# Welcome to your CDP Climate Change Questionnaire 2023

# C0. Introduction

## C0.1

**(C0.1) Give a general description and introduction to your organization.**

One of the world's leading food companies, General Mills operates in more than 100 countries and markets more than 100 consumer brands, including Cheerios, Haagen-Dazs, Nature Valley, Pillsbury, Old El Paso, Progresso, Yoplait, Cascadian Farm, Annie's, Muir Glen, Yoki, and Blue Buffalo. Headquartered in Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, General Mills had fiscal 2022 global net sales of $19 billion. For more than 150 years, General Mills has been making food the world loves. For us that has always meant ensuring our food is a reflection of our ability to do good for our people, planet and communities. That central mission is at the heart of General Mills. But we have never believed in growth for growth's sake.  At General Mills, we work to create holistic value throughout our value chain, from agriculture and operations to our consumers and communities. Below are some highlights of our progress in fiscal 2022 from our 2023 Global Responsibility Report (GRR).

- 100 percent of our company owned production facilities are Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI) certified
- 40 percent of General Mills global volume met the company's criteria as Nutrition Forward Foods
- General Mills is the largest provider of natural and organic packaged food in the US (includes food for both humans and pets)
- We will advance regenerative agriculture on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030
- 100 percent of our 10 priority ingredients are sustainability sourced
- 92 percent of General Mills packaging recyclable or reusable (by weight)
- 87 percent renewable electricity sourced for our global operations
- 88 percent of our employees say that General Mills is a great place to work
- 50 percent of professional positions and 34 percent of company officer positions globally are held by women
- Our global total injury rate was 2.45 injuries per 1 million hours worked by employees in fiscal 2022, significantly below food-industry averages
- We gave US$90 million to charitable causes in fiscal 2022, including General Mills Foundation grants, corporate contributions and food donations
- Over 70 percent of our employees worldwide volunteered in their communities
- Our product donations to food banks enabled 29 million meals around the world in fiscal 2022

# C0.2

**(C0.2) State the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data and indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years.**

**Reporting year**

**Start date**

May 31, 2021

**End date**

May 30, 2022

**Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years**

No

# C0.3

**(C0.3) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.**

Australia
Belgium
Brazil
Canada
China
France
Germany
Greece
Hong Kong SAR, China
India
Ireland
Italy
Malaysia
Mexico
Republic of Korea
Singapore
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Taiwan, China
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America

# C0.4

**(C0.4) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.**

USD

## C0.5

**(C0.5) Select the option that describes the reporting boundary for which climate-related impacts on your business are being reported. Note that this option should align with your chosen approach for consolidating your GHG inventory.**

Operational control

## C-AC0.6/C-FB0.6/C-PF0.6

**(C-AC0.6/C-FB0.6/C-PF0.6) Are emissions from agricultural/forestry, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or emissions from the consumption of your products – whether in your direct operations or in other parts of your value chain – relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?**

| | Relevance |
|---|---|
| Agriculture/Forestry | Elsewhere in the value chain only [Agriculture/Forestry/processing/manufacturing/Distribution only] |
| Processing/Manufacturing | Both direct operations and elsewhere in the value chain [Processing/manufacturing/Distribution only] |
| Distribution | Both direct operations and elsewhere in the value chain [Processing/manufacturing/Distribution only] |
| Consumption | Yes [Consumption only] |

## C-AC0.6b/C-FB0.6b/C-PF0.6b

**(C-AC0.6b/C-FB0.6b/C-PF0.6b) Why are emissions from agricultural/forestry activities undertaken on your own land not relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?**

**Row 1**

**Primary reason**

Do not own/manage land

**Please explain**

General Mills does not directly own and / or operate agricultural land.

## C-AC0.7/C-FB0.7/C-PF0.7

**(C-AC0.7/C-FB0.7/C-PF0.7) Which agricultural commodity(ies) that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue? Select up to five.**

### Agricultural commodity

Wheat

### % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

40-60%

### Produced or sourced

Sourced

### Please explain

Wheat is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, including Big G Cereals like Wheaties, Gold Medal Flour, and Betty Crocker. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable wheat because of wheat's relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the wheat value chain. Wheat is one of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change.

Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

### Agricultural commodity

Other, please specify

Oats

### % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

20-40%

### Produced or sourced

Sourced

### Please explain

General Mills is a significant buyer of oats for multiple brands, including large scale brands Cheerios and Nature Valley. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable oats because of this grain's relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the oat value chain. Oats is one of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change.

Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on

the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

### Agricultural commodity

Cattle products

### % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

40-60%

### Produced or sourced

Sourced

### Please explain

Dairy is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, including Yoplait and Hagen-Dazs. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable dairy because of its relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the dairy value chain. Dairy is one of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change.

Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

### Agricultural commodity

Palm Oil

### % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

10-20%

### Produced or sourced

Sourced

### Please explain

Due to General Mills brands usage of Palm Oil [volume based], as well as known supply chain risks, General Mills has worked to source this commodity sustainably based on RSPO standards. Palm Oil is included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change.

Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

**Agricultural commodity**

Sugar

**% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity**

60-80%

**Produced or sourced**

Sourced

**Please explain**

Sugar is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, used in cereal, snacks, yogurt/ice cream, baked goods and other many other products. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable sugar because of its relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the sugar value chain. Sugar, both from beet and cane plants, are two of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change.

Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

## C0.8

**(C0.8) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?**

| Indicate whether you are able to provide a unique identifier for your organization | Provide your unique identifier |
|---|---|
| Yes, a Ticker symbol | GIS |

# C1. Governance

## C1.1

**(C1.1) Is there board-level oversight of climate-related issues within your organization?**

Yes

# C1.1a

**(C1.1a) Identify the position(s) (do not include any names) of the individual(s) on the board with responsibility for climate-related issues.**

| Position of individual or committee | Responsibilities for climate-related issues |
|---|---|
| Board-level committee | Oversight of the company's sustainability work is provided by the General Mills Board of Director's Public Responsibility Committee (PRC). The purpose of the PRC is to assist the Board of Directors in fulfilling its responsibilities to oversee the company's position on issues of corporate social responsibility and sustainability, including environmental and climate matters, public policy and corporate citizenship around the world. The PRC regularly reviews the company's climate-related objectives, strategies and performance as well as public policy issues. This includes identifying climate-related issues that may affect General Mills' overall sustainability strategy. For example, during 2021, the PRC reviewed Climate Change as a strategic risk in the company-wide Enterprise Risk Management process. In addition, as an example of the PRC's responsibility, the committee reviewed and approved General Mills' 2023 Global Responsibility Report, which is the company's primary disclosure to stakeholders on climate and other ESG issues. In addition, the committee regularly reviews public policy issues and social trends affecting General Mills; monitors our corporate citizenship activities and sustainability, environmental and climate programs; evaluates our policies in the context of emerging corporate social responsibility issues; and reviews our policies governing political contributions. |

# C1.1b

**(C1.1b) Provide further details on the board's oversight of climate-related issues.**

| Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item | Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated | Please explain |
|---|---|---|
| Scheduled – all meetings | Reviewing and guiding strategy<br>Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | The Public Responsibility Committee regularly reviews the company's sustainability objectives, strategies and performance, including environmental and climate. For example, the committee regularly receives updates on and oversees progress against our goals and targets, such as our goal to reduce emissions by 30% by 2030 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement | and net zero emissions by 2050. This is one way our climate-related issues are incorporated into board discussions. In addition, as an example of the PRC's responsibility, the committee reviewed and approved General Mills' 2023 Global Responsibility Report, which is company's primary disclosure to stakeholders on climate and other ESG issues.<br>The committee also reviews public policy issues and social trends affecting General Mills; monitors our corporate citizenship activities and sustainability programs, including environmental and climate; evaluates our policies in the context of emerging corporate social responsibility issues; and reviews our policies governing political contributions and our record of contributions. |

# C1.1d

**(C1.1d) Does your organization have at least one board member with competence on climate-related issues?**

| | Board member(s) have competence on climate-related issues | Criteria used to assess competence of board member(s) on climate-related issues |
|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | Yes | As described in our proxy statement, we ensure our Board of Director nominees possess the qualifications, skills and experiences necessary to successfully guide and oversee the company's long-term strategy and priorities. All of our directors have senior executive leadership experience leading large, complex organizations. These experiences are particularly important in evaluating key strategic decisions, setting priorities and critically evaluating performance to drive sustainable, long- term shareholder value. Importantly, many of our directors have backgrounds in consumer packaged goods (CPG), retail and other consumer-facing businesses that enable the board to guide management in a rapidly changing business, marketing and product innovation environment. Specifically, one of our directors served as the Chief Operating Officer of a major CPG company, overseeing strategy related to both operations and sustainability. This experience helps inform oversight of climate-related issues by the Public Responsibility Committee of the Board, a committee on which this director sits. |

# C1.2

**(C1.2) Provide the highest management-level position(s) or committee(s) with responsibility for climate-related issues.**

### Position or committee

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

testing comments - @SerenaPal

### Climate-related responsibilities of this position

Integrating climate-related issues into the strategy
Monitoring progress against climate-related corporate targets
Managing climate-related risks and opportunities

### Coverage of responsibilities

### Reporting line

Reports to the board directly

### Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues via this reporting line

Quarterly

### Please explain

The
Global Impact Governance Committee
(GIGC), led by our Chairman and CEO
and overseen by the Board's Public
Responsibility committee, is accountable
for our sustainability program. The
Chairman and CEO convenes the GIGC quarterly to establish,
direct and oversee General Mills' positions
on matters of significance to the company
and its stakeholders concerning corporate
social responsibility, environmental and
sustainability issues, and philanthropy.
These matters are included in our
Chairman and CEO's annual performance
objectives and impact his compensation.

### Position or committee

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

### Climate-related responsibilities of this position

Developing a climate transition plan
Integrating climate-related issues into the strategy
Setting climate-related corporate targets
Monitoring progress against climate-related corporate targets

Managing value chain engagement on climate-related issues
Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities
Managing climate-related risks and opportunities

**Coverage of responsibilities**

**Reporting line**

Corporate Sustainability/CSR reporting line

**Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues via this reporting line**

Quarterly

**Please explain**

The company's Chief Sustainability & Global Impact Officer (CSO) stewards the company's sustainability work, reporting to the
Chief Strategy and Growth Officer, and working closely with key business leaders to develop, coordinate and execute programs to achieve company-wide sustainability targets. This includes being responsible for strategy alignment, goal setting and resourcing sustainability efforts. Some key efforts the CSO leads include regenerative agriculture (our commitment to advance regenerative agriculture on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030) and our overall climate ambition to reduce emissions by 30% by 2030 and net zero emissions by 2050.

# C1.3

**(C1.3) Do you provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues, including the attainment of targets?**

| | Provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | Yes | |

# C1.3a

**(C1.3a) Provide further details on the incentives provided for the management of climate-related issues (do not include the names of individuals).**

**Entitled to incentive**

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

**Type of incentive**

Monetary reward

**Incentive(s)**

Salary increase

### Performance indicator(s)

Progress towards a climate-related target
Achievement of a climate-related target

### Incentive plan(s) this incentive is linked to

Short-Term Incentive Plan

### Further details of incentive(s)

Environmental and sustainability performance are included in our Chairman and CEO's annual performance objectives.
Progress on sustainability programs, including climate, are considered as part of his annual performance evaluation,
and can impact his compensation.

### Explain how this incentive contributes to the implementation of your organization's climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

Progress towards the company's science-based target is one of the key measures of environmental and sustainability performance impacting the CEO's incentive.

---

### Entitled to incentive

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

### Type of incentive

Monetary reward

### Incentive(s)

Salary increase

### Performance indicator(s)

Progress towards a climate-related target
Achievement of a climate-related target

### Incentive plan(s) this incentive is linked to

Short-Term Incentive Plan

### Further details of incentive(s)

Managing the company's climate program is one of the items in the CSO's annual objectives and impacts the CSO's performance rating and resulting incentive.

### Explain how this incentive contributes to the implementation of your organization's climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

This incentive is linked to making progress against our science-based climate target

# C2. Risks and opportunities

## C2.1

**(C2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities?**

Yes

## C2.1a

**(C2.1a) How does your organization define short-, medium- and long-term time horizons?**

| | From (years) | To (years) | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Short-term | 0 | 3 | This is the time horizon we use when considering climate related issues. We may re-evaluate this time range as we continue to expand our climate-related assessments, capabilities and strategies. |
| Medium-term | 3 | 10 | This is the time horizon we use when considering climate related issues. We may re-evaluate this time range as we continue to expand our climate-related assessments, capabilities and strategies. |
| Long-term | 10 | 30 | This is the time horizon we use when considering climate related issues. We may re-evaluate this time range as we continue to expand our climate-related assessments, capabilities and strategies. |

## C2.1b

**(C2.1b) How does your organization define substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?**

For purposes of this disclosure, we are defining substantive financial risks, including climate-related risks, to mean an impact greater than $150 million to General Mills. Strategic impact, both for climate-related and non-climate-related risks, is defined as impacting the organization's ability to achieve its strategic goals, including but not limited to items such as corporate reputation, customer demand, potential for business or operational disruption, impacts on employee and staffing needs, and legal or regulatory risk. In some cases, the financial impact of specific items may be unknown, proprietary, or below the company's materiality threshold. However, we know these impacts are still important to our stakeholders and therefore we have provided relevant information that provides context in the risks and opportunities section of our CDP disclosure.

## C2.2

**(C2.2) Describe your process(es) for identifying, assessing and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities.**

### Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations
Upstream
Downstream

### Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

### Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

### Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term
Medium-term
Long-term

### Description of process

Climate-related risks and opportunities are considered a part of the company-wide Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process, which is a program designed to protect enterprise value and provide reasonable assurance to management and the Board of Directors that major risk that could impact our strategic goals are identified and effectively managed by the company. Our program considers threats, opportunities and uncertainties that may impact the organization's strategic, operational, safety, compliance and financial objectives. ERM risks are continuously evaluated to assess their inherent risk (impact and likelihood) and control effectiveness over the short-term, medium-term, and long-term timeframes.

