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Shenzhen, China

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

22.54554

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

114.0683

Row 45

(7.17.2.1) Facility

West Des Moines, IA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.82

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.590264

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-93.804118
[Add row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply
☑ By facility

(7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Colonial Heights

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

3447

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

0

Row 2

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ft Collins

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

721

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

0

Row 3

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Green River

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

23414

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

16758

Row 4

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Harrisonville

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

4598

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

0

Row 5

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Lakewood

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

2303

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

0

Row 6

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Madera

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

53.7

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

0

Row 7

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Mason City (SC)

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

309

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

0

Row 8

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Mason City (SB)

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

672

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

0

Row 9

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Old Fort

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

11763

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

0

Row 10

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Fostoria

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

403

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

0

Row 11

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Oskaloosa

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

827

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

0

Row 12

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Vancouver

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

2826

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

0

Row 13

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ridgefield

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

766

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

0

Row 14

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Victorville

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

946

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

0

Row 15

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Waukesha

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

136

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

0

Row 16

(7.20.2.1) Facility

York

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

6158

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

0

Row 17

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ewing

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

927

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

0

Row 18

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Princeton

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

1050

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

0

Row 19

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Montreal

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

8.17

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

0

Row 20

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Mississauga

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

76.7

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

0

Row 21

(7.20.2.1) Facility

New Plymouth

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

4.98

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

0

Row 22

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Frenchs Forest

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

24.6

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

0

Row 23

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Revel

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

9.7

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

0

Row 24

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Mexico City

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

14.3

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

0

Row 25

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guangzhou

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

14.2

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

0

Row 26

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Folkestone

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

971

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

0

Row 27

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Arizona

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

18.3

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

0

Row 29

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rogers, Arizona

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

24.7

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

0

Row 30

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Target Sales Team

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

18.9

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

0

Row 31

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Europe - Frankfurt Office

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

13.5

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

0

Row 32

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Europe - Paris Office

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

10.5

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

0

Row 33

(7.20.2.1) Facility

APAC - Singapore Office

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

16.2

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

0

Row 34

(7.20.2.1) Facility

CHINA - Shanghai Office

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

43

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

0

Row 35

(7.20.2.1) Facility

LATAM - Panama Office

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

5.21

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

0

Row 36

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Mumbai

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

6.66

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

0

Row 37

(7.20.2.1) Facility

New Delhi

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

3.35

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

0

Row 39

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rocky Hill R&D/Pilot plant

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

88.9

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

0

Row 40

(7.20.2.1) Facility

China - Xiamen

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

26.6

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

0

Row 41

(7.20.2.1) Facility

UK London Office

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

7.56

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

0

Row 42

(7.20.2.1) Facility

New York

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

10.9

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

0

Row 43

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Shenzhen, China

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

16.1

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

0

Row 44

(7.20.2.1) Facility

West Des Moines, IA

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

5.63

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

0
[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

71085

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

62761

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

16758

(7.22.4) Please explain

Our GHG emissions align with our consolidated accounting

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

No other entities outside Consolidated Accounting Group
[Fixed row]

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

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

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

140419517

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

999

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility fossil fuel consumption emissions; refrigerant losses, process and landfill 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

Sources include all scope 1 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Ahold Delhaize compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 1 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

1828516871

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

13005

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility fossil fuel consumption emissions; refrigerant losses, process and landfill 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

Sources include all scope 1 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Walmart, Inc. compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 1 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

483660769

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3440

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility fossil fuel consumption emissions; refrigerant losses, process and landfill 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

Sources include all scope 1 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Costco Wholesale Corporation compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 1 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

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:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

157170032

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1118

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility fossil fuel consumption emissions; refrigerant losses, process and landfill 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

Sources include all scope 1 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to CVS Health. compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 1 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

630668186

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4485

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility fossil fuel consumption emissions; refrigerant losses, process and landfill 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

Sources include all scope 1 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Target Corporation compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 1 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

24704840

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

176

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility fossil fuel consumption emissions; refrigerant losses, process and landfill 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

Sources include all scope 1 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Loblaw Companies Limited compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 1 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

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:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

14691904

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

104

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility fossil fuel consumption emissions; refrigerant losses, process and landfill 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

Sources include all scope 1 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Empire Company Limited compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 1 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

140419517

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

882

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility electricity consumption.

(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

Sources include all scope 2 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Ahold Delhaize compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 2 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

1828516871

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

11482

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility electricity consumption.

(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

Sources include all scope 2 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Walmart, Inc compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 2 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

483660769

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3037

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility electricity consumption.

(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

Sources include all scope 2 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Costco Wholesale Corporation compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 2 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

157170032

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

987

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility electricity consumption.

(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

Sources include all scope 2 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to CVS Health compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 2 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

630668186

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3960

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility electricity consumption.

(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

Sources include all scope 2 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Target Corporation compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 2 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

24704840

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

155

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility electricity consumption.

(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

Sources include all scope 2 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Loblaw Companies Limited compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 2 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

14691904

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

92

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Operating facility electricity consumption.

(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

Sources include all scope 2 emission sources. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Empire Company Limited compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 2 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

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 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

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

☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

140419517

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

28521

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products.

(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

Sources include all scope 3 emission categories. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Ahold Delhaize compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 3 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 16

(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 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

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

☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

1828516871

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

371393

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products.

(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

Sources include all scope 3 emission categories. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Walmart, Inc. compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 3 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 17

(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 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

483660769

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

98237

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products.

(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

Sources include all scope 3 emission categories. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Costco Wholesale Corporation compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 3 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

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 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

157170032

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

31923

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products.

(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

Sources include all scope 3 emission categories. We calculated the ratio of global sales to CVS Health compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 3 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 19

(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 10: Processing of sold products

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

630668186

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

128096

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products.

(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

Sources include all scope 3 emission categories. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Target Corporation compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 3 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

Row 20

(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 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

24704840

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5018

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products.

(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

Sources include all scope 3 emission categories. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Loblaw Companies Limited compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 3 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data

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 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 10: Processing of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

14691904

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2984

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, and processing of sold products.

(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

Sources include all scope 3 emission categories. We calculated the ratio of global sales to Empire Company Limited compared to our total global revenue, and applied the same proportion to our global Scope 3 emissions. Uncertainty is based on assumed uniform product GHG intensity and distribution to all customers versus actual customer and product mix.

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

Response is based on internal Church & Dwight data
[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

C&D continues to evaluate mechanisms and develop protocols for allocating emissions. Guidance to maintain consistent methodologies with peer companies in the consumer products industry could help address these challenges. Due to the number and variety of products we make and sell determining product specific carbon intensity is too large and complex a process, so we assume a uniform carbon intensity across all products and allocate emission based on $ sales.

Row 2

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

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

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

C&D continues to evaluate mechanisms and develop protocols for allocating emissions. Guidance to maintain consistent methodologies with peer companies in the consumer products industry would help address these challenges. Due to the number and variety of products we make and sell determining product specific carbon intensity and applying that to our large and diverse customer base is too large and complex a process. Without that information, we assume a uniform carbon intensity across all products and allocate emission based on $ sales to each customer.
[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

C&D is continuing to evaluate mechanisms and develop protocols for allocating emissions. We have established science-based GHG reduction targets. A part of this process we will be to better define our Scope 3 emissions estimating, which will better inform our ability to allocate emissions. While we have and continue to establish carbon life cycle analysis for some of our products, which could aid in allocating emissions, the variety, number and diverse nature of our product lines and customers makes it impractical at this time to develop sufficient, adequate LCAs to inform emissions allocation to all customers on a per product basis. As this information is developed it may allow some segmented allocations in the future. C&D plans to review available allocation guidance to maintain consistency with peer companies in the consumer products industry. Until that time, emissions will continue to be allocated based on % total sales.
[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:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

223370

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

223370.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

150962

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0

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

150962.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(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

51409

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

51409.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

296

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

296.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

151258

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

274779

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

426037.00
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No biomass fuels are used.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No biomass fuels are used.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No other renewable fuels were used.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No coal was used.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4878

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

4606

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

272

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Oil consumption in 2024 represents diesel fuel and fuel oil usage. In 2025 we are replacing our remaining dual fired boiler with natural gas fired only. Oil will not be used as a primary fuel.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

218492

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

78415

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

140077

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Gas consumption includes natural gas, propane, and gasoline. Natural gas is our primary fuel used for both heat and steam generation. While we do not track specific use for heat generation vs steam generation we are estimating a 35%/65% split between heating and steam generation for all of our reporting sites. At our sales offices, 100% of the natural gas consumed is used for heat.