While climate-related risks and opportunities are a contributing factor for several ERM operational risks, in 2021 climate change was added as its own separate strategic ERM risk given it has the potential to impact both our direct operations as well as our upstream and downstream value chain. Inclusion in ERM program provides oversight at the highest levels of the company to ensure the risk is being managed, and elevates decisions around investments, capabilities, and mitigation effectiveness. The following steps summarize the ERM process:

1. Risk identification & Assessment: We identify risks using input from senior leaders, business units and functions as well as external perspectives. Identified risks within the program are assessed through input from Sr. Leaders, ERM Risk Owners, External Benchmarking and approved by ERM Risk Committee.
2. Risk response and control activity: Business unit/function identification of relevant risk mitigation activities. Our Global Impact Team (GIT) manages the company's strategy for climate change mitigation and adaptation. For example, recognizing the need to accelerate our
progress in reducing emissions, in fiscal 2022 the GIT worked to advance our internal climate focus from footprint accounting to building mitigation strategies, including

engaging a third party to build a climate roadmap to identify focus areas for greenhouse gas reduction. As a result, we commissioned Lever Teams to drive emission reduction across dairy, eliminating deforestation in supply chains across high-risk ingredient categories, sourcing renewable electricity, and leveraging more GHG-efficient equipment and transportation. We are
actively working and planning future action across this breadth of initiatives. The GIT reviews progress and mitigation strategies at least three times per year with the company's Global Impact Governance Committee. The GIT reports the status of climate related risks and mitigation activities to the ERM Committee.
3. Reassessment – ERM Committee reassess risk level and mitigation effectiveness of climate strategies
4. Risk Reporting – The GIT reports progress to the Global Impact Governance Committee at least three times a year, and through our ERM process, management of climate risk is reported to the Public Responsibility Committee of the Board of Directors at least annually.

TCFD risk assessment:
To better understand our climate risk and inform our ERM process, in 2020 General Mills commissioned Trucost/S&P Global to assess its climate-related transition and physical risks and opportunities. Trucost undertook a robust data-driven approach for General Mills' climate risk and opportunity assessment in line with TCFD recommendations. The assessment included: management interviews involving various leaders from across the business to understand the drivers and materiality of GMI's potential climate-related risks and opportunities; and a physical and transition risk assessment to quantify and qualify exposure to different transition risk categories (policy,
market, reputation, technology) and physical climate hazards across the company's value chain, including upstream (ingredients), company facilities and downstream (transportation, warehousing, customers). This analysis considered different climate hazards under various climate scenarios. The findings from this analysis helped inform the decision to add climate as a separate strategic ERM risk and informs the company's climate strategy. We intend to refresh this analysis in the next year to ensure we have up to date and thorough information to inform our climate mitigation plans.

An example of a transition risk identified is that we may become subject to additional legal and regulatory requirements relating to climate change or other sustainability issues, including greenhouse gas emission regulations (e.g., carbon taxes), energy policies, sustainability initiatives (e.g., single-use plastic limits), and disclosure obligations. If additional legal and regulatory requirements are enacted and are more aggressive than the sustainability measures that we are currently undertaking to monitor our emissions and improve our energy efficiency and other sustainability goals, or if we chose to take actions to achieve more aggressive goals, we may experience significant increases in our costs of operations. One way we are addressing this is through reduction of emissions in our owned operations through renewable electricity initiatives. General Mills has set a goal to source 100% renewable electricity for our global operations by 2030. Through fiscal 2022, 87% of our electricity was sourced from

renewable sources, decreasing our Scope 1 and 2 emissions, therefore decreasing exposure to potential carbon taxes.

An example of a physical risk identified is that increased frequency or severity of extreme weather could lead to critical supply chain disruptions, such as: impair our production capabilities, disrupt our supply chain, impact demand for our products, and increase our insurance and other operating costs. We are addressing this through numerous initiatives across our supply chain. For example, we have a Supply Chain Risk & Resilience team that helps to coordinate a robust annual quantitative process to identify and validate enterprise critical sites (i.e. single source). And for each identified critical site, a specific site annual mitigation plan is put in place.

# C2.2a

**(C2.2a) Which risk types are considered in your organization's climate-related risk assessments?**

| | Relevance & inclusion | Please explain |
|---|---|---|
| Current regulation | Relevant, always included | Current regulations are always included in the climate-related risk assessments on an annual basis. For example, a risk identified is increased regulatory focus linked to use/pollution of water resources. Current regulatory water restrictions in some areas of California have so far not had a direct impact on General Mills' operations but could pose an increase in operating costs if water usage was not monitored or controlled. Some of the regulatory structures in California, such as the Clean Water Act may impact operations by as much as $1,000 per day for each day of non-compliance and could also have an impact on ingredient sourcing. |
| Emerging regulation | Relevant, always included | Emerging regulations are always included in the climate-related risk assessments on an annual basis. A potential risk identified is potential increased operating cost, with respect towards carbon taxes around the world, with regulations designed to limit global warming to below 2ºC. There is a strong likelihood of climate-related policy action in the next five to 10 years in many of the markets in which General Mills operates. For example, we have already seen carbon taxes in our Canada operations, and we continue to see more schemes in place. However, General Mills is well-positioned to respond through its targets and initiatives linked to climate change and is actively engaged in policy advocacy to address climate-related issues. |
| Technology | Relevant, always included | Technology is always included in the climate-related risk assessments on an annual basis. A technological risk identified is technological improvements or innovations needed to support the transition to a lower-carbon, energy-efficient economic system, which could increase our operational costs due to investments in the short-term. There is |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | also a potential technology risk associated with failing to keep up with sustainable technologies, such as power purchase agreements, since this is evaluated as part of General Mills' corporate social responsibility by investors and other stakeholders. In addition, approximately 40% of emissions related to General Mills' business comes from the agricultural supply chain. To mitigate those impacts requires investment to be made in the wider scale adoption of Regenerative Agriculture.<br><br>General Mills has chosen to support renewable energy as a technology opportunity that supports the transition to a lower-carbon, energy-efficient economic system. In June 2017, General Mills signed a 15-year virtual power purchase agreement with Renewable Energy Systems (RES) for 100 megawatts of the Cactus Flats wind project in Concho County, Texas. In April 2019, we announced a virtual 15-year power purchase agreement with Roaring Fork Wind, LLC, a joint venture partnership between RES (Renewable Energy Systems) and Steelhead Americas, for 200 megawatts of its Maverick Creek wind project. The wind project, located in central Texas, will produce RECs for General Mills that, together with the Cactus Flats wind power agreement, are calculated to equal 100% of the electricity used annually at the company's owned U.S. and Canada facilities. |
| Legal | Not relevant, included | General Mills has not directly identified a climate-related legal suit that would be a risk to the company, General Mills would address it if there were.<br><br>An example of how we engage legal on climate includes working with our legal partners in executing a virtual power purchase agreement/wind energy commodity swap with RES Cactus Flats Wind Energy, LLC, an affiliate of RES America Developments Inc., to purchase financial electricity and renewable energy credits for a 15-year term. The legal team ensured we were able to acquire 3rd party verifiable renewable energy credits to reduce any legal risk when making GHG reduction claims. |
| Market | Relevant, always included | Market shifts in supply and demand and pricing for certain commodities, products, and services are always included in the climate related risk assessments on an annual basis. There could be a risk of lost profit if General Mills does not properly account for shifts in transportation costs for our products as part of the agricultural supply chain, where we have been actively working with suppliers to reduce costs, but also to add value to our product offerings.<br>Policy action to accelerate the shift to a low-carbon economy, in the form of increased fossil fuel taxes, is likely to have a direct impact on transportation/fuel costs for inbound and outbound transportation. This is also likely to have a significant impact on the agricultural supply chain, which relies heavily on fossil fuels, particularly diesel. In the near |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | term, alternative fuel options may be more expensive, but costs are likely to decrease in the long term as markets adapt. |
| Reputation | Relevant, always included | Reputation is always included in the climate related risk assessments on an annual basis. A risk identified is increased scrutiny and negative sentiment from stakeholders on climate-related issues as climate is one of General Mills' top risks in the regulatory and reputational sphere. Consumers expect companies like General Mills to take proactive steps to address climate-related issues. Climate-related issues are also increasingly important to employees (particularly younger, prospective employees) and investors. Any inactivity on this topic could pose a reputational risk. General Mills already sees stakeholder pressure on climate change, with increased attention being turned to agriculture. Near-term, this is unlikely to have a significant impact on the behavior of consumers or other external stakeholders. However, if the effects of climate change become more acute in the future, then the reputational risks associated with inaction could become much greater. |
| Acute physical | Relevant, always included | Acute physical risk is always included in climate-related risk assessment on an annual basis.<br>A risk identified is the impact to commodity availability and/or pricing due to extreme weather events. For example, severe weather resulting in freezing soil in one of our sugar beet sourcing regions has affected our ability to access the levels of the crop needed/planned for to make our products. This resulted in increased costs due to having to source sugar from alternate sources. |
| Chronic physical | Relevant, always included | Chronic physical risks are always included in our climate-related risk assessment on an annual basis. A chronic risk General Mills has identified is the impact on raw material supply due to change in weather patterns and conditions. For example, General Mills sources agricultural commodities (e.g. wheat, corn, oats and sugar) that are often concentrated in particular regions, and weather conditions in those regions can affect commodity prices. Most of General Mills' ingredient supply comes from North America, where parts of the food supply chain are already exposed to increased weather volatility, such as prolonged drought conditions in central parts of the US. In addition, water rights and water availability in the Rockies and down into Central California may also pose a risk to row crops such as corn, soy and wheat, as well as rice, fruits, vegetables and spices sourced from California. |

# C2.3

**(C2.3) Have you identified any inherent climate-related risks with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?**

Yes

# C2.3a

**(C2.3a) Provide details of risks identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.**

### Identifier

Risk 1

### Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Downstream

### Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation

Other, please specify

### Primary potential financial impact

Increased direct costs

### Company-specific description

Given the environmental impacts of packaging across its lifecycle, from its production to disposal, there has been growing legislation around Extended Producer Responsibility fees for manufacturers that are intended to increase recycling and regulate plastic use. General Mills has been exposed to this type of legislation and fees in its Canada and EU operations for more than a decade. We are now seeing the expansion of EPR legislation in the United States, which is General Mills' largest market (approximately 56% of our fiscal 2022 global net sales were from our US operating segments). Recently California has joined 3 other states in implementing EPR programs, and expect others to follow in the next several years. While we support and advocate for EPR programs that affect true change and circularity, the proliferation of legislation could lead to increases in cost.

### Time horizon

Medium-term

### Likelihood

More likely than not

### Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

### Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

### Potential financial impact figure (currency)

### Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

0

### Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

50,000,000

### Explanation of financial impact figure

Reliable cost estimates for state EPR bills will not be known until each state develops final fee structures in the coming years, and we are closely engaged in this process through our government affairs and policy teams. However, for purposes of this disclosure we are providing a range built on our current EPR schemes costs in Canada applied to potential expansion in US markets over 10 years.

### Cost of response to risk

0

### Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

At General Mills, we work to reduce the environmental impact of packaging by increasing use of recycled and recyclable materials, developing innovative packaging solutions and leading through external collaboration. We are focused on protecting the attributes and safety of our products while giving consumers a positive experience with our packaging, from shelf to disposal. We believe that packaging provides functional protection to our products while meeting consumers' expectations on flavor, convenience, and experience. We use a wide variety of materials to achieve these requirements and we are committed to design all our packaging to be recyclable or reusable by 2030. In fiscal 2022, 92% of our packaging for our North American and Foodservice segments was recyclable or reusable (by weight). We also engage with policymakers and industry to support a shared cost model for recycling materials when it drives both circularity and efficiency, and support standardization to the greatest extent possible.

While there are costs associated with our packaging ambition, from a financial perspective we consider these as part of our overall Global Impact costs as a whole (as many of the workstreams are interconnected). We factor these investments into our company's long-term plans, and we expect to offset them with benefits from Holistic Margin Management (HMM), Strategic Revenue Management, and fixed cost leverage. Therefore we have noted zero as the incremental cost of response to risk. As we continue to advance our efforts it is possible additional costs may arise and we may adjust our responses accordingly.

### Comment

NA

---

### Identifier

Risk 2

### Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Upstream

### Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical

Other, please specify

Rising Mean Temperature

### Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

### Company-specific description

Rising mean temperatures could potentially increase costs by as much as $20,000,000 on an annual basis across our product lines as changes in temperature extremes could affect procurement of large volume crops, such as oats, wheat, and sugar beets, all of which are among the most resource intensive crops of our 10 priority ingredients. Many of our biggest product lines are dependent on these ingredients, such as our U.S. Morning Foods operating unit which in fiscal 2022, represented approximately 17% of our global net sales.

### Time horizon

Medium-term

### Likelihood

About as likely as not

### Magnitude of impact

Medium

### Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

### Potential financial impact figure (currency)

### Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

15,000,000

### Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

20,000,000

### Explanation of financial impact figure

It is difficult to predict the full impact to the agricultural supply chain and the resulting changes and doing so may be considered speculative; however, changes in temperature and weather conditions could potentially add costs in excess of $15-20 million annually by around 2030. According to the IPCC Fifth Assessment report, yields are projected to decline for a range of crops as global temperatures rise. Some crops that General Mills sources that could be exposed to these impacts include wheat, corn and rice among others. If we assume a temperature increase of 1.4 degrees C between 2020 and 2039 (RCP 2.6) for row crops, we could see a potential yield decrease of around 4%, depending on exact crop and sourcing location. If we assume a one-to-one inverse relationship between yield and cost, that could potentially result in a cost

increase of $15-20 million, with no adaptation measures in place. This is calculated by looking at annual spend for a crop (for example, $375,000,000 - $ 500,000,000) and increasing it by 4%. e.g., low end of range; $375 million x .04 = $15 mil, high end of range: $500 million x .04 = $20 mil. General Mills sourcing information is considered proprietary information, so for this example, more specifics on exact crops, rates and quantities are not shared.

### Cost of response to risk

0

### Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

General Mills has identified the risk of increased operating cost due to rising global temperatures, and is managing this through mitigation and adaptation in our regenerative agriculture program. We define regenerative agriculture as a holistic, principles-based approach to farming and ranching that seeks to strengthen ecosystems and community resilience. Regenerative agriculture is a powerful lever for change across the agricultural supply chain and can help maintain a steady supply of high-quality ingredients while addressing some of the world's biggest environmental, social and economic challenges and opportunities. General Mills' goal is to advance regenerative agriculture on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030. Through fiscal 2022, 235,700 acres of farmland are in process of implementing regenerative management.

We believe regenerative agriculture works best when the farming is viewed as a living ecosystem. Our approach seeks to drive adoption of regenerative agriculture principles across 5 key areas: biodiversity, water management, soil health, cow and herd well-being, and farmer livelihoods and community resilience.

While there are costs associated with our regenerative agriculture ambition, from a financial perspective we consider these as part of our overall Global Impact costs as a whole (as many of the workstreams are interconnected). We factor these investments into our company's long-term plans, and we expect to offset them with benefits from Holistic Margin Management (HMM), Strategic Revenue Management, and fixed cost leverage. Therefore we have noted zero as the incremental cost of response to risk. As we continue to advance our efforts it is possible additional costs may arise and we may adjust our responses accordingly.