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No other non-renewable fuels were used

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

223370

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

83021

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

140349

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Natural gas represents 97% of fuel used for Heating/Steam generation in 2024
[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)

296

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

296

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

296

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

296

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

83021

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

83021

(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)

140349

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

140349

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United 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:

☑ Wind

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

150192

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Green e

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Green e certificates purchased for total of 150,192 MWH from 4 wind projects. Canadian Breaks (TX) (commissioned 2019) Amadeus Wind, LLC (TX) (commissioned 2020) Priddy Wind Project I, LLC (TX) (commissioned 2021) Gopher Creek Wind Farm B (TX) (commissioned 2019) Gopher Creek Wind Farm A (TX) (commissioned 2019)

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

5497

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Green e REC

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

Select from:

☑ Canada

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2013

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Green e certificates purchased for total of 5497 MWH from 2 wind projects. Parc éolien du Lac Alfred (QB) (commissioned 2013) Parc éolien Roncevaux (QB) (commissioned in 2016)

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Australia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

48

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Australian LGC

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

Select from:
☑ Australia

(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

LCG certificate purchased for total of 48 MWH from 1 solar project. Limondale Sun Farm 2 – Solar – NSW (SRPVNSL1)

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:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

208

(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)

1996

(7.30.14.10) Comment

I-REC certificates purchased for total of 208 MWH from 2 hydro projects. SDIC Gansu Yellow River Daxia Hydropower Project (commissioned 1996) Jinzhongjiu (Jinsha) Hydropower station (commissioned in 2020)

Row 5

(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:

☑ Wind

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

145

(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:

☑ Sweden

(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

EECS GO certificates purchased for total of 145 MWH from 14 wind projects. Solberg WTG18 (2018) Solberg WTG02 (2018) Solberg05 (2018) Solberg07 (2018) Solberg10 (2018) Solberg11 (2018) Solberg19 (2018) Solberg WTG13(2018) Solberg03 (2018) Solberg WTG14 (2018) Solberg04 (2018) Solberg WTG22 (2018) Solberg WTG21 (2018) Solberg16 (2018)

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:

☑ Solar

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

145

(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:
☑ 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

EECS GO certificates purchased for total of 145 MWH from 2 solar projects. SOLAZUER2 SOLONAREJO36S

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(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:

☑ Wind

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

37

(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:

☑ Sweden

(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

EECS GO certificates purchased for total of 37 MWH from 15 wind projects. Gummaråsen 2 (2010) Gummaråsen 4 (2010) Gummaråsen 5 (2010) Gummaråsen 2 (2010) Gummaråsen 1 (2010) Derome Vind 1 (2014) Derome Vind 3 (2014) Derome Vind 4 (2014) Derome Vind 6 (2014) Derome Vind 5 (2014) Derome Vind 2 (2014) Iglasjön 1 - 8 (2016) Solberg01 (2018) Solberg WTG17 (2018) Solberg16 (2018)

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ India

(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:

☑ Wind

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

14

(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:

☑ India

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2010

(7.30.14.10) Comment

I-REC certificates purchased for total of 14 MWH from 3 wind projects. Green Infra Wind Power Generation Limited_Ramadurga (2014) Sri Lakshmi Ganesh Spinning Mills OE Division_3127 (2010) Green Infra Wind Power Generation Limited_Tadas (2015)

Row 9

(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:
☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

120

(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)

2007

(7.30.14.10) Comment

I-REC certificate purchased for total of 120 MWH from 1 hydropower project. El Gallo Dam - Hydropower plant (2007)

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Zealand

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

40

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ NZECS

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

Select from:

☑ New Zealand

(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

NZEC certificate purchased for total of 40 MWH from 1 solar project. Kaitaia; Lodestone Energy (2023)

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Panama

(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:

☑ Wind

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

20

(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:

☑ Panama

(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)

2013

(7.30.14.10) Comment

I-REC certificate purchased for total of 20 MWH from 1 wind project. AES Eolico Penonome (2013)

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Singapore

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

38

(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:

☑ Singapore

(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

I-REC certificate purchased for total of 38 MWH from 1 solar project. SPES – WJI Solar Project (2023)

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Singapore

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

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

5

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ TIGR

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

Select from:

☑ Singapore

(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

TIGRS certificate purchased for total of 5 MWH from 1 solar project. Union Solar Pte. Ltd.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

5985

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ REGO

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

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

REGO certificates for total of 5985 MWH from 2 wind projects. Greater Gabbard (Off shore Wind) Clyde Windfarm (Central)
[Add row]

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

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40.3

(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)

40.30

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5473

(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)

5607

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

11080.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

168.7

(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)

31.97

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

200.67

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

288.9

(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)

117.8

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

406.70

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

36.81

(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)

36.81

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13.62

(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)

13.62

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

39

(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)

39.00

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33.36

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

9.64

(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)

494

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

537.00

Panama

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19.03

(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)

19.03

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

42.64

(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)

30.36

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

73.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5044

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

286

(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)

4582

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

9912.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

139752

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

0

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

51409

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

212505

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

403666.00
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0000219

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

133847

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

6107100000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

16

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

☑ Other, please specify :Total Scope 1 + Scope 2 increased 5% vs 2023; denominator (Sales in $MM) increase by 4%

(7.45.9) Please explain

Scope 1 + Scope 2 (location based) emissions was down. Specifically emissions from natural gas use and other fuels were down while emissions from electricity purchase was flat. GHG emissions from refrigerant losses and purchased steam were up. USD sales were up 4% resulting in the in the normalized Scope 1 + Scope 2/Million USD revenue. This calculation is based on our previous year CDP values. We are currently reviewing updates to our methodology and may restate previous year data in the future.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.050451317

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

133847

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

2653000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

15

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

☑ Other, please specify :Total Scope 1 + Scope 2 increased 5% vs 2023; denominator (MT product shipped) increase by 2%

(7.45.9) Please explain

Scope 1 + Scope 2 (location based) emissions was down. Specifically emissions from natural gas use and other fuels were down while emissions from electricity purchase was flat. GHG emissions from refrigerant losses and purchased steam were up. A 2% increase in metric tons of product shipped, resulted in the change in intensity per metric ton of product shipped, compared to the previously reported intensity for 2023. This calculation is based on our previous year CDP values. We are currently reviewing updates to our methodology and may restate previous year data in the future.

Row 3

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

81.4

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

133847

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit of production

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

1645

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

18

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

☑ Other, please specify :Total Scope 1 + Scope 2 increased 5% vs 2023; denominator (million units product shipped) increase by 6%

(7.45.9) Please explain

6% increase in million units product shipped, together with the decrease in combined Scope 1 Scope 2 location-based emissions resulted in the decrease in intensity per million units of product shipped, compared to the previously reported intensity for 2023. This calculation is based on our previous year CDP values. We are currently reviewing updates to our methodology and may restate previous year data in the future.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

932

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

GJ

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

MM units Shipped

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

5.8

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Total GJ of energy used was flat (<1% down) in 2024 vs 2023 while units shipped increased resulting in a 6% decrease in the normalized metric.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

262.25

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

GJ

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

MM pounds product shipped

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

5.4

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Total GJ of energy used was flat (<1% down) in 2024 vs 2023 while million pounds product shipped increased resulting in a 2% decrease in the normalized metric. [Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

☑ Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ No, but we are reporting another target that is science-based

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

09/01/2017

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

67822

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

59583

(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)

127405.000

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2023

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

0

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

127405.000

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

71085

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

62761

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

133846.000

(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)

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target includes total Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions. All facilities under our operational control are included in the data for this target, including major administrative offices, R&D operations, manufacturing plants and warehouse/distribution locations.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

As part of our carbon neutral by 2025 target through offsets, we have set a goal of having 0 increase year on year for our scope 1+2 emissions. In 2024, our revised scope 1+2 emissions totaled 133,847 metric tons, or a 5% increase vs. 2023 (127,405 MT), but our absolute targeted GHG emissions in 2024 (Scope 1 and 2 and targeted Scope 3) decreased approximately 1% versus 2023, exceeding our target to hold these emissions flat.

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

Energy efficiency projects at several facilities; increased on-site renewable energy

(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

CHUR-USA-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

09/01/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

09/01/2020

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

71592

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

11079

(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)

82671.000

(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

100.0

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

09/01/2031

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

46

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

44642.340

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

71085

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

16758

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

87843.000

(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

-13.60

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target was developed in 2021 and approved by SBTi in July 2022. Covers all Scope 1 and market-based Scope 2 emissions within the operational control boundary.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Our objective to reduce our total Scope 1 and market based scope 2 emission to less than 55,000 MT CO2e by end of 2031. As of 2024, our target emissions were up 6% compared to the 2020 baseline. Still, we expect reductions to accelerate in the later years of the target period as larger scale projects are implemented.

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

We employ parallel strategies of seeking "bottom up" carbon reduction opportunities and efficiency projects developed and generated at the plant level, while at the same time retaining outside decarbonization and engineering expertise to look at larger scale projects that can reduce significant amounts of carbon emissions from our footprint, including reducing carbon process intensity, energy/heat recovery, use of alternate fuels or carbon capture. In 2024, we invested resources in feasibility and engineering studies for specific projects, began implementation of planned decarbonization projects as well as assessed and revised our roadmap to achieve our SBT goals. However, it is taking longer to execute and we are finding impactful projects to be more difficult and expensive than we originally expected. We maintain dedicated capital budget for projects to enhance our efficiency and reduce the energy intensity of our manufacturing programs. As of 2024, our target emissions were up. We expect to realize the impacts specific decarbonization projects in 2025 and 2026 including equipment upgrade/replacement such as compressors, boilers, and chiller as well as a process fugitive CO2 capture project at one of our baking soda plants that will help reduce non-energy related emissions.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ No, but we are reporting another target that is science-based

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

09/01/2016

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 6: Business travel

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

09/01/2016

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1

0.035068926

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2

0.040976361

(7.53.2.18) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

0.079869743

(7.53.2.20) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel

0.001035857

(7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3

0.0809056000

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

0.1569508870

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.39) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by this Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.41) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel covered by this Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel intensity figure

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

20

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes

0.1255607096

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

1

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

3

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1

0.0268

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2

0.0237

(7.53.2.65) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

0.0646

(7.53.2.67) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel

0.0024

(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3

0.0670000000

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes

0.1175000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

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

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

125.68

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Defined emissions (Scope 1 + Scope 2 + target Scope 3 (North America transportation and business air travel)) are divided by total weight of product shipped. Note that the targeted Scope 3 emissions in the base year intensity represent 100% of the Scope 3 emissions that had been calculated for the 2016 base year (Target Scope 3). These limited Targeted Scope 3 categories represent 8.75% of our comprehensive 2024 Scope 3 emissions.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

Objective is to reduce targeted GHG emissions intensity (mass CO2e/mass product) by 20% by 2025.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

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

Energy reduction Energy efficiency Transportation efficiency improvements
[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

☑ Other climate-related targets

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

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

09/01/2017

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Low-carbon energy source(s)

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2016

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

163705970

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

0

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

09/01/2025

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

100

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

100

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.00

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

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

We track total Scope 2 location based CO2e associated with MWH electricity purchase and tons steam purchase. We track market-based Scope 2 emissions as offset by our Renewable Energy Credit purchases and self generated renewable electricity under our carbon neutral by 2025 target and our SBT target. Our current target is to achieve 100% of our global MWH of electricity purchased as renewable energy. In 2024, we achieved and exceeded renewable energy reduction of 100%, on a gross MWh basis. (used 150,704 MWh vs 162,494 MWh RECs purchased). On a market-based accounting basis between solar generation at our New Zealand and UK plants and purchased RECs we achieved 100% renewables per MWH purchased electricity used.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

CHUR-USA-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We track total electricity use at all operating facilities. We acquire sufficient renewable energy credits to reduce 100% all our purchased electricity use emissions. The only electricity we generate at Church & Dwight facilities is also renewable energy (solar); thus 100% of our electricity use is attributed to low-carbon energy sources.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Maintain 100% renewable electricity for our global operations

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

Facility-level efficiency projects resulted in slightly lower electricity use compared to 2023. Expanding onsite generation to include solar at our UK plant. Planning and procurement of Renewable Energy Credits/Environmental Attribute Credits for anticipated purchased electricity usage at the start of each year helps ensure that

sufficient credits are purchased. We continue to explore onsite solar, onsite wind, VPPAs and similar longer term green energy opportunities to maintain this commitment.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

09/01/2017

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:
☑ Absolute

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

Net emissions target
☑ Other net emissions target, please specify :Carbon Neutral by 2025

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2016

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

18

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

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

100

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

100

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.0000000000

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

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

In addition to energy and carbon reduction effots, Church & Dwight has partnered with Arbor Day Foundation, Climate Impact Partners, Pachama, and others to acquire Certified Carbon Credits to neutralize targeted emissions. These carbon credits are intended to reduce our carbon emissions in conjunction with Scope 2 electricity emission reductions through self-generated solar electricity and RECs. In 2024, 260,000 MT CO2e carbon credits were acquired. These combined with the electricity REC equivalent of 4,8150 MT CO2e resulted in achieving a net offset of >100 for our total targeted emissions (Scope 1+ Scope 2 emissions, + targeted Scope 3 emissions from our North American transportation-related emissions [a portion of Scope 3 categories 4, 6 and 9]). The target is 100% Carbon Neutral by 2025 corporate goal against these targeted emissions.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :CHD 100% carbon neutral vs targeted emissions by 2025 commitment

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Certified carbon credits and electricity RECs are compared against our total targeted emissions (Scope 1 + 2 emissions + targeted Scope 3 emissions from our North American transportation-related emissions [a portion of Scope 3 categories 4, 6 and 9]).

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

Be 100% carbon neutral against our Scope 1, Scope 2, and targeted Scope 3 emissions (North American transportation-related emissions - a portion of Scope 3 categories 4, 5 and 9) by 2025 through reductions, energy attribute credits, and carbon credit offsets.

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

Energy and GHG emission reductions plus purchase of renewable energy credits and carbon credits to reduce and offset calendar year emissions.

Row 2

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 2

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

09/01/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

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

Engagement with suppliers

☑ Percentage of suppliers (by emissions) with a science-based target

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

0.0

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2026

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

75

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

20

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

26.6666666667

(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 is part of our science-based target approved by SBTi in 2022.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets initiative – approved supplier engagement target

(7.54.2.17) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

CHUR-USA-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our goal is engage our suppliers that represent 75% of our Scope 3 Category 1 emissions to establish their own science-based targets by 2026. These suppliers include providers of purchased goods and services, capital goods and upstream transportation and distribution. Between CDP Supply Chain engagement and direct engagement with our contract manufacturers we estimate we have engaged suppliers representing approximately 70% of our Scope 3, Category 1 emissions in 2024.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

Reduce Scope 3, Category 1 emissions to below 2019 (baseline levels)

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

In 2025 we are expanding the number of suppliers engaged through our CDP Supply Chain Program by nearly 3x to ensure we are engaging with enough supplier to represent 75% of our scope three emissions. This is a substantial increase in number to account for an additional 10-15% of Scope 3 Cat 1 emissions. 2024 supplier responses indicating an approved SBT reduction target(s) represented slightly more than 20% of Scope 3 Cat 1 emissions.
[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
Under investigation	*33*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*5*	*6900*
Implementation commenced	*4*	*1300*
Implemented	*13*	*4592*
Not to be implemented	*6*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption
☑ Solar PV

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

105

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

100000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

568700

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Installed solar panels at our Folkestone Uk facility. Will supply >10% of electricity demand.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Compressed air

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

173

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

30000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2600000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ >25 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Replaced 2 main air compressors in the plant plus upgraded compressor system programming.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Smart control system

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

204

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

15000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

18000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Installed inactivity times, programmable thermostats, motion sensors, and similar controls on both process (conveyors) and building systems (HVAC, lighting).

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Insulation

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

24

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

500

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

35000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ >25 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Reinstalled thermal system insulation on piping and valves throughout boiler room of an older plant.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Maintenance program

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

180

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

59000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

32000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Implemented and maintained improved maintenance practices on compressed air distribution and steam distribution systems including increased frequency of inspections/surveys and prioritization of repair work orders.

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Lighting

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

6

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1500

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

LED replacement upgrades

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Transportation
☑ Other, please specify :Transportation of product to customer load optimization

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

3900

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation & distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

500000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

300000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 1-2 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Continuous improvement to our North American load optimization efforts resulted in approximately 9% increase in weight of product shipped while at the same time achieving approximately 3% fewer total truck miles miles and 4% increase in intermodal miles in 2024 compared to 2023. Estimate is the net decrease in product transportation sector of our targeted Scope 3 emissions in 2024 vs 2023
[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:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our sustainability goals including our carbon neutral by 2025 goal, are published in our Corporate Sustainability Report and our progress is discussed in many employee forums such as green team meetings and townhall meetings. Employee performance guidelines include elements of these goals, particularly within the Operations and R&D functions. All operating facilities are expected to implement energy, water or waste reduction projects. Dedicated funds for sustainability and environmental projects are included in the capital budgeting process to enable facilities to plan and execute appropriate sustainability projects. Between the published goals and various points of employee communications most employees are aware and engaged with our various sustainability efforts

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Lower return on investment (ROI) specification

(7.55.3.2) Comment

ROI requirements are reviewed on a case by case basis for sustainability projects. Based on individual project merits, stated ROI requirements in the capital spending policy can be waived if a project is considered viable and beneficial to the company and its sustainability goals. As we complete engineering assessments and implement projects designated to enable us to achieve our new SBT commitments, ROI requirements are expected to be further adjusted for projects intended to have the most impact on our emissions.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In order to better enable facilities to initiate energy savings and sustainability projects a dedicated capital budget category was designated to seed sustainability projects. As capital projects are developed priority may be assigned based on a project's sustainability merits. In addition to capital project spending the company budgets for incremental spending on green energy RECs and forestry carbon credits proportional to our annual usage/emissions and stated targets.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Achieving our sustainability and carbon reduction goals are tied to management performance evaluation, including bonus and compensation. Sustainability goals including climate initiatives are established by our CEO and cascaded throughout the organization. Key criteria that contribute to performance evaluations and associated monetary rewards include achieving stated sustainability goals. The Strategic Initiatives metric portion of the bonus program includes sustainability-related performance such as ESG goals and accounts for 20% of the determination of an individual's bonus multiplier. In addition to this financial incentive, the company

annually recognizes the manufacturing plant with the best EHS performance with the Dwight C. Minton Environmental & Safety Excellence Award. Part of the award criteria achieving plant energy reduction and GHG emission goals. The Environmental & Safety Operations Department also recognizes individual plants for their sustainability performance including the plant the achieved the largest % reductions in energy use, water, or waste generation at our annual conference for EHS and engineering professionals across the organization.
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:
☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits retired by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :REDD+ Forest conservation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative, Peru. Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use; Forest conservation (REDD+) Purchase Verified Emission Reduction credits through the Arbor Day Foundation verified in accordance with Verra Registry Verified Carbon Standard (VCU)

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

151644

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2012

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS/Verra (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Barrier analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

CCB-Gold

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Certificates 11469-332646041-332797684-VCS-VCU 263-VER-PE-14-944-15062008-14062012-1

Row 2

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :REDD+ Forest conservation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative, Peru. Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use; Forest conservation (REDD+) Purchase Verified Emission Reduction credits through the Arbor Day Foundation verified in accordance with Verra Registry Verified Carbon Standard (VCU)

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

45856

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2014

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS/Verra (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Barrier analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

CCB-Gold

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Certificates 10696-239654229-239700084-VCS-VCU 263-VER-PE-14-944-15062012-14062014-1

Row 3

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

GreenTrees ACRE, US Advanced Carbon Restored Ecosystem, Afforestation/Reforestation. Purchase Verified Emission Removal Credits through Arbor Day Foundation verified in accordance with American Carbon Registry (ACR)

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

2497

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2020

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ ACR (American Carbon Registry)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Barrier analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Not specified

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Certificates ACR-US-114-2020-1318-186243 to 188742

Row 4

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Peatland protection and restoration

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Katingan Peatland Restoration and Conservation Project, Indonesian Borneo, Avoided Planned Deforestation, Forest conservation (REDD+). Purchase Verified Emission Reduction credits through the Pachama verified in accordance with Verra Registry Verified Carbon Standard (VCU)

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

50000

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2017

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS/Verra (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Barrier analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Not specified

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Certificates Serial #: 6359-306295394-306315393-VCU-016-APX-ID-14-1477-01012017-31122017-1, 6359-308007040-308017039-VCU-016-APX-ID-14-1477-01012017-31122017-1, 6359-306240605-306260604-VCU-016-APX-ID-14-1477-01012017-31122017-1

Row 5

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :REDD+ Forest Conservation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Manoa REDD+ Project, Brazil, Avoided Unplanned Deforestation; Forest conservation (REDD+). Purchase Verified Emission Reduction credits through the Pachama verified in accordance with Verra Registry Verified Carbon Standard (VCU)

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

10000

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2019

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS/Verra (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Barrier analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

CCB-Gold

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Certificates 15179-660652072-660662071-VCS-VCU-261-VER-BR-14-1571-01012019-31122019-0
[Add row]

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Palm oil

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Specific suppliers

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

We track our palm oil RSPO certification status of the palm fatty acid distillate (PFAD) and palm kernel fatty acid (PKFA) that we purchase from our primary supplier Wilmar International. Other suppliers and raw materials of palm oil derivative are not included at this time.