### Comment

NA

---

### Identifier

Risk 3

### Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

### Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation

Carbon pricing mechanisms

### Primary potential financial impact

Increased direct costs

### Company-specific description

For General Mills' operations - which includes 42 manufacturing facilities as of fiscal 2022 - there is a potential that emerging regulations could increase indirect operating costs through the form of potential fees and carbon taxes. The TCFD identifies increased pricing of GHG emissions and increased operating costs (e.g. higher compliance costs) as examples of climate-related policy risk. Carbon prices associated with emissions trading schemes, carbon taxes, fuel taxes and other policies are expected to rise in the future as governments take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the Paris Agreement. The speed and level to which carbon prices may rise is uncertain and likely to vary across countries and regions. In terms of carbon pricing risk – or the emergence of increasing taxes on fuel or GHG emissions – General Mills may face increased expenses related to paying these costs, and it may choose to pass them on to customers, absorb them, or invest in lowering its emissions. General Mills' operations in the United States - which account for 25 of the 42 global facilities and approximately 73% of manufacturing-based emissions - are exposed to the greatest carbon pricing risk, mainly due to the size of General Mills' carbon footprint at U.S. facilities, as well as a low baseline level of current carbon pricing.

### Time horizon

Medium-term

### Likelihood

About as likely as not

### Magnitude of impact

Medium

### Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

### Potential financial impact figure (currency)

### Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

2,320,000

### Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

20,880,000

### Explanation of financial impact figure

Carbon pricing risk is dependent on both the total amount of GHG emissions from a location and potential carbon price increases at that location. Under the moderate

carbon price (2-3°C) scenario, General Mills could face a cost carbon risk of between $2.32-$20.88 million by 2030. This is calculated assuming Scope 1 and 2 emissions of 464,000, which is a 42% decrease versus our F20 baseline (tying to our 2030 science-based target reduction); and multiplying that by an estimated carbon price range from a low estimate of $5/MT to a high estimate of $45/MT. 464,000 MT CO2 *$5/MT = $2,320,000 and 464,000 MT CO2*$45/MT = $20,880,000.

### Cost of response to risk

0

### Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

We manage this risk by reducing our emissions from operations (Scope 1 and 2). One key way we do this is through reducing energy use in our facilities. We identify and implement improvements through our Five-Step Energy Reduction Process, by working with our manufacturing plants to establish energy programs, conduct energy analyses, develop and execute improvement plans, and validate results. This process historically focused on facilities with significant spending on energy. We have recently evolved it to include all General Mills manufacturing facilities, by focusing improvement efforts on common systems such as compressed air, lighting and steam/hot water. In fiscal 2022, we completed 21 energy efficiency and reduction projects across the company. In total, these projects saved approximately 16 million kWh of electricity, 19 thousand MMBTU of natural gas and avoided 6,092 metric tons $CO_2e$ of GHG emissions.

Another way we reduce is emissions is through renewable electricity. During 2020, General Mills set a goal to source 100% renewable electricity for our global operations by 2030. We achieved 87% of this target through fiscal 2022 and continue to make fast progress on this commitment. We have implemented numerous renewable energy initiatives at facilities worldwide that meet financial guidelines and support our environmental objectives.

While there are costs associated with our programs to reduce emissions, from a financial perspective we consider these as part of our overall Global Impact costs as a whole (as many of the efforts are interconnected). We factor these investments into our company's long-term plans, and we expect to offset them with benefits from Holistic Margin Management (HMM), Strategic Revenue Management, and fixed cost leverage. Therefore we have noted zero as the incremental cost of response to risk. As we continue to advance our efforts it is possible additional costs may arise and we may adjust our responses accordingly.

### Comment

NA

## C2.4

### (C2.4) Have you identified any climate-related opportunities with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

Yes

# C2.4a

**(C2.4a) Provide details of opportunities identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.**

### Identifier

Opp1

### Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

### Opportunity type

Resilience

### Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Participation in renewable energy programs and adoption of energy-efficiency measures

### Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

### Company-specific description

By developing and implementing energy efficiency and reduction projects, GMI anticipates a reduction in operating costs. We have estimated that we can reduce operating costs by more than $1.5 million on an annual basis across General Mills' global operations based on 2022 planned and implemented projects where we estimate that we can attain energy savings by as much as 16 million kWh of electricity and 18,500 MMBTU of natural gas.

The amount and type of energy we use are the key drivers of GHG emissions and cost in our global operations. During fiscal year 2022, through numerous energy efficiency projects, the energy usage rate decreased by 5% compared to the prior year. We consistently work to identify and implement energy improvements and efficiency opportunities throughout the year and annually report results and believe these actions will result in both a reduction of our indirect (operating) costs and will contribute to our science-based target of reducing our GHG emissions by 2030.

### Time horizon

Short-term

### Likelihood

Likely

### Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

### Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

### Potential financial impact figure (currency)

1,500,000

### Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

### Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

### Explanation of financial impact figure

By developing and implementing energy efficiency projects, GMI anticipates a reduction in operating costs. In fiscal 2022, we completed 21 energy efficiency and reduction projects across the company. In total, these projects saved approximately 16 million kWh of electricity, 19 thousand MMBTU of natural gas and avoided 6,092 metric tons $CO_2e$ of GHG emissions. These also delivered approximately $1.5 million of cost savings. The methodology used to calculate the individual project energy savings (kWh or MMBTU) is taking an engineering estimate of the efficiency improvement based on the specs of the new equipment versus the known efficiency of the unit that is being replaced. We then take the reduced usage of kWh or MMBTU times the price for the gas/electric/water to get the annual cost savings. The exact rates and figures for these projects are considered proprietary.

### Cost to realize opportunity

5,200,000

### Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

General Mills views implementing energy efficiency & reduction projects at our internal locations as an opportunity to drive sustainability across our global operations and continually reduce our environmental impact. Our main focus areas include GHG emissions, energy use, water withdrawal and waste reduction. We identify and implement improvements through our Five-Step Energy Reduction Process, by working with our manufacturing plants to establish energy programs, conduct energy analyses, develop improvement plans, execute improvement plans, and validate results. This process historically focused on facilities with significant spending on energy. We have recently evolved it to include all General Mills manufacturing facilities, by focusing improvement efforts on common systems such as compressed air, lighting and steam/hot water.

In fiscal 2022, we invested approximately $5,200,000 USD of capital in over 21 energy efficiency and reduction projects. This is the aggregate of the capital costs associated with the 21 energy projects that were completed in fiscal 2022. These costs are tracked by our Global Energy team and partially by our corporate Capital Management Tool. The $5.2 million in capital costs is composed of 21 individual energy efficiency projects across 17 different facilities.

Calculation: $2.7 million (LED lighting projects) + $1.6 million (solar projects) + + $0.9 million (equipment upgrades and optimization) = $5.2 million

### Comment

Any additional operational costs would be considered to be minimal (less than 5% of operational costs).

### Identifier

Opp2

### Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Upstream

### Opportunity type

Resilience

### Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Other, please specify

Consistent and reliable access to ingredients

### Primary potential financial impact

Reduced direct costs

### Company-specific description

General Mills has identified the opportunity to increase the reliability of our supply chain and ability to operate under various conditions. Our ability to make food the world loves depends on our reliable and consistent access to ingredients. Our ability to sustainably and reliably source our priority ingredients helps to increase the reliability of our supply chain, reduced costs associated with having to source alternate ingredients when disruptions occur by up to $ 5 million.

We address this through development of a climate adaptation plan for our key ingredients: we have a goal to sustainably source our top 10 ingredients by 2020. These ingredients represent approximately 40% of our global spend. The ingredients included in this commitment are US wheat, US corn, oats, vanilla, cocoa, US dairy, US sugar beets, palm oil, sugarcane, and fiber packaging. Through fiscal 2020, we have sustainably sourced 100% of these ingredients.

Sustainably sourcing these ingredients helps to secure supply and limit volatility, therefore reducing costs. For example, we recently faced a shortage of sugar beets from one of our key sourcing regions in the US, which added significant cost as we had to source sugar from other locations. By sustainably sourcing sugar beets, we can limit our exposure to this type of volatility in supply, and therefore decrease costs that could be caused by disruptions.

### Time horizon

Medium-term

### Likelihood

About as likely as not

### Magnitude of impact

Medium

### Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

### Potential financial impact figure (currency)

5,000,000

### Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

### Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

### Explanation of financial impact figure

General Mills has identified the opportunity to increase reliability, which also limits cost volatility in our financial planning processes, through development of a climate adaptation plan for our key ingredients. While we do not have a total financial impact figure, we know that we can see volatility resulting from supply. For example, temperature extremes may potentially add costs in excess of $5 million depending on exact market conditions. An example of a financial volatility related to weather would be the drought year for U.S corn. In 2012, corn prices reached over $8.00/bushel as compared to recent years (2015-2017) with prices between the $3-4/bushel range. More recently, General Mills faced a shortage of sugar beets due to prolonged increase precipitation in a key growing region, making the crop unavailable and leading to sourcing from alternate sources, which added incremental costs in excess of $5 million. The estimate of $5 million is based on the actual realized increased costs due to this shortage and having to secure alternate sources for sugar, understanding that we could face costs of similar or higher magnitude.  $5 million equals actual cost for sourcing sugar from alternate sources minus the initial planned cost for the ingredient supply. Exact rates and quantities are considered proprietary information.

### Cost to realize opportunity

0

### Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

General Mills has identified the opportunity to increase reliability of supply and decrease raw material cost volatility, which helps with financial planning processes, through development of a climate adaptation plan for our key ingredients, focused on regenerative agriculture, a holistic, principles-based approach to farming and ranching that seeks to strengthen ecosystems and community resilience.  Regenerative agriculture is a powerful lever for change across the agricultural supply chain and can help maintain a steady supply of high-quality ingredients while addressing some of the world’s biggest environmental, social and economic challenges and opportunities. General Mills' goal is to advance regenerative agriculture on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030. Through fiscal 2022, 235,700 acres of farmland are in process of implementing regenerative management.

We believe regenerative agriculture works best when the farming is viewed as a living ecosystem. Our approach seeks to drive adoption of regenerative agriculture principles across 5 key areas: biodiversity, water management, soil health, cow and herd well-being, and farmer livelihoods and community resilience.

While there are costs associated with our regenerative agriculture program, from a financial perspective we consider our overall Global Impact costs as a whole (as all the efforts are interconnected). We factor these investments into our company's long-term plans, and we expect to offset them with benefits from Holistic Margin Management (HMM), Strategic Revenue Management, and fixed cost leverage. Therefore we have noted zero as the incremental cost of response to risk. As we continue to advance our efforts it is possible additional costs may arise and we may adjust our responses accordingly.

### Comment

NA

### Identifier

Opp3

### Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Downstream

### Opportunity type

Products and services

### Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Shift in consumer preferences

### Primary potential financial impact

Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

### Company-specific description

General Mills is the largest provider of natural and organic packaged food in the US, with over $2.5 billion in natural and organic sales in 2022 (Source: SPINS 52 weeks ending 1/1/2023, Total – US Mulo, Natural Enhanced Channel and Pet Channel). Since 2000 General Mills has steadily grown our organic business with new products, such as Progresso Organic Soup, and brand acquisitions, including Cascadian Farm, Muir Glen and Annie's. Over the past two years, the Natural & Organic food and beverage category has been growing faster than total food & beverage and consumer demand continues to increase. The company could potentially see an increase in revenue as consumer demand continues to increase. This increasing demand for organic products continues to outpace the supply of organic ingredients, especially in North America. That is why General Mills works to increase the long-term capacity of our organic supply chain and expanding organic acreage. These efforts align with our growth objectives, consumer demand and our commitment to regenerative agriculture.

**Time horizon**

Medium-term

**Likelihood**

More likely than not

**Magnitude of impact**

Medium-high

**Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?**

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

25,720,000

**Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)**

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

General Mills has identified an opportunity to increase revenue by addressing a shift in consumer preferences for more organic products. Based on US spins data (including food for both people and pets), General Mills achieved $2.572 billion in natural and organic sales in the US in 2022. The potential financial impact estimate represents an incremental 1% growth over this figure. Calculation: .01 * $2.572 billion = $25,720,000.

**Cost to realize opportunity**

125,000

**Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation**

General Mills has identified an opportunity to increase revenue by addressing a shift in consumer preferences for more organic products. We have a multi-pronged strategy to promote continuous improvement within organic farming, which supports our opportunity to increase revenue through producing more organic products. This strategy includes supplier partnerships, industry collaboration, research and large-scale land conversion.

As an example of this strategy, we have partnered with Grain Millers to promote organic farming. By committing US$125,000 through 2022 to conduct soil testing, host field days, share best practices and help remove hurdles to advancing the organic movement, we are promoting growth in organic farming which supports our opportunity to have increased revenue from natural and organic products, as Grain Millers is the largest oat supplier in the US and is a key supplier for our Cascadian Farm Organic brand.

The $125,000 cost estimate represents the actual contribution to Grain Millers to support soil health research on oat farms in the Upper Midwest. This is one example of the cost related to our multi-pronged strategy, as our total investment in this area is

considered proprietary.

**Comment**

NA

# C3. Business Strategy

## C3.1

### (C3.1) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world?

**Row 1**

**Climate transition plan**

No, but our strategy has been influenced by climate-related risks and opportunities, and we are developing a climate transition plan within two years

**Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world and any plans to develop one in the future**

General Mills does have a science-based target aligned with the 1.5C guidance, and we have identified key drivers of our emissions and levers for reduction. Over the next year we intend to build a more comprehensive transition plan to achieve this goal. We are starting to staff internal teams to build glidepaths for carbon reduction and investing in external support to bring in capabilities of carbon abatement, quantification, and training. We also have work in process to begin engaging with suppliers in key categories to encourage them on their decarbonization journey, including setting targets and developing carbon abatement strategies.