(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Data is not available

(8.1.1.5) Primary reason why data is not available for your disclosed commodity

Select from:

☑ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☑ No, the volume excluded is unknown

(8.1.1.10) Please explain

In 2024, our spend on all identified direct palm oil derivatives decreased by 45% due to exiting the animal feed business. In 2025, quality issues with 2024 data were identified, specifically with potentially palm oil derived raw materials outside the direct palm oil derivatives tracked under our Palm Oil Sustainable Sourcing Commitment. To ensure accuracy, we are only disclosing on palm fatty acid distillate (PFAD) and palm kernel fatty acid (PKFA) quantities purchased from primary supplier. Due to the decreasing volume of PFAD and PKFA being purchased, we are in the process of evaluating our sustainable palm oil sourcing program going forward.
[Add row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Palm oil	*6900*	*Select all that apply*	*6900*

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
		☑ Sourced	

[Fixed row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Dumai, Padang, Bitung, Kuala Tanjung

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

6900

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Due to exiting the animal feed business in early 2024, historically representing most of our palm derivatives, we did not receive complete tracking of the origin for our all palm fatty acid distillate (PFAD) and palm kernel fatty acid (PKFA) purchased from our primary supplier. According to our supplier's 2024 Sustainability Report, they can trace 98.5% of their palm products to mill. This response assumes that purchased PFAD and PKFA in 2024 is sourced from the same points of as 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:

☑ Yes, we have a no-conversion target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity
[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Palm oil

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

Our no-deforestation and no-conversion commitment includes no development on high carbon stock forests, protecting high conservation value areas, and no development on peatland. These are defined in their respective organizations. HSC as defined at http://highcarbonstock.org by the HCS Steering Group; HCV as defined by the HCV network: https://www.hcvnetwork.org/hcv-approach; BMPs covered by the "RSPO Manual on Best Management Practices (BMPs) for existing oil palm cultivation on peat."

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:
☑ 2018

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:
☑ Country/area, please specify :Indonesia

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:
☑ In line with supplier commitments

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2021

[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Other volume, please specify :Total commodity volume as palm fatty acid distillate and palm kernel fatty acid associated with operations

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Engagement with Tier 2+ suppliers

☑ % of volume from Tier 2+ suppliers compliant with your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2015

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

01/01/2015

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

93

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

93.00

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, no alignment after assessment

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Covers all palm fatty acid distillate and palm kernel fatty acid purchased by the company through our Palm Oil sustainable Sourcing program through our primary supplier.

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

Given exiting the primary business using palm derivatives, we are evaluating our sustainable palm oil program going forward.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

100% volume of PFAD and PKFA purchased in RSPO mass balance material by end of 2025

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Disclosure volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RSPO supply chain certification - Mass Balance

☑ RSPO supply chain certification – Segregated

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2015

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

01/01/2015

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, no alignment after assessment

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We worked with our suppliers towards the goal of ensuring that the ingredients used in our products are from responsible sources. The best way to ensure that our PFAD and PKFA are sustainably sourced is to source certified materials. RSPO is the most widely accepted palm certification standard, that is why we selected the 100% RSPO certification target. We purchased approximately 6900 metric tons of these palm oil derivatives in 2024. This amount is getting smaller as we eliminate PFAD from our products. Since 2018, 100% of these palm oil ingredients are certified by RSPO standards. We achieved our goal of >97% traceability to the mill level by 2023 for these primary palm oil-based ingredients and continued to achieve that target in 2024.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Supplier engagement and procurement efforts to identify and work with Wilmar on aligned goals and objectives. Allocation of budget to ensure palm oil derivatives acquisition is certified compliant with RSPO standards.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Annual target to meet: 100% palm oil (PFAD and PKFA) RSPO certified

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Other volume, please specify :Total commodity volume as palm fatty acid distillate and palm kernel fatty acid associated with operations

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

☑ % of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

☑ Production unit

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2015

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

01/01/2015

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2024

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

97

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

98.5

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, no alignment after assessment

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Covers all palm fatty acid distillate and palm kernel fatty acid purchased by the company through our Palm Oil sustainable Sourcing program through our primary supplier.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Supplier engagement and procurement efforts to identify and work with supplier on aligned goals and objectives. Allocation of budget to ensure palm oil derivatives acquisition is certified compliant with RSPO standards.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Annual target to meet or exceed: >97% volume PFAD/PKFA palm oil derivative traceable to mills
[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Palm oil

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply
☑ Chain-of-custody certification
☑ Supplier engagement/communication

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

Our supplier is committed to continuous improvement to responsibly source palm oil derivatives. They request and maintain traceability information for volumes received from third party refiners, traders and bulkers and their sustainability team then continually monitors the lists obtained from its suppliers to ensure that there is no breach concerning its NDPE Policy. Their procurement practices involve buying largely from sources that can provide visibility of origin. According to our supplier's 2024 sustainability report, 98.5% of palm products was independently verified as traceable back to the mills.
[Fixed row]

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

Palm oil

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

98.5

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

0

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

1.5

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00
[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Palm oil

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☑ 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:

☑ Yes

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Rely upon RSPO compliance of primary supplier for palm oil derivatives

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

We rely upon RSPO producer/grower certification and compliance from our supplier. In 2024 our use of direct palm derivatives (specifically PFAD) was greatly reduced and identified palm derivatives represent <1% of procurement spend in 2024. With this decrease we are considering shifting our sustainable sourcing program away from palm oil and discontinuing our existing monitoring program.
[Fixed row]

(8.9.2) Provide details of third-party certification schemes not providing full DF/DCF assurance.

Palm oil

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RSPO - Mass Balance

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

93

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ No

(8.9.2.4) Comment

An estimated 93% of our PFAD and PKFA volume was sourced RSPO certified mass balance. The remaining 7% is RSPO certified, but not to mass balance criteria. We've attached an example invoice showing the supplier RSPO member identification and mass balance ("MB") indication for the PFAD purchased. According to our supplier's 2024 Palm NDPE Implementation Report, 95.9% of their palm products have achieved "delivering" status for both No Deforestation and No Peat requirements using the NDPE IRF with third-party limited assurance. In addition, they achieved 91% traceability to the plantation. Due to the complexity of the palm oil derivative supply chain, the process of achieving traceability involves many tiers and is subject to change based on the progress of our suppliers.

(8.9.2.5) Certification documentation

Wilmar_PFAD_8760002099_CHD_Example.pdf
[Add row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint.

Palm oil

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

98.5

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Since a specified cutoff date

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2018

(8.10.1.6) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since the specified cutoff date (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

Our primary supplier has been a member of the RSPO since 2005 engaged in many RSPO taskforces and working groups. Our supplier launched the Supplier Group Compliance Program which identifies deforestation via proactive monitoring of concession areas within a supplier group. It provides deforestation and fire alerts linked directly to the concessions and companies responsible for them, enabling them to confirm and act on non-compliances within the supply chain. The Program monitors >23.1 million hectares in multiple countries, including Indonesia. They monitor using the Supplier Reporting Tool, an online self-reporting tool, to assess suppliers' progress and implementation of its NDPE Policy. The SRT sends annual questionnaires to 100% of their direct supplying mills and associated estates. According to Our supplier's 2024 Palm NDPE Implementation Report, 95.9% of their palm products at production level are delivering for both No Deforestation and No Peat requirements and 1.5% is unknown. They also uses a publicly available, radar-based forest monitoring system Radar Alerts for Detecting Deforestation. RADD is facilitated by World Resources Institute (WRI) and includes agreed verification protocols for alerts that capture forest changes in high resolution as another tool to uncover recent deforestation. We do not have a current hectare value to report.

[Add row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ 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.

	Third-party certification scheme adopted	Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Unknown

[Fixed row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

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 have significant GHG emissions, reductions or removals associated with land management or land use changes within our direct operations. Our primary supplier has a goal of reducing 50.4% of their absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2032 from a 2022 base year including land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstock. In 2024, they reported they reduced their Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 4.3% relative to 2023. They also reduced their forest, land, and agriculture emissions by 18.3%. In 2024, our supplier reaffirmed their commitment by setting and submitting to Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTI) with their targets validated in 2025. We have a goal to maintain carbon neutral status for our owned and controlled global operations by the end of 2025, as we have already offset more 100% of our targeted carbon dioxide emissions. We established science-based targets approved by the SBTI in 2022. These targets take into account the level of carbon reduction needed to meet the goals set forth in the Paris Agreement. These targets align with SBTi's latest criteria for maintaining global temperature rise to 1.5 degrees Celsius for Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions and well below 2 degrees Celsius for Scope 3. Church & Dwight commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions 46% below 2020 levels by 2031. Church & Dwight pledges to reduce absolute Scope 3 emissions below 2019 levels through influencing our supply chain partners. Church & Dwight commits to continuing our pledge to use 100% Renewable electricity for operations under our control.
[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

☑ Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

☑ Environmental protection

☑ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting

☑ Labor rights

☑ Human rights protected under international law

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

☑ Third party audits

(8.14.5) Please explain

All of our palm fatty acid distillate (PFAD) and palm kernel fatty acid (PKFA) from our primary supplier is compliant with the legal compliance and the latest changes. 100% of our purchased PFAD and PKFA is RSPO certified. This certification is given only if the legal compliance is respected. Our responsible sourcing approach is based on our Global Operating Guiding Principles that covers labor rights, environmental protection (including preservation of resources, environmental management, hence covering forest-related commodities) and business ethics topics. Our supplier has had in place since 2013 a No Deforestation, No Peat and No Exploitation Policy, which was updated in 2019 to better align with globally recognized frameworks such as, United Nations FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance on Tenure, United Nations Global Compact, International Labour Organization, and RSPO guidance on peat and the integrated HCV-HCSA assessments for new plantings conventions. In addition to adhering to its own policies, we require all suppliers to follow our Guiding Principles which encompasses the Company's Palm Oil Sustainability Sourcing Commitment. We reserve the right to audit any of our vendors at any time to ascertain whether they and those in their supply chains are complying with these Guiding Principles. If non-compliance with these Guiding Principles is suspected or discovered, we investigate such breach or take such other remedial steps as we consider appropriate. Without prejudice to any other actions that we may take, in our discretion, and in appropriate circumstances, we may elect to work with a vendor to implement a corrective action plan to resolve the non-compliance. However, we reserve the right to immediately terminate a vendor relationship where a vendor or those in its supply chain has not complied with these Guiding Principles. We review our suppliers using the Supplier Ethical Data Exchange (Sedex) system to determine which of our suppliers are most at risk for non-compliance with our policy. This allows us to determine if an audit is needed and based on the outcomes of an audit, we determine if we work with the vendor to implement corrective actions or terminate if that is more appropriate.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Ability to contribute to/ build on existing landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

☑ Organization has operational presence in area

☑ Current and future sourcing risk

☑ Opportunity for increased human well-being in area

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Our supplier is part of the Production and Protection Beyond Concessions action group, a joint effort by 12 companies and several technical support organizations coordinated by Proforest. Recognizing that a large proportion of deforestation in the oil palm landscape occurs outside oil palm concessions, the PPBC aims to define a proactive approach to address this forest loss through interventions, targeted monitoring and livelihood enhancement. Key efforts focus on prioritizing locations where action is needed through geospatial analysis, stakeholder engagement and initiative mapping. The target is to develop, collectively agree and implement action and monitoring protocols for oil palm priority areas, mainly in Indonesia and Malaysia.
[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ1

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Kalaweit Foundation PT KENCANA SAWIT INDONESIA (KSI)

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

PT KENCANA SAWIT INDONESIA (KSI)

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

☑ No, area is unknown

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :We receive most of our PFAD and PKFA from Wilmar

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

2022

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

0

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

☑ Decreased ecosystem degradation rate

☑ Increased and/or maintained protected areas

☑ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for biodiversity, habitat fragmentation and/or threats to IUCN Red List species in priority areas

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ NGO and/or civil society

☑ Other, please specify :Local forest/rural associations

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

Our supplier participates in and supports the work of Kalaweit Foundation including at its own PT KENCANA SAWIT INDONESIA (KSI) conservation area. PT KSI released 23 siamangs, also known as gibbons (Symphalangus syndactylus), into its conservation area in Sumatra, Indonesia. Siamangs are known to be difficult to

reintroduce to the wild. Widespread deforestation means that siamangs are increasingly susceptible to loss of habitat and food as well as illegal poaching. Wilmar has a goal of increasing the siamang population in PT Kencana SawitIndonesia (KSI) to 30 by 2050.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

Within the last year, the program has introduced 2 more Siamangs (total of 23), enabling them to exhibit natural behaviors in the wild. Progress is reported in our supplier's 2024 Sustainability report.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Add row]

(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.

Row 1

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ1

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

[Add row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply
☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply
☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations
☑ Other, please specify :Involved in multi-partnership or stakeholder initiatives

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:
☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

In 2018 we joined the RSPO and since then have sourced 100% certified PFAD and PKFA ingredients through RSPO mass balance sources and RSPO credit. [Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Electricity

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

We have a goal to achieve carbon neutral status for our owned and controlled global operations by 2025 through GHG reduction programs, green electricity renewable energy credits (RECs), and purchased carbon credits. In 2024, 100% of our targeted greenhouse gas emissions (Scope 1, Scope 2, and targeted Scope 3 transportation emissions) were either offset through carbon credits or reduced through renewable energy credits. C&D purchased carbon credits from the Arbor Day Foundation® supporting the Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative project. This project provides funding for improved forest management through a unique community-based conservation and sustainable farming model. This project conserves of ecologically rich fauna and flora in the Peruvian Andean Amazon. The credits are verified in accordance with Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and Climate, Community, & Biodiversity Standard (CCB).

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based elsewhere

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2008

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2028

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

182000

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

182000

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Peru

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

-5.86184

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-77.60616

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

1876000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Arbor Day Foundation® conducts a third-party verification of project attributed every 1-2 years. Start year and target year reflects the overall project. Latitude and Longitude are approximate and represent the general region of the project.

Row 5

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

☑ Increase in carbon sequestration

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

We have a goal to achieve carbon neutral status for our owned and controlled global operations by 2025 through GHG reduction programs, green electricity renewable energy credits (RECs), and purchased carbon credits. In 2024, 100% of our targeted greenhouse gas emissions (Scope 1, Scope 2, and targeted Scope 3 transportation emissions) were either offset through carbon credits or reduced through renewable energy credits. C&D is a purchased carbon credits from the Arbor Day Foundation® supporting the GreenTrees Reforestation Program. This project focuses on restoring a once thriving floodplain forest in the Mississippi Alluvial Valley and riparian forests in Virginia from what is now degraded agricultural land. The credits are verified in accordance with ACR Methodology for Afforestation and Reforestation of Degraded Land, Version 1.0, March 2011.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2003

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:
☑ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

55037

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

55037

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

37.4316

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

78.6569

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:
☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

100000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

Arbor Day Foundation® conducts a third-party verification of project attributed every 1-2 years. Start year and target year reflects the overall project. Latitude and Longitude are approximate and represent the general region of the project.

Row 6

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Peatland protection and restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

☑ Increase in carbon sequestration

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

We have a goal to achieve carbon neutral status for our owned and controlled global operations by 2025 through GHG reduction programs, green electricity renewable energy credits (RECs), and purchased carbon credits. In 2024, 100% of our targeted greenhouse gas emissions (Scope 1, Scope 2, and targeted Scope 3 transportation emissions) were either offset through carbon credits or reduced through renewable energy credits. C&D is a purchased carbon credits from the Pachama supporting the Katingan Peatland Restoration and Conservation Project in Indonesia. This project protects and restores peatland ecosystems, offers local communities sustainable sources of income, and tackles global climate change. The project lies within the districts of Katingan and Kotawaringin Timur in Central Kalimantan Province and covers one of the largest remaining intact peat swamp forests in Indonesia. The credits are verified in accordance with Verified Carbon Standard (VCS).

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2010

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ >2050

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

14980

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

14980

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

2.200644

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

113.914881

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

455501

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

VCS Program projects are subject to independent auditing by both Verra staff and qualified third parties. Start year and target year reflects the overall project. Latitude and Longitude are approximate and represent the general region of the project.

Row 7

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :REDD+ Forest Conservation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Increase in carbon sequestration

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

We have a goal to achieve carbon neutral status for our owned and controlled global operations by 2025 through GHG reduction programs, green electricity renewable energy credits (RECs), and purchased carbon credits. In 2024, 100% of our targeted greenhouse gas emissions (Scope 1, Scope 2, and targeted Scope 3 transportation emissions) were either offset through carbon credits or reduced through renewable energy credits. C&D is a purchased carbon credits from the Pachama supporting the Manoa REDD+ Project. This is a partnership between Biofílica and Grupo Triângulo, located at Manoa Farm, city of Cujubim, state of Rondônia. The farm's forest demonstrates the pioneering in sustainable forest management and are one of the few forest areas remaining in private area in the region. This effort also focuses on training members of local associations and farm employees on agroforestry systems and low carbon agriculture. The credits are verified in accordance with Verified Carbon Standard (VCS).

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based elsewhere

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2013

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:
☑ 2041-2045

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

730387

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

730387

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

-8.789903

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-62.749309

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:
☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

156300

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon credits gained

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

VCS Program projects are subject to independent auditing by both Verra staff and qualified third parties. Start year and target year reflects the overall project. Latitude and Longitude are approximate and represent the general region of the project.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Row 1

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:
☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Rocky Hill, NJ

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:
☑ Data is not available

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not available

Select from:
☑ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

R&D. No individual metered water; water service included in lease cost.

Row 2

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:
☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Mexico City, Mexico

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:
☑ Data is not available

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not available

Select from:
☑ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

Ops Office. No individual metered water; water service included in lease cost.

Row 3

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:
☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Guangzhou, China

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:
☑ Data is not available

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not available

Select from:
☑ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

Ops Office. No individual metered water; water service included in lease cost.