## C3.2

### (C3.2) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy?

| | Use of climate-related scenario analysis to inform strategy |
|---|---|
| Row 1 | Yes, qualitative and quantitative |

## C3.2a

### (C3.2a) Provide details of your organization's use of climate-related scenario analysis.

| Climate-related scenario | Scenario analysis coverage | Temperature alignment of scenario | Parameters, assumptions, analytical choices |
|---|---|---|---|
| Physical climate | Company-wide | | In 2020, General Mills commissioned Trucost to assess its climate-related transition and physical risks. Trucost |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| scenarios RCP 2.6 | | | undertook a robust data-driven approach for General Mills' climate risk and opportunity assessment, in line with TCFD recommendations. The assessment included:<br>* Management interviews involving various leaders from across the business to understand the drivers and materiality of GMI's potential climate-related risks and opportunities<br>* Physical and transition risk assessment to quantify and qualify exposure to different transition risk categories (policy, market, reputation, technology) and physical climate hazards for GMI operating facilities and key ingredients, considering different climate hazards under different scenarios.<br>Several scenarios and timeframes were considered. One of these was RCP2.6, representing aggressive mitigation actions to halve emissions by 2050. This scenario is likely to result in warming of less than 2 degree Celsius by 2100. Inputs considered during the analysis include risks associated with climate change that affect agriculture and our operations, such as severe weather events and increased temperatures. The scope was General Mills' operations (including manufacturing facilities, warehouses and distribution centers and top external suppliers) as well as sourcing regions for key ingredients. This is important because approximately 40% of the GHG emissions related to General Mills' business comes from the agricultural supply chain. Assumptions considered during the analysis was that consensus tells us that the average global temperature increase must remain below 2°C (3.6°F) in order to safeguard the well-being of people and the planet for future generations. This scenario was applied to 2020, 2030 and 2050 timeframes, which is relevant to General Mills as providing for a growing population with fewer resources is a challenge that affects our planet and our business. |
| Physical climate scenarios RCP 4.5 | Company-wide | | In 2020, General Mills commissioned Trucost to assess its climate-related transition and physical risks. Trucost undertook a robust data-driven approach for General Mills' climate risk and opportunity assessment, in line with TCFD recommendations. The assessment included:<br>* Management interviews involving various leaders from across the business to understand the drivers and |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | materiality of GMI's potential climate-related risks and opportunities<br>* Physical and transition risk assessment to quantify and qualify exposure to different transition risk categories (policy, market, reputation, technology) and physical climate hazards for GMI operating facilities and key ingredients, considering different climate hazards under different scenarios.<br>Several scenarios and timeframes were considered. One of these was RCP 4.5, representing strong mitigation actions to reduce emissions to half of current levels by 2080. This scenario is more likely than not to result in warming in excess of 2 degrees Celsius by 2100. Inputs considered during the analysis include risks associated with climate change that affect agriculture and our operations, such as severe weather events and increased temperatures. The scope was General Mills' operations (including manufacturing facilities, warehouses and distribution centers and top external suppliers) as well as sourcing regions for key ingredients. This is important because approximately 40% of the GHG emissions related to General Mills' business comes from the agricultural supply chain. Assumptions considered during the analysis was that consensus tells us that the average global temperature increase must remain below 2°C (3.6°F) in order to safeguard the well-being of people and the planet for future generations. This scenario was applied to 2020, 2030 and 2050 timeframes, which is relevant to General Mills as providing for a growing population with fewer resources is a challenge that affects our planet and our business. |
| Physical climate scenarios RCP 8.5 | Company-wide | | In 2020, General Mills commissioned Trucost to assess its climate-related transition and physical risks. Trucost undertook a robust data-driven approach for General Mills' climate risk and opportunity assessment, in line with TCFD recommendations. The assessment included:<br>* Management interviews involving various leaders from across the business to understand the drivers and materiality of GMI's potential climate-related risks and opportunities<br>* Physical and transition risk assessment to quantify and qualify exposure to different transition risk categories (policy, market, reputation, technology) and |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | physical climate hazards for GMI operating facilities and key ingredients, considering different climate hazards under different scenarios.<br>Several scenarios and timeframes were considered. One of these was RCP 8.5, representing continuation of business as usual with emissions at current rates. This scenario is expected to result in warming in excess of 4 degrees Celsius by 2100. Inputs considered during the analysis include risks associated with climate change that affect agriculture and our operations, such as severe weather events and increased temperatures. The scope was General Mills' operations (including manufacturing facilities, warehouses and distribution centers and top external suppliers) as well as sourcing regions for key ingredients. This is important because approximately 40% of the GHG emissions related to General Mills' business comes from the agricultural supply chain. Assumptions considered during the analysis was that consensus tells us that the average global temperature increase must remain below 2°C (3.6°F) in order to safeguard the well-being of people and the planet for future generations, and this scenario projects what might happen if business continues as usual instead and does not hit this target. This scenario was applied to 2020, 2030 and 2050 timeframes, which is relevant to General Mills as providing for a growing population with fewer resources is a challenge that affects our planet and our business. |
| Transition scenarios IEA 2DS | Company-wide | | In 2015 we identified and used the 2 Degree Scenario and the Sectoral Decarbonization Approach scenario models to set our initial Science Based Target for greenhouse gas reduction, which aligned to the earlier IPCC 2050 emission reduction guidance of 41-72%. This helped to inform Generals Mill's future sustainability goals and ambitions. We have since announced a new science-based target aligned to 1.5C. Inputs considered during the analysis include risks associated with climate change that affect agriculture, such as severe weather events, CO2 and increased temperatures. The analysis considered our entire value chain, not just our own operations. This is important because approximately 40% of the GHG emissions related to General Mills' business comes from the agricultural supply chain. Assumptions considered during the analysis was that consensus tells us that the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average global temperature increase must remain below 2°C (3.6°F) in order to safeguard the well-being of people and the planet for future generations. Analytical methods included were in line with the Sector Decarbonization Approach. Time horizons considered for the climate related scenario was between 2010 to 2050 (long term horizon) for the 2DS model, which is relevant to General Mills as providing for a growing population with fewer resources is a challenge that affects our planet and our business. Areas of the organization considered as part of the scenario analysis includes our entire value chain, from farm to fork to landfill. This includes agriculture, where we have the largest impact on emissions. The results of the scenario analysis have informed the business objectives and strategy as we have created ambitious climate change goals, using science-based methodology, and are developing plans for reducing greenhouse gas emissions across our entire value chain. Our current goal is a 30 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gas emissions across our value chain by 2030. We have also committed to advancing regenerative agriculture on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030. Through 2022, 235,700 acres are in the process of implementing regenerative principles. |

# C3.2b

**(C3.2b) Provide details of the focal questions your organization seeks to address by using climate-related scenario analysis, and summarize the results with respect to these questions.**

### Row 1

#### Focal questions

What types of risks is General Mills exposed to and where in the value chain do these risks occur?

#### Results of the climate-related scenario analysis with respect to the focal questions

Through the scenario analysis, we have identified that General Mills is exposed to both climate-related transition risks and acute and chronic physical risks. The results of this scenario analysis have reinforced our prioritization of agriculture as part of our value chain in our risk management process. As a food company, our business is rooted in agriculture, and agriculture accounts for the bulk of our GHG emissions. Risk associated

with our key ingredients could include market risk (as a result of potential increased carbon pricing) and physical risks like water stress, cold wave and acute weather events. This had led to our company investing in regenerative agriculture as one of our top 3 Global Impact priorities and driving ongoing research in measurement and management as a key lever to reduce climate impacts.

The prioritization of addressing the results of this scenario analysis and the climate-related risks associated with agriculture was identified in 2020 and will continue to be relevant for the foreseeable future, particularly through 2030 (short-term and medium-term) as we strive towards our goal of advancing regenerative agriculture on 1,000,000 acres of farmland by 2030 and achieving net zero emissions by 2050 (long term).

# C3.3

**(C3.3) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy.**

| | Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area? | Description of influence |
|---|---|---|
| Products and services | Yes | General Mills has identified climate-related risks and opportunities for our products and services. We have identified that the risk of changes in temperature extremes and severe weather events can impact General Mills' products and services because the raw materials used to develop those products may no longer be readily accessible.<br><br>This has influenced our strategy to ensure long term availability of our ingredients and commitment to sustainably source 10 priority ingredients. These ingredients, which represent approximately 40 percent of our purchases, include: cocoa, vanilla, oats, U.S wheat, U.S sugar beets, U.S corn (dry milled) U.S dairy (raw fluid milk), fiber packaging, sugarcane, palm oil.<br><br>As of fiscal 2020, 100% of these priority ingredients were sustainably sourced.<br><br>Developing products with positive climate impacts can also help to drive top line growth and sales, which is an opportunity for General Mills. We know that our consumers care about where our products come from and we are working to developing products with ingredients using |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | regenerative principles. As we continue our journey to communicate and establish the importance of regenerative agriculture to consumers, on-pack messaging is a powerful way for us to introduce commitments, progress, and the farmers with whom we are partnering in this journey. For example, we partnered with Montana farmers to create two limited-edition products with organic ingredients grown using regenerative practices. |
| Supply chain and/or value chain | Yes | General Mills' value chain is impacted by the risk of climate change (both acute and chronic physical risks) impacting agriculture and the availability of crops upon which our business depends. Over time, we have seen degradation of natural resources as 33% of the Earth's soils are already degraded and over 90% could become degraded by 2050. Keeping soil healthy is critical to meeting demands on food, fuel and fiber as our global population grows.<br><br>To positively impact our planet, it is imperative that we adapt our approach to farming, natural resource management and energy usage. We believe that the most promising solutions start with healthy soil.<br><br>The most substantial strategic decision made in an effort to manage climate-related impacts within General Mills' agricultural supply chain is the commitment to advancing regenerative agriculture practices on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030. This is part of our medium-term time horizon (3 - 10 years). We define regenerative agriculture as agriculture that protects and intentionally enhances natural resources and farming communities. Regenerative agriculture works with nature to pull carbon from the air and store it in the soil, where it nourishes a network of life. This approach is a powerful lever for change across the agricultural supply chain. It not only sustains the natural resources and farming communities we depend on but can renew, restore and regenerate them for generations to come.<br><br>Through fiscal 2022, 235,700 acres of farmland are in process of implementing regenerative principles.<br><br>Our regenerative agriculture commitment supports our company's broader climate goal of reducing GHG emissions across our entire value chain by 30% by 2030 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | and net zero emissions by 2050 (part of our long-term time horizon). |
| Investment in R&D | Yes | General Mills has identified that there is reputational risk to the company by inadequately managing climate change risk and could face decreased sales if there was a significant negative environmental impact associated with a General Mill's product. This risk has a medium risk to the company.<br><br>We have integrated this risk into our business strategy and planning by considering environmental impacts in product and packaging design and development as it is essential to improving our carbon footprint and overall environmental performance.<br><br>General Mills has identified that investment in R&D for packaging can potentially impact our enterprise-wide environmental footprint by minimizing food and packaging waste. We attempt to find best-in-class packaging solutions that are readily recyclable by the consumer, achieve food shelf-life and food safety requirements, efficiently utilize packaging materials, and which are made from carefully selected packaging raw materials (e.g. fiber/paper, metal, plastic/resins, glass). In 2019, we announced our ambition that all General Mills brands will design 100% of our packaging to be recyclable or reusable by 2030, a critical driver in our quest to create a more sustainable value chain. This is part of our medium-term time horizon (3 - 10 years). In fiscal 2022, 92% of our packaging for our North American and Foodservice segments was recyclable or reusable (by weight).<br><br>As part of this ambition, we actively seek more sustainable materials in the early phases of packaging design. For example, a substantial strategic decision made in investing in packaging design was to launch a renewable, bio-based plastic film, partially made of plant-based materials for Cascadian Farm cereal box liners. This change in materials replaces the impacts of about 600,000 pounds (270 metric tonnes) of non-renewable plastic annually. This bio-film increases the sustainability of raw materials and reduces the packaging carbon footprint. And in early 2021, General Mills launched the first store drop-off recyclable snack bar wrapper for our Nature Valley bars, coupled with a consumer education campaign on how to recycle them. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Wrappers recycled through store drop-off programs are turned into new materials like composite lumber. |
| Operations | Yes | General Mills' operations are impacted during financial planning as we consider climate risk and opportunities. General Mills has identified renewable energy as an opportunity to help us meet our GHG reduction goals and will factor this into our financial planning process as we evaluate projects. A substantial strategic decision made in Operations was that during 2020, General Mills set a goal to source 100% renewable electricity for our global operations by 2030. We achieved 87% of this target through fiscal 2022.<br><br>We have implemented numerous renewable energy initiatives at facilities worldwide that meet financial guidelines and support our environmental objectives. Examples include anaerobic digestion (which captures and uses methane to generate electricity) and burning oat hulls and other biomass.<br><br>General Mills has chosen to support renewable energy as a technology opportunity that supports the transition to a lower-carbon, energy-efficient economic system. Specifically, we have invested in two wind power projects that will produce RECS for General Mills that are calculated to equal 100% of the electricity used annually at the company's owned US facilities in the US. This is part of our medium-term time horizon (3-10 years). |

# C3.4

**(C3.4) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your financial planning.**

| | Financial planning elements that have been influenced | Description of influence |
|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | Access to capital | General Mills has taken the impact of climate change into account for our medium-term financial planning.<br><br>In 2021, General Mills took a leadership position by aligning a portion of our company's financing with our commitment to combat climate change. In April 2021, we announced the renewal of a five-year $2.7 billion |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | revolving credit facility, which includes a pricing structure tied to environmental impact metrics. General Mills was the first U.S. consumer packaged goods company to put in place a sustainability-linked revolving credit facility. By entering into this agreement, General Mills receives a pricing adjustment based on progress in two key areas: reducing greenhouse gas emissions in owned operations and using renewable electricity for global operations.<br><br>In addition, in October 2021 General Mills announced its inaugural sustainability-linked bond aligned to climate change, making us the first U.S. investment grade CPG company to execute this type of bond. The 10-year, $500 million sustainability-linked bond is tied to measurable improvements on our journey to reduce our Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions. Both of these innovative financing structures demonstrate our commitment to combating climate change and illustrate how we continue to embed sustainability into our financial planning. |

## C3.5

**(C3.5) 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 |
|---|---|
| Row 1 | No, but we plan to in the next two years |

# C4. Targets and performance

## C4.1

**(C4.1) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?**

Absolute target

## C4.1a

**(C4.1a) Provide details of your absolute emissions target(s) and progress made against those targets.**

**Target reference number**

Abs 1

**Is this a science-based target?**

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

**Target ambition**

1.5°C aligned

**Year target was set**

2020

**Target coverage**

Company-wide

**Scope(s)**

Scope 1

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Base year**

2020

**Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

326,100

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

443,700

**Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (upstream) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

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

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

769,800

**Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1**

100

**Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2**

100

**Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 15: Investments (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (upstream) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)**

**Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

100

**Target year**

2030

**Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

42

**Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]**

446,484

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

317,900

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

74,100

**Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises  emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 15: Investments  emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Other (upstream) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

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

392,000

**Does this target cover any land-related emissions?**

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

**% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]**

116.8516250356

**Target status in reporting year**

Achieved

**Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 1 & 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol) and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified and this target has been endorsed by http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/

**Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

**List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target**

Energy efficiency and renewable energy procurement contributed most to achieving our Scope 1 & 2 target. The emissions reduction initiatives which have contributed most to progress towards the target to the end of the reporting year is our two wind power virtual purchase power agreements.

Our observed progress curve has been logarithmic – the rate of progress towards the target is faster at the start

---

**Target reference number**

Abs 2

**Is this a science-based target?**

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

**Target ambition**

1.5°C aligned

**Year target was set**

2020

**Target coverage**

Company-wide

**Scope(s)**

Scope 3

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

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 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

**Base year**

2020

**Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

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

**Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

7,723,800

**Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

132,300

**Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

3,569,300

**Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

72,600

**Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

5,900

**Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

42,300

**Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

3,579,000

**Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

323,900

**Base year Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (upstream) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

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

15,449,200

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

15,449,200

**Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1**

**Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)**

90

**Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)**

99

**Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

30

**Base year Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 15: Investments (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (upstream) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

**Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)**

81

**Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

81

**Target year**

2030

**Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

30

**Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]**

10,814,440

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

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

**Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

7,940,700

**Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

221,800

**Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

3,506,500

**Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

73,700

**Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

8,100

**Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

42,000

**Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

3,545,200

**Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

389,500

**Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises  emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Category 15: Investments  emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Other (upstream) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

**Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

15,727,500

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

15,727,500

**Does this target cover any land-related emissions?**

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

**% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]**

-6.0046259137

**Target status in reporting year**

Underway

**Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 3 activities per the GHG Protocol and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified and this target has been endorsed by http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/

**Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

Our plan to achieve the target includes seven key levers across our value chain: regenerative agriculture, reductions in dairy farm impacts, eliminating deforestation, energy efficiency, renewable electricity, transportation efficiency, and reducing food waste. We plan to get back on track through renewed focus and changing how we resource climate work. We're also bringing in external guidance.

Our anticipated progress curve will be exponential – the rate of progress towards the target is anticipated to be faster at the end.

**List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target**

## C4.2

**(C4.2) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?**

Target(s) to increase low-carbon energy consumption or production

Net-zero target(s)

## C4.2a

**(C4.2a) Provide details of your target(s) to increase low-carbon energy consumption or production.**

**Target reference number**

Low 1

**Year target was set**

2019

**Target coverage**

Company-wide

**Target type: energy carrier**

Electricity

**Target type: activity**

Consumption

**Target type: energy source**

Renewable energy source(s) only

**Base year**

2019

**Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)**

1,201,326

**% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year**

23.6

**Target year**

2030

**% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in target year**

100

**% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year**

87

**% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]**

82.9842931937

**Target status in reporting year**

Underway

**Is this target part of an emissions target?**

Yes, Abs1

**Is this target part of an overarching initiative?**

RE100

**Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

In April 2020 we joined the RE100 initiative and set a company-wide target to achieve 100% renewable electricity consumption by 2030. This date is part of our Fiscal 2019 time frame (June 2018 - May 2019) which is why we have our Baseline Year and

Reporting year set to 2019. Our baseline is Fiscal 2019 of 23.6% renewable electricity and covers global sites under operational control (Manufacturing, R&D, Offices, Warehouses, HD Shops, and Cake Kitchens). This target is part of our absolute Scope 1 & 2market reduction target Abs 1.

**Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

We identify and implement improvements in energy usage through our Five-Step Energy Reduction Process by working with our manufacturing plants to establish energy programs, conduct energy analyses, develop and execute improvement plans, and validate results. In fiscal year 2022, we achieved 87% of our RE100 target and continue to make fast progress on this commitment via energy efficiency improvements and increased renewable energy consumption.

**List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target**

## C4.2c

**(C4.2c) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).**

**Target reference number**

NZ1

**Target coverage**

Company-wide

**Absolute/intensity emission target(s) linked to this net-zero target**

Abs1

Abs2

**Target year for achieving net zero**

2050

**Is this a science-based target?**

No, but we are reporting another target that is science-based

**Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

The net zero target is company wide. After achieving our science-based target of 30% across Scopes 1-3 by 2030, the remaining emissions will be neutralized through additional reductions, removals or other compensation. We expect the magnitude remaining to be millions of metric tons of CO2e.

**Do you intend to neutralize any unabated emissions with permanent carbon removals at the target year?**

Yes

**Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at target year**

We don't have any planned milestones or near-term investments for neutralization at this time. We intend to within the next two years.

**Planned actions to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain (optional)**

## C4.3

**(C4.3) 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.**

Yes

## C4.3a

**(C4.3a) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.**

| | Number of initiatives | Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *) |
|---|---|---|
| Under investigation | 0 | 0 |
| To be implemented* | 0 | 0 |
| Implementation commenced* | 0 | 0 |
| Implemented* | 21 | 6,092 |
| Not to be implemented | 0 | 0 |

## C4.3b

**(C4.3b) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.**

**Initiative category & Initiative type**

Energy efficiency in buildings

Lighting

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

6,092

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

Scope 2 (market-based)

**Voluntary/Mandatory**

Voluntary

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

1,498,500

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

5,226,000

**Payback period**

4-10 years

**Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

11-15 years

**Comment**

We identify and implement improvements through our Five-Step Energy Reduction Process, by working with our manufacturing plants to establish energy programs, conduct energy analyses, develop and execute improvement plans and validate results. This process historically focused on facilities with significant spending on energy. We have recently evolved it to include all General Mills manufacturing facilities by focusing improvement efforts on common systems such as compressed air, lighting and steam/hot water.

During fiscal 2022, energy usage at our production facilities decreased by 5% compared to the prior year, as efficiency improvements offset higher production of energy-intensive products. We completed 21 energy efficiency and reduction projects across the company. In total, these projects saved approximately 16 million kWh of electricity, 19 thousand MMBTU of natural gas and avoided 6,092 metric tons $CO_2e$ of GHG emissions. For example, through 12 projects to retrofit LED lighting across our North American facilities, we are saving more than 8 million kWh of electricity annually.

# C4.3c

**(C4.3c) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?**

| Method | Comment |
|---|---|
| Employee engagement | General Mills uses employee engagement as a method to drive investment in emissions reduction activities. Originally launched in 2016 and updated throughout FY 2022, we developed an online GHG training for all employees globally to help educate and drive responsible decision making. This site familiarizes employees with our core commitments, key learning resources, our Global Impact Governance Committee and Steering Team.<br><br>We have been working with employees in marketing, sourcing and supply chain to help them to realize that the decisions that they make have an effect on the overall GHG footprint of the company. In conjunction with Earth Day, the company hosted a series of educational events at our Minneapolis headquarters to teach |

| | |
|---|---|
| | employees about the opportunities and challenges of reducing our environmental footprint. |
| Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards | General Mill's states that we will "Do the Right Thing" all the time which will drive investment in emission reduction activities to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements / standards. We will make necessary investments to ensure that we remain within regulatory limits. |
| Dedicated budget for energy efficiency | We will use the method of having a dedicated budget for energy efficiency to drive investment in emission reduction activities.<br>Normal annual capital investment in utility efficiency projects totals ~$5MM [lighting, compressed air, HVAC; efficient motors; etc]<br>Ongoing, GMI corporate Engineering function funds the salaries, benefits, training & travel of a corporate staff of 2 Energy Leaders working 100% of time on utility efficiency improvements totaling ~$1million in expense costs annually.<br>- In GMI's 30 largest food processing plant sites (which represent 75% of the company's total annual utility spend) there are engineers and technicians who invest a percentage of their time each year on maintenance, operational and small project initiatives designed to improve energy efficiency. This manpower investment specifically on energy efficiency is estimated to total over $500M annually. |
| Marginal abatement cost curve | General Mill's has begun using the method of a marginal abatement cost curve to drive investment in emissions reduction activities. Global Sustainability partnered with supply chain leads to identify GHG reduction opportunities. Examples include packaging material changes, farm-level investments, and energy efficiency projects. These opportunities were paired with cost estimates to generate a supply chain MACC tool, which compares potential GHG reduction initiatives in terms of dollar per metric ton of CO2e reduction potential. |

# C4.5

**(C4.5) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?**

Yes

# C4.5a

**(C4.5a) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.**

**Level of aggregation**

Group of products or services

### Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Other, please specify

Life Cycle Analysis

### Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

Other, please specify

Ready to eat products that don't require refrigeration/freezing

### Description of product(s) or service(s)

Ready to eat products that don't require refrigeration/freezing
Snacks, Ready to Eat Cereal, and Pet platforms made up 44% of company sales in fiscal 2022.

Ready to eat products do not require a consumer to use fossil fuel for preparation. Any cooking required is done at the manufacturing level, where "economies of scale" and energy efficiency projects lead to reduced fossil fuel use per product, and therefore avoided emissions at the consumer level.

### Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

No

### Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

### Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

### Functional unit used

### Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

### Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

### Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

### Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

### Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

44

# C5. Emissions methodology

## C5.1

**(C5.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?**

No

## C5.1a

**(C5.1a) 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?**

**Row 1**

**Has there been a structural change?**

Yes, an acquisition
Yes, a divestment
Yes, other structural change, please specify

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

In FY22, General Mills acquired Tyson Foods pet treats business and TNT Crust.
General Mills divested its Yoplait business in Europe.

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

General Mills completed its acquisition of TNT Crust, a manufacturer of high-quality frozen pizza crusts, in June of 2021.
It completed its acquisition of Tyson Foods pet trets business in July of 2021.
Its Yoplait EUAU divestiture was effective November of 2021.
General Mills underwent an internal structural change, effective in January of 2022.

## C5.1b

**(C5.1b) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?**

| | Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition? | Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s) |
|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | Yes, a change in methodology | Methodology for calculating emissions that result from consumers' use of General Mills sold products was updated to increase unit count accuracy. Activity data now represents number of units sold, where 1 unit = 1 consumer cook unit, rather than 1 case of several cook units. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Shipping emission calculation methodology for truck and rail transport was simplified to pull tonne-kilometer data, rather than tonne-kilometer and gallons data. This provides a more accurate representation of General Mills' shipping footprint.<br><br>General Mills, in collaboration with GHG consultant Quantis, created custom emissions factors for mechanically separated chicken and lamb, pizza topping, pizza cheese, organic ingredients, an oil blend, and fish meal in an effort to improve the accuracy of our agricultural footprint. |

# C5.1c

**(C5.1c) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in C5.1a and/or C5.1b?**

| | Base year recalculation | Scope(s) recalculated | Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold | Past years' recalculation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | Yes | Scope 1<br>Scope 2, location-based<br>Scope 2, market-based<br>Scope 3 | Annually, General Mills will review its base year emissions. According to the GHG Protocol, efforts are made to ensure a "like for like" base year is accounted. This means that emissions from business that are modified after the base year are included in or excluded from the base year (either actual or estimated). Materiality was evaluated using a 5% significance threshold, based on the business' contribution to GMI's GHG footprint as well as its sales. For each material structural change, General Mills recalculates GHG emissions for baseline year (2020), previous year, and current reporting year. | Yes |

# C5.2

**(C5.2) Provide your base year and base year emissions.**

## Scope 1

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

326,100

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 2 (location-based)

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

641,700

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 2 (market-based)

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

443,700

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8,572,000

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

599,400

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

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

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

133,000

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3,569,300

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

72,600

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5,900

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified

by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

53,200

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

### Base year start

### Base year end

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

### Comment

Not relevant. The minimum boundary for upstream leased assets is "The scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of lessors that occur during the reporting company's operation of leased assets (e.g. from energy use)." We use the operational control approach to setting boundaries, and therefore leased assets would fall under scope 1 and 2 emissions. For example, leased warehouse space falls under scope 1 & scope 2 operational control, but has been deemed immaterial, at less than 1% of emissions and is verified each year.

## Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1,436,300

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42,300

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. Our emissions are third party verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Numbers may not exactly match verification letter due to rounding.

## Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3,579,000

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

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

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1,082,100

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

### Base year start

### Base year end

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

### Comment

Not relevant. The minimum boundary for downstream leased assets is "The scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of lessees that occur during operation of leased assets (e.g. from energy use). General Mills does not currently calculate or report on Total Emissions for Downstream Leased Assets due to materiality threshold; we currently lease out three small properties, one of which is a plot of land. These leases do not meet our materiality threshold for Scope 3 Category 13 emissions calculations.

## Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

### Base year start

June 1, 2019

### Base year end

May 31, 2020

### Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4,700

### Comment

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 15: Investments

**Base year start**

**Base year end**

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

**Comment**

Not relevant. General Mills does not have investment related scope 3 emissions, therefore, this category is immaterial to our operations.

### Scope 3: Other (upstream)

**Base year start**

**Base year end**

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

**Comment**

### Scope 3: Other (downstream)

**Base year start**

**Base year end**

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

**Comment**

## C5.3

**(C5.3) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.**

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

# C6. Emissions data

## C6.1

### (C6.1) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

#### Reporting year

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

317,900

**Comment**

Total rounded to the nearest hundredth, in accordance with verification letter.

## C6.2

### (C6.2) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

#### Row 1

**Scope 2, location-based**

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

**Scope 2, market-based**

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

**Comment**

Emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol). Both location and market-based emissions have been externally verified by a third party, Apex Co.

We use the market-based method defined by the GHG Protocol's Scope 2 standard and used the market-based method emission factor hierarchy and the location-based method emission factor hierarchy.

Totals are rounded to the nearest hundredth to maintain consistency with verification letter.

## C6.3

### (C6.3) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

#### Reporting year

**Scope 2, location-based**

514,700

**Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)**

74,100

**Comment**

Total rounded to the nearest hundredth to maintain consistency with verification letter.

## C6.4

**(C6.4) 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?**

Yes

## C6.4a

**(C6.4a) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.**

**Source of excluded emissions**

Refrigerants at locations under operational control

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

Scope 1

**Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source**

Emissions are not relevant

**Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source**

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

**Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source**

**Date of completion of acquisition or merger**

**Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents**

0

**Estimated percentage of total Scope 3 emissions this excluded source represents**

0

### Explain why this source is excluded

Emissions affiliated with leakage of high Global Warming Potential refrigerants constituted ~0.00176% of General Mills' global Scope 1 emissions. This figure falls well below our materiality threshold of 5%, therefore deeming refrigerants immaterial to our GHG footprint for RY22.

### Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

We calculated emissions for refrigerants using emission factor consistent with DEFRA and GHG Protocol. We then divided this figure by total Scope 1 metric tons of CO2e, to arrive at 0.00176%. No qualifying refrigerants were released in reporting year.

## C6.5

### (C6.5) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

#### Purchased goods and services

##### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

8,809,400

##### Emissions calculation methodology

Supplier-specific method
Average data method
Spend-based method

##### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

11

##### Please explain

#### Capital goods

##### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

499,900

##### Emissions calculation methodology

Spend-based method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

An average input-output-based emission factor was assigned on a dollar basis (i.e. kg CO2eq per USD spent) to all capital equipment expenditures. A British I/O database was used in this year's methodology, consistent with prior year's methodology. This British database defaulted to emissions per 2011 British Pound, and these EFs were adjusted to be representative of a 2022 USD. Input/Output of different categories of capital expenditures were mapped to different input-output emission factors.
Data was scaled to adjust for 32% cumulative inflation rate between 2011 and 2022.