Row 4

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Regional Sales Offices

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:
☑ Data is not available

(9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not available

Select from:
☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

Either de minimis use or no individual metered water; water service included in lease cost.
[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:
☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

All locations with metered water intake report their water intake monthly through our corporate sustainability program. Larger locations monitor water withdrawals via daily meter readings, while others using smaller volumes or that are less water critical rely upon monthly meter readings or billing statements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

A small number of primarily domestic water users (Regional Sales or Operations management offices plus one R&D site) are excluded from the reported totals.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

All locations with metered water intake report their water intake monthly through our corporate sustainability program. This reporting includes identifying the water source as either "city water" (third party), "well water" (on site) or "other". None of our locations directly withdraw from surface water. Larger locations monitor water withdrawals via daily meter readings, while others using smaller volumes or that are less water critical rely upon monthly meter readings or billing statements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

A small number of primarily domestic water users (Regional Sales or Operations management offices plus one R&D site) are excluded from the reported totals. All other reporting facilities are supplied by third party public water systems or on site groundwater wells.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Direct testing (2 locations using site well water) or third party water quality customer statements (remaining locations using third party water supply)

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our manufacturing sites have local water quality monitoring programs to ensure water quality meets our product standards. While each facility measures water quality parameters for operational purposes, the water use is managed locally and quality parameters are not reported to the corporate level unless they are outside specification limits. If water quality testing determines water does not meet quality standards, Corporate Quality is notified, and a Quality investigation and field action is initiated. Two of our locations use well water for either potable water or process water. These locations monitor relevant water quality parameters per local water quality regulations. Most other manufacturing locations and all non-manufacturing locations (offices, R&D, warehouses) are serviced by municipal water systems that must meet local drinking water quality standards. Intake water quality is monitored at least yearly, at a minimum, at all locations.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Direct metering or mass balance/engineering estimate.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All reporting locations provide discharge volumes monthly. Where the location is not required to maintain a metered discharge, water mass balance or engineering estimates are used to estimate discharge volumes.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Direct metering or mass balance/engineering estimate.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All reporting locations report discharge destination (public sewer, discharge to surface water, discharge to groundwater, or other). Water discharges are characterized as "sanitary", "process", "cooling" or "other". Where the location does not maintain metered discharges for all categories, water mass balance or engineering estimates are used to estimate the discharge volumes by type.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Many of our plants operate onsite pre-treatment systems for wastewater that vary based on the specific wastewater characteristics. Most of our facilities discharge to a POTW or other third parties for treatment and disposal. Treatment methods may include pH adjustment, oil/water separation, physical settling/separation, filtration, chemical flocculation, aerobic or anaerobic biological treatment, and others. At this time we do not track cumulative discharge volumes by individual treatment methods.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Many of our manufacturing locations discharge process wastewater via a local industrial discharge permit. Sampling and analysis of the discharge is required by these permits. Based on operation monitoring of wastewaters include pH, biological or chemical oxygen demand, oil & grease, total or dissolved solids, or site specific parameters like metals, surfactant, and others. 3 locations have "0" industrial discharge permits and certify annually that no industrial effluent is discharged to sewer.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Many of our plants operate onsite pre-treatment systems for wastewater that vary based on the specific wastewater characteristics. These operations are under authorization of a discharge permit from either a state or local authority and include monitoring of wastewater discharge parameters. The water use and treatment is managed locally and quality parameters are not reported to the corporate level unless they are outside specification limits. Permit excursions result in agency notification, an incident investigation and corrective action. Ten of our manufacturing plants (56%) operate WW treatment systems with monitoring representing 71%

of our process and cooling wastewater. The remaining wastewater flows are associated with either smaller scale operations (not classified as significant industrial use), domestic use only (offices, warehouses), or are hauled to be treated offsite by a third party.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Direct sampling and analysis of discharge. Frequency of measurement varies from every week to semi-annually depending on individual site parameters and permit requirements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Many of our plants operate onsite pre-treatment systems for wastewater that vary based on the specific wastewater characteristics. These operations are under authorization of a discharge permit from either a state or local authority and include monitoring of wastewater or stormwater discharge parameters. Quality parameters are not reported to the corporate level unless they are outside specification limits. Permit excursions result in agency notification, an incident investigation and corrective action. 7 of our sites, representing 39% of our plants, monitor ammoniacal nitrogen, total nitrogen, inorganic nitrogen, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, and/or total phosphorus in wastewater. Others monitor for specific pollutants based on their operations (e.g. zinc or surfactants).

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Direct measurement. Frequency of measurement varies from every 1-2 weeks to monthly depending on site parameter and permit requirements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Many of our plants operate onsite pre-treatment systems for wastewater that vary based on the specific wastewater characteristics. These operations are under authorization of a discharge permit from either a state or local authority and include monitoring of wastewater discharge parameters. The water use and treatment is managed locally and quality parameters are not reported to the corporate level unless they are outside specification limits. Permit excursions result in agency notification, an incident investigation and corrective action. 5 of our manufacturing plants, representing 28% of our plants, are specifically required to monitor temperature.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Mass balance (total reported withdrawal - total reported discharge = net consumption).

(9.2.4) Please explain

All reporting sites estimate net consumption as total water in minus total water out.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Many of our processes include recovery or reclaim process water loops which helps reduce our freshwater processing requirements. However, this is not consistently monitored across our operations, and we do not gather this data at the corporate level. A rough estimate of recycled liquors (water) in our sodium bicarbonate manufacturing operations is in the tens of millions of gallons per year. We are developing engineering solutions to ensure recovered water meets quality standards for use or alternative non-product applications to maximize the reclaim benefits. We estimate these projects could save at least 10 million gallons of water if fully realized and optimized across multiple manufacturing facilities.

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

Presence is monitored and disruption is addressed for operational lavatories, locker rooms/showers, and potable water at each facility.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All facilities have functional WASH services available to all employees.
[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)

1641

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Total water intake marginally increased in 2024 relative to 2023, but less than 4% so is considered about the same. This increase is primarily attributed to improved metering, increased production, construction, and line changes. Leaks from valves or other water-handling equipment deficiencies that were repaired in 2024 also partially contributed to our decreased water intake. We continue to look for opportunities to minimize water usage and improve efficiency. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

724

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Internal tracking indicates total water discharge significantly increased in 2024 from 2023. This is primarily attributed to improved metered discharge measurement and increased production. In 2023, we invested resources to examine engineering opportunities to process and reclaim wastewater that we currently dispose or discharge. Projects include diverting "clean" non-contact water flow from wastewater for capture and reuse and installation of a trial treatment system to capture and treat select wastewater streams. In 2024, pilot installations proved successful in diverting water for recovery, but we were unable to fully reclaim the recovered water volume due to the potential risk associated with product quality. We are developing engineering solutions to ensure recovered water meets quality standards for use or alternative non-product applications to maximize the reclaim benefits. We estimate these projects could save at least 10 million gallons of water if fully realized and optimized across multiple manufacturing facilities. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

916

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Consumption is calculated as total discharge subtracted from total inputs. Internal tracking indicates total water consumption decreased in 2024 from 2023. This is primarily attributed to improved discharge metering and production related factors such as volume, formula updates, and product mix. As the company continues to grow, we would expect water consumption to increase with growth. However, continuing water reduction and efficiency efforts has potential to maintain about the same net consumption. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.
[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)

120

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

7.31

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

As defined in 2022, we define our "areas of water stress" to locations classified by medium to high or high overall water WRI risk or greater. All of our locations maintained the same overall water risk classification in 2024 as 2023 except one site reduced its water risk to low-medium. Two of our sites remained classified as high overall water risk. There was an increase in water withdrawal from water stressed regions in 2024 from 2023. The increased withdrawal amount is attributed to increased production as well as an additional water line added at one of our sites. Water conservation efforts at these sites including reduced irrigation and optimized mixing and cleaning. The majority of our locations are in low to medium risk or low risk areas as defined by the WRI framework. Approximately 93% of our total water extraction is from locations classified as a low or low to medium overall water risk. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.
[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:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

C&D does not directly withdrawal surface water at any of our locations. One facility relies upon fresh surface water extracted by an adjoining industrial facility, which then provides potable water to our facility. This water is captured in the third party sources line.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Brackish/seawater is not used in our operations.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

308

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Only two locations use direct extraction of groundwater. Total groundwater extraction in 2024 was up, but less than about 4% so is considered about the same. A large construction project temporarily increased site pullulation contributing to the noted water withdrawal increase. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Non-renewable groundwater as defined by CDP is not used in our operations.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Produced or entrained water as defined by CDP is not used in our operations.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1332

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Total water intake from public or private sources marginally increased in 2024 relative to 2023, but less than 4% so is considered about the same. The noted increase is primarily due to improved measurement with increased metering, increased production, and line changes. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.
[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)

120

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to surface water increase was above our 4% threshold so was higher in 2024 relative to 2023. Two plants discharge treated wastewater direct to fresh water. The increase is mostly attributed to revised cooling water setpoints at one site to meet new permit requirements that led to increased cooling water turnover. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

None of our facilities discharge to brackish surface water bodies or seawater.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

33

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to groundwater primarily consists of irrigation (landscape maintenance) and three locations that operated onsite septic systems for sanitary wastes. In 2025, erroneous irrigation water use values at one site were corrected for CY2023 and CY2024. The “higher” comparison to last year represents the relative change from the restated 2023 number (to reflect the correction at one site) against the 2024 number. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

571

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Most of our WW is discharged to POTW or hauled to third parties for treatment. There was a significant increase in water discharged to third parties due to improved measurement, increased production, and line changes. In 2025, the water discharge estimation methodology was updated at one site to improve accuracy, resulting in a lower discharge value in 2023 than historically calculated. The "much higher" comparison to last year represents the relative change from the restated 2023

number (to reflect the correction at one site) against the 2024 number. Comparison of totals: About same = delta +/- 4%; higher or lower = delta +/- 5-20%; much higher or lower = delta +/- >20%.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization’s emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☑ Nitrates

☑ Phosphates

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Quality parameters for nitrates, phosphates, and other priority substances are monitored by each individual site for compliance purposes. Cumulative total discharge by mass emissions data is not generated or collected.
[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

10

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.3.4) Please explain

We have assessed risks, opportunities, impacts, and dependencies related to water use in our direct operations. We have evaluated our impacts and dependencies at our 3 largest locations that have the highest water withdrawal using the Encore (encorenature.org) online tool. We have considered risks of a more global nature and therefore consider our top 10 water using sites to potentially be at risk from either water availability risks or severe weather risks. These 10 locations represent 42% of total reporting sites, but 56% of manufacturing locations and 94% of total water intake. Nine (9) of these locations produce consumer products, while the 10th makes animal nutrition products for our Specialty Products Division. Any disruption in access to clean water for use in product formulation or site cleaning/sanitation would inhibit our ability to make and sell product to our customers. We regularly monitor the WRI ranking of our locations to understand changing regional water risks, perform periodic local water/wastewater infrastructure studies, and communicate with applicable regulatory bodies with jurisdiction over our water and wastewater operations to stay informed and mitigate potential impacts related to our water use and management. This includes prioritizing locations for water conservation and management improvement projects.