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

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

222,500

### Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

The total amount of fuel/energy provided by General Mills was multiplied by the scope 3 emission factors to calculate the total GHG emissions.

## Upstream transportation and distribution

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

3,506,500

### Emissions calculation methodology

Fuel-based method
Distance-based method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Cradle-to-gate emission factors were sourced from the Ecoinvent 3.6 database. The impact assessment method used was the EF Method v1.4 (AWARE-compatible).

For rail and truck transport, a standard tkm calculation was used. Tonne-km were calculated based on internal reports that provide avg miles and gross weight (lbs) for each shipment group.
For ocean transport, gallons activity data was assessed using a Marine Fuel Oil emission factor from the DEFRA 2020 database. As year over year invoice spend on ocean freight remained flat, F21's ocean gallon data was used for F22 footprinting.

For truck transport, emissions were split into tailpipe emissions and upstream/ downstream impacts (impacts related to road wear and tear, truck maintenance, etc.). Tailpipe emissions were associated with the number of gallons of fuel consumed and was based on an Ecoinvent dataset for diesel combustion. The upstream/ downstream impacts associated with truck transport were based on a modified Ecoinvent dataset, altered to exclude emissions associated with fuel use. This was calculated on a per tkm basis.

Intermodal transport was assumed to be 80% rail and 20% truck.

Temperature states are accounted for in truck transport only, and are based on modified Ecoinvent datasets for frozen, refrigerated, and ambient truck datasets which contain additional upstream/ downstream emissions based on the refrigeration needs per tkm transported, and reflect the additional fuel needed to run the refrigeration on a per tkm basis.

## Waste generated in operations

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

73,700

### Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method
Waste-type-specific method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis; primary data for amount of waste in our operations is from internal system. The emission factors for incineration and landfilling, as well as transportation were sourced from the

Ecoinvent 3.6 database. The impact assessment method used was the EF Method v1.4 (AWARE-compatible).

The cutoff method was applied to recycling and incineration with energy recovery: impacts of the disposal method and transportation were applied, but no credit for recycling or energy recovery from incineration was given. In line with the GHG protocol guidance, recycling and reuse considered only the impacts of transporting the items to the recycling plant but did not include the impacts of the recycling process. Transport to waste treatment assumed a 5km distance from facility to the collection center, and 72km from the collection center to the waste treatment center.

## Business travel

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

8,100

### Emissions calculation methodology

Distance-based method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

### Please explain

Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Flight miles were multiplied by the cradle-to-gate emission factor (per person kilometer) to calculate the emissions associated with business travel using “with RF” factors from “Business travel-air” and “WTT-business travel-air”, where domestic = short, short = med, and long = long. Cradle-to-gate emission factors were sourced from the 2020 and 2021 DEFRA Conversion Factors version 1.0, “business travel-air” & “WTT-business travel-air”. The impact assessment method was updated to use IPCC AR5 GWP100 for “business travel-air”; IPCC AR4 GWP100 for “WTT-business travel-air”, since only kg CO2e is reported.

## Employee commuting

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

53,700

### Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis; Primary data was collected from internal systems for # of employees and geographical location. Cradle-to-gate emission factors were sourced from the Ecoinvent 3.6 database. The impact assessment method used was the EF Method v1.4 (AWARE-compatible).

For North American employee commuting, U.S. Census data was used for the national distribution of modes of transportation to work. The Bureau of Transportation data was used to estimate the national average distance of a commute to work. The employee headcount was distributed amongst the different transportation modes and multiplied by the national average commuting distance. These were multiplied by their respective cradle-to-gate emission factors to calculate the GHG emissions associated with North American employee commuting.

For international commuting, data from various sources were used to estimate breakdown of public transit, pedestrian, and car commute transport for Latin American, Asian, Indian, European, and other regions. The employee headcount was distributed amongst the different transportation modes and multiplied by the U.S. national average commuting distance. These were multiplied by their respective cradle-to-gate emission factors to calculate the GHG emissions associated with international employee commuting.

## Upstream leased assets

### Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

### Please explain

The minimum boundary for upstream leased assets is "The scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of lessors that occur during the reporting company's operation of leased assets (e.g. from energy use)." We use the operational control approach to setting boundaries, and therefore leased assets would fall under scope 1 and 2 emissions. For example, leased warehouse space falls under scope 1 & scope 2 operational control, but has been deemed immaterial, at less than 1% of emissions and is verified each year.

## Downstream transportation and distribution

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

1,342,100

### Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

For rail and truck transport, a standard TKM calculation was used to estimate fuel usage and resulting emissions.

For ocean freight, gallons activity data was assessed using a Marine Fuel Oil emission factor (DEFRA Scope 1 AR5).

Intermodal transport was assumed to be 80% rail and 20% truck.

Temperature states are accounted for in truck transport only, and are based on modified Ecoinvent datasets for frozen, refrigerated, and ambient truck datasets which contain additional upstream/downstream emissions based on the refrigeration needs per tkm transported, and reflect the additional fuel needed to run the refrigeration on a per gallon basis.

Retail storage: The calculation is based on the cubic feet of product sold and takes into account assumptions on how many days product sits in inventory at retail, but this data is then mapped to retail refrigerated and frozen storage emission factors that come from the WFLDB. These WFLDB EFs contain their own assumptions about how much energy is consumed at this stage.
Warehouse Storage: In previous years, approximately 80% of impacts from warehouse storage originated from GMI's owned warehouses. Scope 3 warehousing impacts were estimated based on GMI's historical average owned warehouse impacts and this ratio; this ratio indicates that Scope 3 warehousing emissions are approximately equal to 25% of Scope 1 and Scope 2 warehousing emissions.

Consumer trips to store: This category uses production volumes (mass) and passenger vehicle MPG as its primary parameters, allowing General Mills to track changes over time both directly under its control and outside of it. The calculation uses the production volumes, makes an assumption about the mass of product per car trip (20 kg product/trip), and combines that with an assumed distance (7.58 miles) and mpg (26.83 mpg for North America, 37.9 in International in 2022) to output a number of gallons of gasoline consumed.

## Processing of sold products

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

42,000

### Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

Refrigerated and frozen home storage was calculated based on Trucost assumptions surrounding the storage time, the storage type (whether refrigerated or frozen), and the product volume. These were used to calculate the m3-yr. The WFLDB home storage emissions factors are per m3-yr. Product volumes were multiplied by storage volume scaling factors (Quantis assumptions), which help to more accurately account for storage inefficiencies at the consumer level, such as extra space in the pantry, refrigerator, or freezer. The scaling factors used were 4, 2 and 3 for dry, frozen and refrigerated respectively. Packaging volume was assumed to be half of the shipping volume.
Food preparation at consumer assumed a prep method and a prep time. This was multiplied by the # of unit sales provided by General Mills. From there, a total time in minutes was calculated for each prep method (stove, oven, microwave, toaster). Data on oven and stove power consumption was multiplied by the time to calculate the total energy required for food preparation. Gas stove assumed a power of 4.1kW, and electric assumed a power of 1 kW. A weighted average of 37% gas stove, and 63% electric stove was assumed. For oven, a weighted average of 29% electric and 71% gas was assumed.

Impacts from commercial baking were estimated using pounds of product sold, mapped to assumptions around cooking method and energy requirements per cooking method. Energy requirements per cooking method were assumed based on published commercial kitchen and baking data from Energy Star. GHG impacts were calculated using DEFRA emission factors for natural gas and Ecoinvent EFs for US-based electricity.

## Use of sold products

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

3,545,200

### Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

Refrigerated and frozen home storage was calculated based on Trucost assumptions surrounding the storage time, the storage type (whether refrigerated or frozen), and the product volume. These were used to calculate the m3-yr. The WFLDB home storage emissions factors are per m3-yr. Product volumes were multiplied by storage volume scaling factors (Quantis assumptions), which help to more accurately account for storage inefficiencies at the consumer level, such as extra space in the pantry, refrigerator, or freezer. The scaling factors used were 4, 2 and 3 for dry, frozen and refrigerated respectively. Packaging volume was assumed to be half of the shipping volume.

Food preparation at consumer assumed a prep method and a prep time. This was multiplied by the # of unit sales provided by General Mills. From there, a total time in minutes was calculated for each prep method (stove, oven, microwave, toaster). Data on oven and stove power consumption was multiplied by the time to calculate the total energy required for food preparation. Gas stove assumed a power of 4.1kW, and electric assumed a power of 1 kW. A weighted average of 37% gas stove, and 63% electric stove was assumed. For oven, a weighted average of 29% electric and 71% gas was assumed.

Impacts from commercial baking were estimated using pounds of product sold, mapped to assumptions around cooking method and energy requirements per cooking method. Energy requirements per cooking method were assumed based on published commercial kitchen and baking data from Energy Star. GHG impacts were calculated using DEFRA emission factors for natural gas and Ecoinvent EFs for US-based electricity.

## End of life treatment of sold products

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

1,126,700

### Emissions calculation methodology

Waste-type-specific method

### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

### Please explain

Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. The emission factors for incineration and landfilling, as well as transportation were sourced from the Ecoinvent 3.6 database. The impact assessment method used was the EF Method v1.4 (AWARE-compatible).

The cutoff method was applied to recycling and incineration with energy recovery: Impacts of the disposal method and transportation were applied, but no credit for recycling or energy recovery from incineration was given. In line with the GHG protocol guidance, recycling and reuse considered only the impacts of transporting the items to the recycling plant but did not include the impacts of the recycling process. EPA data was applied to estimate packaging recycling rates.
Transport to waste treatment assumed a 5km distance from home to the collection center, and 72km from the collection center to the waste treatment center.

The method for calculating food waste at the consumer uses publicly available data published by WRI. The report provided food waste data for several global regions including “North America and Oceania,” “Industrialized Asia,” “Latin America,” and “Europe”. Those percentages were used to calculate total food waste in the NAR, CHINA, BRAZIL, EUAU, and emerging markets regions. Overall, it was assumed that 61% of food in North America, 36% in Asia and Latin America, and 52% of food in EUAU is wasted at the consumer. It was assumed all food waste is treated in a landfill.

## Downstream leased assets

### Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

### Please explain

The minimum boundary for downstream leased assets is "The scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of lessees that occur during operation of leased assets (e.g. from energy use)." General Mills does not currently calculate or report on Total Emissions for Downstream Leased Assets due to materiality threshold. General Mills leases out two buildings downstream. Leased buildings account for ~0.3% of General Mills’ global real estate footprint (square footage), which does not meet General Mills' materiality threshold.

## Franchises

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

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

4,600

### Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

#### Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

#### Please explain

The calculations for emissions from energy consumption at Haagen-Dazs locations (both owned and franchised) were moved to the calculation engine this year. Emissions were estimated based on square footage and location, using EIA data for consumption per square foot for Food Service establishments, IEA emission factors for electricity consumption, and DEFRA 2020 and 2021 emission factors for natural gas impacts.

### Investments

#### Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

#### Please explain

General Mills does not have investment related scope 3 emissions, therefore, this category is immaterial to our operations.

### Other (upstream)

#### Evaluation status

#### Please explain

### Other (downstream)

#### Evaluation status

#### Please explain

## C-AC6.8/C-FB6.8/C-PF6.8

**(C-AC6.8/C-FB6.8/C-PF6.8) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?**

Yes

## C-AC6.8a/C-FB6.8a/C-PF6.8a

**(C-AC6.8a/C-FB6.8a/C-PF6.8a) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.**

### CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

#### Emissions (metric tons CO2)

1,095

### Methodology

Default emissions factors

### Please explain

Sources for biofuel combustion in manufacturing processes at General Mills-owned facilities include oat hulls and wood burning. Emissions resulting from the combustion of these two biomass types were generated using standard emissions factors. Co2 emissions for biomass (wood and oat hulls) are calculated using standard Emissions Factors provided by DEFRA 2021 - set for advanced users.

## CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

### Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

### Methodology

Default emissions factors

### Please explain

We do not account for any biofuels in our distribution.

# C-AC6.9/C-FB6.9/C-PF6.9

**(C-AC6.9/C-FB6.9/C-PF6.9) Do you collect or calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each commodity reported as significant to your business in C-AC0.7/FB0.7/PF0.7?**

### Agricultural commodities

Cattle products

### Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

### Reporting emissions by

Unit of production

### Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.27

### Denominator: unit of production

Metric tons

### Change from last reporting year

About the same

### Please explain

Scope 3 GHG calculations cover purchases of dairy globally for the declared fiscal year, excluding joint ventures. Our threshold for significant change vs. last year is +/- 5%. In

F22, GHG intensity (MT CO2e) per MT dairy equaled 3.27, compared to 3.33 in F21 - representing a -2% change vs. last year. F21 intensity calculations were updated to reflect General Mills' divestiture of Yoplait Europe business, per the GHG protocol's guidance on baseline and prior year restatements; emissions and activity data affiliated with this divestiture were removed from our footprint. Dairy emissions factors were derived from the World Food Lifecycle Database and custom organic dairy emissions factors developed in partnership with Quantis.

**Explain why you do not calculate GHG emission for this commodity and your plans to do so in the future**

**Agricultural commodities**

Palm Oil

**Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?**

Yes

**Reporting emissions by**

Unit of production

**Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2.12

**Denominator: unit of production**

Metric tons

**Change from last reporting year**

About the same

**Please explain**

When using consistent emissions methodology for F22 vs F21, we saw no changes in emissions per unit of palm production; GHG intensity per palm oil production unit remained flat at 2.12 MT CO2e/MT palm oil. Our company produces snacks, baked goods, and other products from palm ingredients and our main activities related to this commodity is manufacturing. To calculate this figure, we accounted for all the emissions related to palm oil, including land management and processing. We used average emission factors from the World Food LCA Database.

**Explain why you do not calculate GHG emission for this commodity and your plans to do so in the future**

**Agricultural commodities**

Sugar

**Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?**

Yes

**Reporting emissions by**

Unit of production

**Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0.62

**Denominator: unit of production**

Metric tons

**Change from last reporting year**

About the same

**Please explain**

Our threshold for significant change vs. last year is +/- 5%. In F22, GHG intensity (MT CO2e) per MT sugar production was 0.62, compared to 0.59 in F21 - representing a 4% increase vs. last year. When using consistent emissions methodology for F22 vs F21, we saw no changes in emissions per unit of sugar production. Our company produces snacks, baked goods, and other products from sugar ingredients and our main activities related to this commodity is manufacturing. To calculate this figure, we accounted for all the emissions related to sugar, including land management and processing. We used average emission factors from the World Food LCA Database.

**Explain why you do not calculate GHG emission for this commodity and your plans to do so in the future**

**Agricultural commodities**

Wheat

**Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?**

Yes

**Reporting emissions by**

Unit of production

**Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0.69

**Denominator: unit of production**

Metric tons

**Change from last reporting year**

About the same

**Please explain**

When using consistent emissions methodology for F22 vs F21, we saw no significant changes in emissions per unit of wheat production. Our threshold for significant change vs. last year is +/- 5%. In F22, GHG intensity (MT CO2e) per MT wheat production equaled 0.69, compared to 0.70 in F21 - representing a 1% decrease vs. last year. Our company produces snacks, baked goods, and other products from wheat ingredients and our main activities related to this commodity is manufacturing. We also buy and sell grain directly to customers for further processing. To calculate this figure, we accounted for all the emissions related to wheat, including land management and processing. We used average emission factors from the World Food LCA Database in addition to a custom organic wheat flour EF developed in partnership with Quantis.

**Explain why you do not calculate GHG emission for this commodity and your plans to do so in the future**

---

**Agricultural commodities**

Other, please specify

Oats

**Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?**

Yes

**Reporting emissions by**

Unit of production

**Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0.46

**Denominator: unit of production**

Metric tons

**Change from last reporting year**

About the same

**Please explain**

When using consistent emissions methodology for F22 vs F21, we saw no changes in emissions per unit of oat production. In F22, our GHG intensity per unit of oat production equaled 0.46 MT CO2e, compared to 0.47 MT CO2e in F21, representing a -0.1% decrease. General Mills' threshold for significant year over year change is +/-5%. Our company produces snacks, baked goods, and other products from oat ingredients and our main activities related to this commodity is manufacturing. We also buy and sell grain directly to customers for further processing. To calculate this figure, we accounted for all the emissions related to oats, including land management and processing. We used average emission factors from the World Food LCA Database.

**Explain why you do not calculate GHG emission for this commodity and your plans to do so in the future**

# C6.10

**(C6.10) 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.**

**Intensity figure**

0.000020639

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

392,000

**Metric denominator**

unit total revenue

**Metric denominator: Unit total**

18,992,800

**Scope 2 figure used**

Market-based

**% change from previous year**

29

**Direction of change**

Decreased

**Reason(s) for change**

Change in renewable energy consumption
Other emissions reduction activities

**Please explain**

In F22, within our owned operations we have reduced emissions (Scope 1 and 2) by 26% compared to last year, primarily due to our ongoing progress in energy efficiency and focus on renewable electricity. Revenue increased in F22 compared to F21.

One factor that contributed to this Scope 2 Market decrease is that, during fiscal 2022, the energy usage rate at our production facilities decreased by 5% compared to the prior year, as efficiency improvements offset higher production of energy-intensive products. Another contributing factor to this decrease in Scope 2 Market emissions intensity is that during fiscal 2022, energy usage at our production facilities decreased by 5% compared to the prior year, as efficiency improvements offset higher production of energy-intensive products. We completed 21 energy efficiency and reduction projects across the company. In total, these projects saved approximately 16 million kWh of

electricity, 19 thousand MMBTU of natural gas and avoided 6,092 metric tons $CO_2e$ of GHG emissions. For example, through 12 projects to retrofit LED lighting across our North American facilities, we are saving more than 8 million kWh of electricity annually. A third contributing factor is due to progress made on our RE100 commitment. In fiscal 2022, we purchased and applied 1,013,643 MWh of Renewable Energy Credits (RECS) generated through a VPPA in the United States and Canada, which is reflected in our Scope 2 Market emissions. We also purchased 82,732 MWh of Guarantees of Origin (GOs). These resulted in a total GHG savings of 440,600 MT CO2e in F22.

# C7. Emissions breakdowns

## C7.1

**(C7.1) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?**

Yes

## C7.1a

**(C7.1a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used greenhouse warming potential (GWP).**

| Greenhouse gas | Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e) | GWP Reference |
|---|---|---|
| CO2 | 318,181 | IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year) |
| CH4 | 411 | IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year) |
| N2O | 193 | IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year) |

## C7.2

**(C7.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/area/region.**

| Country/area/region | Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e) |
|---|---|
| Australia | 2,663.22 |
| Belgium | 0.28 |
| Brazil | 3,890.42 |
| Canada | 5,700.64 |
| China | 6,399.6 |
| France | 6,796.01 |
| Germany | 13.5 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Greece | 814 |
| Hong Kong SAR, China | 129.56 |
| India | 413.85 |
| Ireland | 2.99 |
| Italy | 0.28 |
| Malaysia | 4.63 |
| Mexico | 2,855.32 |
| Singapore | 9.74 |
| Republic of Korea | 13.07 |
| Spain | 7,040.94 |
| Sweden | 6.24 |
| Switzerland | 24.25 |
| Taiwan, China | 216.94 |
| United Arab Emirates | 7.37 |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | 50.2 |
| United States of America | 278,635.97 |

# C7.3

**(C7.3) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.**

By business division
By activity

# C7.3a

**(C7.3a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.**

| Business division | Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e) |
|---|---|
| North America Retail | 224,900 |
| International | 30,300 |
| North America Foodservice | 22,500 |
| Pet | 40,200 |
| | |

# C7.3c

**(C7.3c) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.**

| Activity | Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e) |
|---|---|
| Natural Gas Combustion | 279,880 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Liquid Propane Combustion | 1,730 |
| Fuel Oil #2 Combustion | 780 |
| Sales Fleet - Transportation Consumption | 8,260 |
| CO2 for Processing | 26,160 |
| BioMass | 1,090 |

## C-AC7.4/C-FB7.4/C-PF7.4

**(C-AC7.4/C-FB7.4/C-PF7.4) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?**

Yes

## C-AC7.4b/C-FB7.4b/C-PF7.4b

**(C-AC7.4b/C-FB7.4b/C-PF7.4b) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.**

**Activity**

Processing/Manufacturing

**Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

290,268

**Methodology**

Region-specific emissions factors

**Please explain**

Scope 1 values reported are for globally owned operations and have been third party verified. Emission factors for fuel usage are from DEFRA UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting Year 2021 Version 1.0 Full Set

## C7.5

**(C7.5) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by country/area/region.**

| Country/area/region | Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e) | Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e) |
|---|---|---|
| Australia | 7,390 | 7,390 |
| Belgium | 0.79 | 0 |
| Brazil | 3,560 | 3,560 |
| Canada | 3,640 | 880 |
| China | 45,690 | 44,550 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| France | 2,400 | 0 |
| Germany | 80 | 1.66 |
| Greece | 3,890 | 0 |
| Hong Kong SAR, China | 1,770 | 1,150 |
| India | 5,920 | 5,910 |
| Ireland | 10 | 20 |
| Italy | 1.35 | 2.1 |
| Malaysia | 50 | 50 |
| Mexico | 4,760 | 4,760 |
| Singapore | 60 | 60 |
| Republic of Korea | 330 | 330 |
| Spain | 5,950 | |
| Sweden | 1.33 | |
| Switzerland | 10 | |
| Taiwan, China | 1,510 | 1,510 |
| United Arab Emirates | 60 | 60 |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | 180 | |
| United States of America | 427,400 | 3,880 |

# C7.6

**(C7.6) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.**

By business division

# C7.6a

**(C7.6a) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.**

| Business division | Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e) | Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e) |
|---|---|---|
| North America Retail | 304,500 | 8,600 |
| International | 78,900 | 64,600 |
| North America Foodservice | 90,300 | 500 |
| Pet | 41,000 | 400 |
| | | |

# C7.7

**(C7.7) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?**

Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

# C7.9

**(C7.9) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?**

Decreased

# C7.9a

**(C7.9a) 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 emissions (metric tons CO2e) | Direction of change in emissions | Emissions value (percentage) | Please explain calculation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Change in renewable energy consumption | 71,600 | Decreased | 14 | In Fiscal 2022, we purchased and applied 1,013,643 MWh of Renewable Energy Credits (RECS) generated through a VPPA in the United States. We generated and applied 82,732 MWh via Guarantees of Origin (GOs). This renewable electricity procurement is reflected in our Scope 2 Market emissions.<br><br>The emissions where a "zero" EF was applied equaled 440,600 MT CO2e when calculated using the eGrid EF's for the equivalent MWhs. This compares to Fiscal 2021, during which we generated and applied 708,550 MWh, or 369,000 MT CO2e, of REC purchases.<br><br>Therefore, last year, our change in renewable energy consumption via Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs) was FY2022 EACs - FY2021 EACs = 440,600 – 369,000 = 71,600 MT CO2e. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Last year (Fiscal 2021), our total Scope 1 and 2 emissions was 527,500 MT CO2e, therefore we arrived at a 14% decrease through (-71,600 / 527,500) * 100 = -14%.<br><br>Note: F21 Scope 1 and 2 emissions have been restated to ensure year-over-year methodological consistency and reflect merger and acquisition activities. |
| Other emissions reduction activities | 0 | No change | | We did not experience any change due to other emissions reduction activities. |
| Divestment | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to Divestment. |
| Acquisitions | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to Acquisitions |
| Mergers | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to Mergers |
| Change in output | 79,900 | Decreased | 10 | General Mills decreased its output by 930 million pounds in F22 compared to F21.<br><br>As a result of this decreased output and required raw materials, we saw a decrease of 79,900 MT CO2e in gross Scope 1 & 2 (location) emissions in F22 at manufacturing plants under our operational control. This means that the total change in emission from manufacturing output is equal to a 10% decrease (79,900/832,600)*100% = 10%.<br><br>As renewable energy credits and guarantees of origin were applied when calculating gross S1 & S2 Market emissions, this decrease in manufacturing output is only reflected in S1 & 2 Location gross emission changes.<br><br>Note: Total F21 Scope 1 and 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | emissions have been restated to ensure year-over-year methodological consistency and reflect merger and acquisition activities. |
| Change in methodology | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to a Change in Methodology |
| Change in boundary | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to a change in boundary |
| Change in physical operating conditions | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to a change in physical operating conditions |
| Unidentified | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to Unidentified items |
| Other | 0 | No change | 0 | We did not experience any change due to "other" items |

## C7.9b

**(C7.9b) Are your emissions performance calculations in C7.9 and C7.9a based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?**

Market-based

# C8. Energy

## C8.1

**(C8.1) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?**

More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

## C8.2

**(C8.2) 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) | Yes |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Consumption of purchased or acquired heat | No |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired steam | Yes |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling | No |
| Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling | Yes |

# C8.2a

**(C8.2a) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.**

| | Heating value | MWh from renewable sources | MWh from non-renewable sources | Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock) | LHV (lower heating value) | 74,407 | 1,642,421 | 1,716,828 |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity | | 1,096,375 | 162,699 | 1,259,074 |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired steam | | 0 | 1,187 | 1,187 |
| Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy | | 682 | | 682 |
| Total energy consumption | | 1,171,464 | 1,806,307 | 2,977,771 |

# C8.2b

**(C8.2b) 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 | No |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam | No |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling | No |
| Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation | Yes |

# C8.2c

**(C8.2c) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.**

## Sustainable biomass

### Heating value

LHV

### Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

74,407

### MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

74,407

### MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

### Comment

The criteria used to classify the biomass as sustainable varied by biomass source. We use two types of sustainable biomass, oat hulls, which are a by-product in our oat production and would otherwise be discarded. The other source is wood, where we used certifications to determine it was sustainably sourced.

## Other biomass

### Heating value

Unable to confirm heating value

### Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

### MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

### MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

### Comment

## Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

### Heating value

Unable to confirm heating value

### Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

### MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

### MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

### Comment

## Coal

### Heating value

Unable to confirm heating value

### Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

### MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

### MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

### Comment

## Oil

### Heating value

LHV

### Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

44,253

### MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

44,253

### MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

### Comment

## Gas

**Heating value**

LHV

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

1,569,881

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

1,569,881

**MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration**

0

**Comment**

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

**Heating value**

Unable to confirm heating value

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

0

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

0

**MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration**

0

**Comment**

### Total fuel

**Heating value**

LHV

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

1,688,540

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

1,688,540

**MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration**

0

**Comment**

# C8.2d

**(C8.2d) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.**

| | Total Gross generation (MWh) | Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh) | Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh) | Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Electricity | 1,259,074 | 1,259,074 | 1,096,375 | 1,096,375 |
| Heat | 1,607,275 | 1,607,275 | 101,185 | 101,185 |
| Steam | 1,187 | 1,187 | 0 | 0 |
| Cooling | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

# C8.2g

**(C8.2g) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your non-fuel energy consumption in the reporting year.**

**Country/area**

Australia

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

10,751

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

10,751

**Country/area**

Belgium

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

5

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

5

---

**Country/area**

Brazil

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

34,105

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

34,105

---

**Country/area**

Canada

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

6,785

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

6,785

**Country/area**

France

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

44,532

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

44,532

**Country/area**

Germany

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

224

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

224

---

**Country/area**

Greece

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

7,819

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

7,819

---

**Country/area**

China

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

71,202

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

682

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

1,187

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

73,071

---

**Country/area**

Hong Kong SAR, China

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

1,404

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

1,404

---

**Country/area**

India

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

8,140

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

8,140

---

**Country/area**

Ireland

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

50

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

50

---

**Country/area**

Italy

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

5

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

5

**Country/area**

Malaysia

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

77

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

77

**Country/area**

Mexico

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

11,936

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

11,936

**Country/area**

Singapore

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

162

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

162

**Country/area**

Republic of Korea

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

639

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

639

**Country/area**

Spain

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

28,815

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

28,815

**Country/area**

Sweden

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

104

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

104

**Country/area**

Taiwan, China

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

2,711

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

2,711

**Country/area**

Switzerland

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

404

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

404

**Country/area**

United Arab Emirates

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

123

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

123

**Country/area**

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

837

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

837

**Country/area**

United States of America

**Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

1,028,089

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

0

**Is this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

No

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

0

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

0

**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

1,028,089

## C8.2h

**(C8.2h) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity purchases in the reporting year by country/area.**

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

United States of America

**Sourcing method**

Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

**Renewable electricity technology type**

Wind

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

1,013,643

**Tracking instrument used**

US-REC

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

United States of America

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

Yes

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

2018

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

2021

**Supply arrangement start year**

2018

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Green-e

**Comment**

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Greece

**Sourcing method**

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

**Renewable electricity technology type**

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

7,819

**Tracking instrument used**

GO

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Norway

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

Yes

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

1968

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

2021

**Supply arrangement start year**

2020

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**

No additional, voluntary label

**Comment**

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**
France

**Sourcing method**
Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

**Renewable electricity technology type**
Large hydropower (>25 MW)

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**
44,532

**Tracking instrument used**
GO

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**
Norway

**Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**
Yes

**Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)**
1949

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**
2021

**Supply arrangement start year**
2020

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**
No additional, voluntary label

**Comment**
EACs applied to France electricity consumption sourced from numerous hydroelectric production facilities ranging from commissioning years 1949 (oldest) -1995 (newest).

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**
Spain

**Sourcing method**
Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

**Renewable electricity technology type**
Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

28,815

**Tracking instrument used**

GO

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Norway

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

Yes

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

1981

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

**Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**

No additional, voluntary label

**Comment**

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Germany

**Sourcing method**

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

**Renewable electricity technology type**

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

221

**Tracking instrument used**

GO

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Norway

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

No

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

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

2021

**Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**

No additional, voluntary label

**Comment**

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Sweden

**Sourcing method**

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

**Renewable electricity technology type**

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

104

**Tracking instrument used**

GO

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Norway

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

No

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

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

2021

**Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**

No additional, voluntary label

**Comment**

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**

Switzerland

**Sourcing method**

Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

**Renewable electricity technology type**

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

404

**Tracking instrument used**

GO

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**

Norway

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

No

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

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**

2021

**Supply arrangement start year**

2021

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**

No additional, voluntary label

**Comment**

**Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity**
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

**Sourcing method**
Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

**Renewable electricity technology type**
Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**
837

**Tracking instrument used**
GO

**Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity**
Norway

**Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**
No

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

**Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)**
2021

**Supply arrangement start year**
2021

**Additional, voluntary label associated with purchased renewable electricity**
No additional, voluntary label

**Comment**

## C8.2i

**(C8.2i) Provide details of your organization's low-carbon heat, steam, and cooling purchases in the reporting year by country/area..**

**Sourcing method**
Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

**Country/area of consumption of low-carbon heat, steam or cooling**
China

**Energy carrier**
Steam

**Low-carbon technology type**
Other, please specify
Purchased steam

**Low-carbon heat, steam, or cooling consumed (MWh)**
1,187

**Comment**

## C8.2j

**(C8.2j) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity generation by country/area in the reporting year.**

**Country/area of generation**
China

**Renewable electricity technology type**
Solar

**Facility capacity (MW)**
1,100

**Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**
1,733

**Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)**
1,733

**Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation**
No

**Type of energy attribute certificate**

**Comment**

## C8.2k

**(C8.2k) Describe how your organization's renewable electricity sourcing strategy directly or indirectly contributes to bringing new capacity into the grid in the countries/areas in which you operate.**

Our investment in two wind farms, via our Virtual Purchase Power Agreements, directly contributed to new capacity into the grid.

## C8.2l

**(C8.2l) In the reporting year, has your organization faced any challenges to sourcing renewable electricity?**

| | Challenges to sourcing renewable electricity |
|---|---|
| Row 1 | Yes, in specific countries/areas in which we operate |

## C8.2m

**(C8.2m) Provide details of the country/area-specific challenges to sourcing renewable electricity faced by your organization in the reporting year.**

| Country/area | Reason(s) why it was challenging to source renewable electricity within selected country/area | Provide additional details of the barriers faced within this country/area |
|---|---|---|
| Taiwan, China | Lack of credible renewable electricity procurement options (e.g. EACs, Green Tariffs)<br>Limited supply of renewable electricity in the market | Due to lack of credible RE purchasing options, it is challenging to source renewable electricity in Taiwan. |
| Republic of Korea | Limited supply of renewable electricity in the market | Due to lack of RE purchasing options, it is challenging to source renewable electricity in South Korea. There are no EACs currently being sold in South Korea. |

# C9. Additional metrics

## C9.1

**(C9.1) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.**

# C10. Verification

## C10.1

**(C10.1) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.**

| | Verification/assurance status |
|---|---|
| Scope 1 | Third-party verification or assurance process in place |
| Scope 2 (location-based or market-based) | Third-party verification or assurance process in place |
| Scope 3 | Third-party verification or assurance process in place |

## C10.1a

**(C10.1a) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.**

**Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Annual process

**Status in the current reporting year**

Complete

**Type of verification or assurance**

Limited assurance

**Attach the statement**

General Mills AA 1000 Verification Statement-2022.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

p. 1-3

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

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

100

## C10.1b

**(C10.1b) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.**

**Scope 2 approach**

Scope 2 location-based

**Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Annual process

**Status in the current reporting year**

Complete

**Type of verification or assurance**

Limited assurance

**Attach the statement**

General Mills AA 1000 Verification Statement-2022.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

p. 1-3

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

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

100

**Scope 2 approach**

Scope 2 market-based

**Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Annual process

**Status in the current reporting year**

Complete

**Type of verification or assurance**

Limited assurance

**Attach the statement**

General Mills AA 1000 Verification Statement-2022.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

p. 1-3

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

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

100

# C10.1c

**(C10.1c) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.**

**Scope 3 category**

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

**Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Annual process

**Status in the current reporting year**

Complete

**Type of verification or assurance**

Limited assurance

**Attach the statement**

General Mills AA 1000 Verification Statement-2022.pdf

**Page/section reference**

p. 1-3

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

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

100

# C10.2

**(C10.2) Do you verify any climate-related information reported in your CDP disclosure other than the emissions figures reported in C6.1, C6.3, and C6.5?**

Yes

# C10.2a

**(C10.2a) Which data points within your CDP disclosure have been verified, and which verification standards were used?**

| Disclosure module verification relates to | Data verified | Verification standard | Please explain |
|---|---|---|---|
| C4. Targets and performance | Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1) | Reference Standard used by Apex: ISO 14064-3 Second Edition 2019-04: Greenhouse gases -- Part 3: Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements | General Mills engaged APEX to conduct an independent assurance of its Greenhouse Gas emissions, Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 1&2 annually to compare current versus prior year emissions. 1 |
| C4. Targets and performance | Year on year change in emissions (Scope 2) | Reference Standard used by Apex: ISO 14064-3 Second Edition 2019-04: Greenhouse gases -- Part 3: Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements | General Mills engaged APEX to conduct an independent assurance of its Greenhouse Gas emissions, Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 1&2 annually to compare current versus prior year emissions. 1 |
| C4. Targets and performance | Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1 and 2) | Reference Standard used by Apex: ISO 14064-3 Second Edition 2019-04: Greenhouse gases -- Part 3: Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements | General Mills engaged APEX to conduct an independent assurance of its Greenhouse Gas emissions, Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 1&2 annually to compare current versus prior year emissions. 1 |
| C4. Targets and performance | Progress against emissions reduction target | Reference Standard used by Apex: ISO 14064-3 Second Edition 2019-04: Greenhouse gases -- Part 3: Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements | General Mills engaged APEX to conduct an independent assurance of its Greenhouse Gas emissions, Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 1&2 annually to compare current versus baseline year emissions. 1 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| C4. Targets and performance | Progress against emissions reduction target | Reference Standard used by Apex: ISO 14064-3 Second Edition 2019-04: Greenhouse gases -- Part 3: Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements | General Mills engaged APEX to conduct an independent assurance of its Greenhouse Gas emissions, Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 1&2 annually to compare current versus baseline year emissions. 1 |
| C4. Targets and performance | Progress against emissions reduction target | Reference Standard used by Apex: ISO 14064-3 Second Edition 2019-04: Greenhouse gases -- Part 3: Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements | General Mills engaged APEX to conduct an independent assurance of its Greenhouse Gas emissions, Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 1&2 annually to compare current versus baseline year emissions. 1 |

[1]General Mills RY22 Verification Statement YoY_Revised 05112023.pdf

# C11. Carbon pricing

## C11.1

**(C11.1) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?**

Yes

## C11.1a

**(C11.1a) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impacts your operations.**

Other carbon tax, please specify

Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan

## C11.1c

**(C11.1c) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.**

### Other carbon tax, please specify

**Period start date**

May 31, 2021

**Period end date**

May 30, 2022

**% of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax**

0.19

**Total cost of tax paid**

36,534

**Comment**

Our Winnipeg, Manitoba facility is subject to a Carbon Tax that is part of the Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan, on gas, liquid or solid fuel products intended for combustion, at price per tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2 eq). This tax is directly passed on to us in our utility invoices as a charge per M3 of natural gas. Over the course of the reporting year, the cost has ranged from $0.0783 per M3 to $0.1916 per M3. We are addressing this tax internally by reducing our utility usage through the 5 Step Energy Process. Examples of work already completed at Winnipeg includes having an assessment completed for lighting as well as studies completed related to the compressed air supply and compressed air demand systems and subsequently implemented improvements based on the assessment recommendations.

# C11.1d

**(C11.1d) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?**

To comply with the systems we are regulated by (Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan) and by those we anticipate being regulated by General Mills production sites have an annual target to reduce energy use by 2 percent normalized to production. We use the Five-Step Energy Reduction Process to identify and implement improvements in energy usage by working with our manufacturing plants to establish energy programs, conduct energy analyses, develop and execute improvement plans, and validate results. This process historically focused on facilities with significant spending on energy. We have recently evolved it to include all General Mills manufacturing facilities. The Five-Step Energy Reduction Process was used to identify the need to focus improvement efforts on common systems such as compressed air, lighting and steam/hot water and expect this initiative to save about US$12 million in energy use between 2021 to 2026.

During fiscal 2022, energy usage at our production facilities decreased by 5% compared to the prior year, as efficiency improvements offset higher production of energy-intensive products. We completed 21 energy efficiency and reduction projects across the company that were identified by the Five-Step Energy Reduction Process. In total, these projects saved approximately 16 million kWh of electricity, 19 thousand MMBTU of natural gas and avoided 6,092 metric tons $CO_2e$ of GHG emissions. For example, through 12 projects to retrofit LED lighting across our North American facilities, we are saving more than 8 million kWh of electricity annually.

# C11.2

**(C11.2) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?**

No

## C11.3

### (C11.3) Does your organization use an internal price on carbon?

No, but we anticipate doing so in the next two years

# C12. Engagement

## C12.1

### (C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?

Yes, our suppliers

Yes, our customers/clients

Yes, other partners in the value chain

## C12.1a

### (C12.1a) Provide details of your climate-related supplier engagement strategy.

**Type of engagement**

Engagement & incentivization (changing supplier behavior)

**Details of engagement**

Run an engagement campaign to educate suppliers about climate change

**% of suppliers by number**

1

**% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)**

46

**% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5**

65

**Rationale for the coverage of your engagement**

In F22, we launched a Supplier-facing GHG engagement program in support of our 2030 environmental commitments, including our commitment to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions across our full value chain by 30% by 2030. We have just wrapped the first year of this multi-year strategy, designed to bring our supply base along the 3-5 year maturity journey to reduce carbon emissions in the value chain. While the engagement strategy will provide resources and development for all suppliers in our value chain, we are prioritizing the top 150 emitting suppliers for deeper collaboration over the next two years. These suppliers were selected as top emitters from 15 high emitting categories, representing 65% of our total supplier emissions.

These categories include direct and indirect spend and include but is not limited to spend in areas such as Transportation, Dairy, Meat, and Fiber Packaging.

### Impact of engagement, including measures of success

Through this strategy, we will 1) Set supplier GHG abatement expectations, 2) provide development resources to accelerate supplier abatement, 3) Drive awareness and action against Enterprise plan priorities and 4) Measure supplier emissions, track reductions, document supplier-generated pipeline opportunities. In developing this new program, success criteria for the first year were defined as ensuring Leadership alignment on strategy and objectives and securing the appropriate resources (incremental headcount) to support ongoing program success. We consider year 1 to be a success, as we secured 2 incremental FTE headcount to engage with suppliers and drive the strategy forward with suppliers, received executive-level buy-in for the strategy, and embedded specific GHG metrics into impacted Sourcing team member's priorities in all 15 high impact categories.

### Comment

### Type of engagement

Engagement & incentivization (changing supplier behavior)

### Details of engagement

Run an engagement campaign to educate suppliers about climate change
Facilitate adoption of a unified climate transition approach with suppliers
Other, please specify
Provide training, support and best practices focused on forest-positive strategies

### % of suppliers by number

3.1

### % total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

3.2

### % of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5

5.9

### Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

At General Mills, we recognize that eliminating deforestation and preserving natural ecosystems are essential to meeting our climate commitment. To drive positive outcomes for both people and planet, we are focused on forest-positive strategies for commodities at high risk of deforestation and where we can make a meaningful impact, which includes palm oil and cocoa. As a result of our recent climate footprinting work, we know that collectively the production of these ingredients makes up approximately 15% of our ingredient-derived GHG emissions, and most of those emissions come from land use change. By eliminating deforestation in these commodities, we are not only protecting our forests, but also the people who depend on them. General Mills is a

founding member of the Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action, formally launched in September 2020, which requires member companies to collaboratively work toward a forest-positive future, and proactively work with suppliers to mainstream deforestation-free production across their business. Through these activities, we are focusing on our supplier base specifically and the actions they are taking. We recognize that deforestation and land use change have significant impacts for climate change. That's why we are looking to the work of SBTi, in particular the newly released Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) Guidance, as well as where we can drive impact as we continue to evolve our strategies and programs.

### Impact of engagement, including measures of success

We are a relatively small buyer of palm oil but recognize that our purchasing practices and collaboration can positively impact ecosystems and people and drive progress toward our climate targets. We have committed to and successfully sourced 100% of our palm oil as Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) certified every year since 2015. General Mills is a founding member of the Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action, which requires members to collaboratively work toward a forest-positive future, and proactively work with suppliers to mainstream deforestation-free production across their business. We actively engage our suppliers in direct review of their palm oil production and sourcing practices, traceability to mill, and advancing where possible to traceability to production. We work closely with our suppliers and industry partners, like Proforest, to build performance and compliance with our commitments through active score carding and are advancing progress using the No-deforestation, No-peat and No-exploitation Implementation Reporting Framework (NDPE IRF) designed to help companies understand and track progress in delivering NDPE commitments and deforestation-free supply chains.

We work closely with our key cocoa suppliers (Barry Callebaut, Cargill) in West Africa (Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire) where more than 90% of our cocoa supply comes from. In 2017, we signed on to the World Cocoa Foundation's Cocoa and Forests Initiative (CFI) to combat deforestation in key growing regions. Through this initiative we have worked closely with suppliers to identify strategic actions against 3 core commitments: protect and restore forests, promote sustainable production, and engage communities and boost social inclusion. We consider the engagement successful when the 2022 goals have progress or are met/exceeded and consider 2022 a successful year. In 2022 General Mills made progress in Cote d'Ivoire to 80% traceability to farm vs a goal of 100% which is up 16% vs the prior year while in Ghana, we achieved 63% traceability to farm (vs 100% goal and up 3% vs prior year). As we continue our work with CFI, we will leverage the knowledge we gain to inform approach and strategy to achieve deforestation-free cocoa for the rest of our sourcing origins as eliminating deforestation is a one of the key levers to achieving