Upstream value chain

(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

147

(9.3.4) Please explain

To date our primary focus has been on water use/risk in our direct operations. However, we perform information gathering on water management and use from within our supply chain through CDP Supply Chain as well as from our contract manufacturing base through direct survey. In 2024 we contacted 77 suppliers representing about 90% of our domestic US spend (through CDP) as well as 70 contract manufacturers (through direct survey). We received and are reviewing responses from 93 suppliers/contract manufacturers. This informs us regarding their degree of water management, use, and if they have water reduction and efficiency efforts. To date we have not done a comprehensive review and prioritization of water related impacts, dependencies, risks and opportunities in the upstream value chain. As we continue to gather data and examine our water risks we will assess the need to implement such a review in the future.
[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)

York, PA

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(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

United States of America

☑ Susquehanna River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.93648

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-76.84978

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

407

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

407

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

70.4

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

70.1

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

337

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water intake increased slightly above 4% due to a 3% increase in production and product trials. Water discharge increased 18% due to operational issues that have been identified and resolved.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Colonial Heights, VA

(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

☑ Opportunities

(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

United States of America

☑ James River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.300275

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-77.38453

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

42.8

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

42.8

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

38.4

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0.51

(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

37.9

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

4.41

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Increased water metrics are due to a process change and introduction of a new production line. While there is overall increase production across the existing and new lines in 2024 vs 2023, the primary driver in increased water demand is associated with more frequent line changes that require more frequent equipment cleaning on the remaining original production lines.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Mason City, IA

(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

☑ Opportunities

(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

Canada

☑ Mississippi River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

43.142395

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-93.191071

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

47.2

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

47.2

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

41.9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

41.9

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

5.35

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water inputs and discharge increased by 13% and 16% respectively. Water input and discharge increase is largely driven by a wet scrubber air pollution control device on site. Water net consumption, despite 21% increase in site production, remained within our 4% change threshold to be considered about the same.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Folkestone, UK

(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

☑ Opportunities

(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 :Coastal drainage

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

43.661646

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

1.197207

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

37.9

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

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

37.9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

34.6

(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

34.6

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3.29

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water inputs and discharged decreased by 8% due to a 9% decrease in production and water efficiency efforts.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Old Fort, OH

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(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

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Great Lakes Basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.240462

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-83.118106

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

317

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

308

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

8.62

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

122

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

117

(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

3.93

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

195

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water intake increased slightly above 4% largely due to hydro-excavation activities conducted during a major construction event. Discharge increased by 5% largely due revised cooling water setpoints to meet new permit requirements that led to increased cooling water turnover. Production volumes and net water consumption were relatively unchanged.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Lakewood, NJ

(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

☑ Opportunities

(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 :Metedeconk River/Mid-Atlantic Basin

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.061226

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-74.180716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

138

(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

138

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

63.4

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

63.4

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

74.6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water inputs decreased by 10% and consumption decreased by 20% due to a 11% decline in production, shift in production mix, and water conservation efforts including condensation return and water pretreatment improvements.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Victorville, CA

(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

☑ Opportunities

(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 :Mojave River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.486607

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-117.286789

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

113

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

113

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

36

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

29.7

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

6.29

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

76.5

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

In 2025, 2023 and 2024 discharge values were corrected to include water used for irrigation, which was previously included in the net consumption calculation. With this adjustment as well as measurement improvements via a new meter, a new process line installation, and increased production, total water inputs and total discharge were up in 2024 relative to 2023. The comparison to last year represents the relative change from the restated 2023 number against the 2024 number.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Green River, WY

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.528576

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-109.466246

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

202

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

202

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

144

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

3.01

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

141

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

58.1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water inputs significantly increased due to improving input metering and measurement. Water discharge significantly increased while consumption significantly decreased because of improved discharge measurement.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Vancouver, WA

(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

☑ Opportunities

(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

Canada

☑ Columbia River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

45.640316

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-122.606101

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

72.6

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

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

72.6

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

62.5

(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

62.5

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

10.1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Site operations and water metrics remained about the same.

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Harrisonville, MO

(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

☑ Opportunities

(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

Canada

☑ Mississippi River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.870521

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-94.364919

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

170

(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

170

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

41.9

(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

41.9

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

In 2025, water discharge estimation methodology was updated to improve accuracy. The 2023 discharge value was over estimated, and net consumption was underestimated. This calculation correction reduced the discharge estimate with a corresponding increase in net consumption. When recalculating historic data, water inputs, net consumption, and discharge in 2024 were lower than the revised 2023. This is attributed to a 5% decrease in production. The comparison to last year represents the relative change from the restated 2023 number against the 2024 number.
[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

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

To date we have focused our verification efforts on our carbon accounting. As our sustainability programs continue to mature we will evaluate the need to expand data assurance to other areas, including our water accounting.
[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

This may include any of our consumer product plants including Lakewood, NJ; Colonial Heights, VA; York, PA; Old Fort, OH; Harrisonville, MO; Green River, WY; Vancouver, WA, Victorville, CA; or Folkestone UK depending upon specific products.

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

If facility production is curtailed by water availability or disrupted by severe weather or related water issues, product will not be available for customer.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

We have considered more global risks and therefore consider our top 10 water using sites to potentially be at risk from either water availability risks or severe weather risks. Depending upon the specific product the requesting supply chain member may be impacted by water risks impacting any of our plants. Our overall water risk management practice, including assessing local water/wastewater availability risk, focus on water reductions in both our product formulations and processing operations, help to mitigate these risks and enable continued production of products to our customers.

Row 2

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

This may include any of our consumer product plants including Lakewood, NJ; Colonial Heights, VA; York, PA; Old Fort, OH; Harrisonville, MO; Green River, WY; Vancouver, WA, Victorville, CA; or Folkestone UK depending upon specific products.

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

If facility production is curtailed by water availability or disrupted by severe weather or related water issues, product will not be available for customer.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

We have considered more global risks and therefore consider our top 10 water using sites to potentially be at risk from either water availability risks or severe weather risks. Depending upon the specific product the requesting supply chain member may be impacted by water risks impacting any of our plants. Our overall water risk management practice, including assessing local water/wastewater availability risk, focus on water reductions in both our product formulations and processing operations, help to mitigate these risks and enable continued production of products to our customers.

Row 3

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

This may include any of our consumer product plants including Lakewood, NJ; Colonial Heights, VA; York, PA; Old Fort, OH; Harrisonville, MO; Green River, WY; Vancouver, WA, Victorville, CA; or Folkestone UK depending upon specific products.

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

If facility production is curtailed by water availability or disrupted by severe weather or related water issues, product will not be available for customer.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

We have considered more global risks and therefore consider our top 10 water using sites to potentially be at risk from either water availability risks or severe weather risks. Depending upon the specific product the requesting supply chain member may be impacted by water risks impacting any of our plants. Our overall water risk management practice, including assessing local water/wastewater availability risk, focus on water reductions in both our product formulations and processing operations, help to mitigate these risks and enable continued production of products to our customers.

Row 4

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

This may include any of our consumer product plants including Lakewood, NJ; Colonial Heights, VA; York, PA; Old Fort, OH; Harrisonville, MO; Green River, WY; Vancouver, WA, Victorville, CA; or Folkestone UK depending upon specific products.

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

If facility production is curtailed by water availability or disrupted by severe weather or related water issues, product will not be available for customer.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

We have considered more global risks and therefore consider our top 10 water using sites to potentially be at risk from either water availability risks or severe weather risks. Depending upon the specific product the requesting supply chain member may be impacted by water risks impacting any of our plants. Our overall water risk management practice, including assessing local water/wastewater availability risk, focus on water reductions in both our product formulations and processing operations, help to mitigate these risks and enable continued production of products to our customers.

Row 5

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

This may include any of our consumer product plants including Lakewood, NJ; Colonial Heights, VA; York, PA; Old Fort, OH; Harrisonville, MO; Green River, WY; Vancouver, WA, Victorville, CA; Montreal, QC; or Folkestone UK depending upon specific products.

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

If facility production is curtailed by water availability or disrupted by severe weather or related water issues, product will not be available for customer.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

We have considered more global risks and therefore consider our top 10 water using sites to potentially be at risk from either water availability risks or severe weather risks. Depending upon the specific product the requesting supply chain member may be impacted by water risks impacting any of our plants. Our overall water risk management practice, including assessing local water/wastewater availability risk, focus on water reductions in both our product formulations and processing operations, help to mitigate these risks and enable continued production of products to our customers.

Row 6

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

This may include any of our consumer product plants including Lakewood, NJ; Colonial Heights, VA; York, PA; Old Fort, OH; Harrisonville, MO; Green River, WY; Vancouver, WA, Victorville, CA; or Folkestone UK depending upon specific products.

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

If facility production is curtailed by water availability or disrupted by severe weather or related water issues, product will not be available for customer.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

We have considered more global risks and therefore consider our top 10 water using sites to potentially be at risk from either water availability risks or severe weather risks. Depending upon the specific product the requesting supply chain member may be impacted by water risks impacting any of our plants. Our overall water risk management practice, including assessing local water/wastewater availability risk, focus on water reductions in both our product formulations and processing operations, help to mitigate these risks and enable continued production of products to our customers.
[Add row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	6107100000	*3721572.21*	*We expect our withdrawal to decrease with future water efficiency projects.*

[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Total products shipped

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.345

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

The denominator is per metric ton of product shipped. In 2024, 2,652,749 tonnes were shipped.

(9.12.5) Comment

We have not developed product specific water intensity data however we do have water intensity data for the organization in M3/MT product shipped.

Row 2

(9.12.1) Product name

Total products shipped

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.618

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water withdrawn

(9.12.4) Denominator

The denominator is per metric ton of product shipped. In 2024, 2,652,749 tonnes were shipped.

(9.12.5) Comment

We have not developed product specific water intensity data, however we do have water intensity data for the organization in M3/MT product shipped.
[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:

☑ Other, please specify :Internal Restricted Substance List

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Don't know

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

As a consumer products company we manufacture personal care and household products that may include hazardous materials as defined by the USEPA or other jurisdictions. These include acidic or basic cleaning products, surfactant containing detergents and cleaners, flammable and non-flammable aerosols, and a few flammable liquid (alcohol based) personal care products. Compliance with wastewater discharge permits and requirements is based on the types of materials processed at each site, including those that may be hazardous. Our R&D processes reviews extensive data sources with respect to potential ingredients to understand their toxicity and environmental hazards, including bioaccumulation and persistence, and we strive to select safer chemicals that perform the same function. Our restricted substance list (RSL) is managed by a multi-department team to update the list of chemicals as new findings and legislation emerges. We maintain a master list of restricted substances addressing chemicals referenced in national and global standards. Today, none of the Restricted Ingredient List will be intentionally added to any of our formulations. We also review formulations from our acquired brands to identify whether any restricted substances should be removed. If any are identified, an action plan is put in place to address it. We do not currently track revenue information specifically associated with products containing hazardous substances or residual restricted substances.
[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

We define "low water impact" products as being those that have substantially smaller water content, and therefore require a reduced quantity of water for their manufacturing process, relative to a comparable "average" product. We also have some products such as dry shampoo, that provide an alternative to higher volume water use in the end use phase. We do not reference any specific international guidance in defining low water impact products.

(9.14.4) Please explain

Examples of Church & Dwight's low water impact products include dry shampoo, concentrated laundry detergent, laundry pod products, laundry detergent sheets, and laundry product formulated for use in high efficiency washing machines.
[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:

☑ Yes

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

Because all of our operating location are in the US, Canada, and UK adequate WASH services are considered as expected and baseline for our plants. Therefore no improvement targets have been formally set.

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

We continue to examine our water reduction goals and targets. By continuous water reduction we recognize that it may impact our ability to meet wastewater criteria and has occasionally resulted in challenges for re-use of the volume of recovered water. While there is still opportunity to reduce water volumes and increase efficiency, we are considering alternative targets and goals within our water sustainability program.
[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per product

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2024

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

72.8

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2024

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

65.5

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

74.1

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-18

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target is to reduce our total water withdrawals from our direct operations by 10% annually normalized to production.

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

In 2024, our normalized water reduction was higher primarily due to improved metering in 2024. We continue to develop and implement water conservation projects to achieve our goal. In 2024, pilot installations proved successful in diverting water for recovery, but we were unable to fully reclaim the recovered volume due to the potential product quality. We are developing engineering solutions to ensure recovered water meets quality standards for reuse or alternative non-product applications to maximize the reclaim benefits. We estimate these projects may save 10 million gallons of water if fully realized across multiple manufacturing facilities. In 2024, we revised our water reduction target from 10% to 5% for 2025 onward. This adjustment reflects the diminishing marginal benefits of the projects we implement, as the simpler, more effective measures have already been utilized and further water reductions is having a negative impact on sanitation and manufacturing capability.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Our water use efficiency can be seen in our normalized water metric (thousand gallons water intake/mass product shipped). We are evaluating water targets other than direct reduction on incoming water because in many cases the further reduction in water use is starting to impact our production especially in the areas of

maintaining sanitation and ability to treat or discharge wastewater with higher contaminant concentrations as we reduce extraneous water use. Further minimization of water use, without significant technology shifts is becoming more difficult resulting in a shift in our target for 2025 and forward. However, we continue to explore water reclaim and recycling where appropriate.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Other water pollution, please specify :0 WW and Stormwater NOVs

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/01/2023

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

2

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2024

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

4

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target is to have 0 notices of violation of our wastewater and stormwater permits annually.

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

We perform root cause analysis and implement corrective actions implemented for any water related NOVs to minimize likelihood of recurrence. For the wastewater violations resolutions include: improved equipment recalibration, system and equipment O&M, improved monitoring, and training for responsible employees who maintain our water and wastewater systems.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Our water pollution target to meet regulatory requirements is evergreen.
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

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

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.1.2) Target type and metric

Plastic polymers

☑ Reduce or eliminate the use of hazardous substances

☑ Reduce the use of polymers with properties that may hinder their reusability, recyclability and disposal

Plastic packaging

☑ Reduce or eliminate the use of hazardous substances

☑ Eliminate problematic and unnecessary plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is reusable

☑ Reduce the total weight of virgin content in plastic packaging

☑ Reduce the total weight of plastic packaging used and/or produced

☑ Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale

☑ Increase the proportion of renewable content from responsibly managed sources in plastic packaging

End-of-life management

☑ Increase the proportion of recyclable plastic waste that we collect, sort, and recycle

☑ Increase the proportion of recyclable plastic waste that is collected, sorted, and recycled

☑ Reduce the proportion of plastic waste which is sent to landfill and/or incinerated

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

☑ Ensure compliance with EPR policies and schemes

☑ Adhere to eco-design requirements

(10.1.3) Please explain

Church and Dwight has specific internal and public goals surrounding the use of packaging plastic polymers for use within its brands which use non harmful and widely recyclable resins. Church and Dwight also has an internal and public goal to increase the adoption of post consumer recycled content in its plastic packaging. We also have an internal and public goal to reduce the amount of virgin plastic material. Over 22.9% of our plastic packaging is post-consumer recycled content (up from 18.1% in 2023). Church and Dwight has a recyclability target of 95% for all its plastic and non plastic packaging materials by the end of 2025. Our target is to increase Post-Consumer Recycled (PCR) plastic to a minimum of 25% average across all global plastic packaging by the end of 2025 and reduce the amount of virgin (petroleum based) plastic packaging used globally by more than 30% versus 2017 baseline data by the end of 2025. Similar goals are being developed for plastic products, but are not as fully developed as for packaging. Church and Dwight sells durable goods containing plastic parts under the Spinbrush, Flawless, Waterpik, Trojan and First Response brands.
[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not produce or commercialize plastic polymers

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We source, but so not produce durable plastic goods and components

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Church and Dwight sells durable goods under the Spinbrush, Flawless, Waterpik, Trojan and First Response brands that include plastic components.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not produce plastic packaging

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Church and Dwight commercializes products across many of its brands using plastic material as part of the packaging.

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not provide services that use plastic packaging

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not provide waste management services

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not provide financial services

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Not applicable
[Fixed row]

(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content.

Durable goods and durable components used

(10.4.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

0

(10.4.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ None

(10.4.7) Please explain

We are initiating plastic reductions in our durable goods products that contain plastics. To date most of our efforts have been focused on packaging which is the predominant use of plastic for our organization. We are starting to extend these initiatives to our durable goods containing plastics; however, the details requested above are not currently available.
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

68556

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ % virgin fossil-based content

☑ % pre-consumer recycled content

☑ % post-consumer recycled content

(10.5.3) % virgin fossil-based content

49

(10.5.5) % pre-consumer recycled content

29

(10.5.6) % post-consumer recycled content

22

(10.5.7) Please explain

These percentages are based on averages across our brand portfolios for plastic packaging specified and used. Any content not specified as PIR (post-industrial recycle or "pre-consumer recycled") or PCR (post consumer recycled) is considered virgin fossil based. We do not have standards or tracking in our data on virgin renewable content, if any.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

Select all that apply

☑ % technically recyclable

☑ % recyclable in practice and at scale

(10.5.1.3) % of plastic packaging that is technically recyclable

71.1

(10.5.1.4) % of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice at scale

70

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

70% of our packaging materials by weight are considered recyclable in practice and at scale. An additional 1.1% is considered technically recyclable.
[Fixed row]

(10.6) Provide the total weight of waste generated by the plastic you produce, commercialize, use and/or process and indicate the end-of-life management pathways.

Usage of plastic

(10.6.1) Total weight of waste generated during the reporting year (Metric tons)

68556

(10.6.2) End-of-life management pathways available to report

Select all that apply

☑ Recycling

☑ Landfill

(10.6.4) % recycling

70

(10.6.8) % landfill

30

(10.6.12) Please explain

The reported value is plastic used in product packaging. Because we have no control over end user end of life management, or means to measure end of life management, we are reporting the % recycle as the relative mass of plastic packaging used that is recyclable in practice at scale (70%). The difference is assumed disposed in landfill.
[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, and we do not plan to undertake any biodiversity-related actions

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*

[Fixed 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:

☑ Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)

(13.1.3) Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

We are currently prioritizing our resources to third party verify our carbon related data and processes. We are reviewing our practices and processes anticipating we will extend our verification activities to include our total energy data and water related data in the near future.
[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
	We are not providing additional information

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Executive Vice President, Chief Supply Chain Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ No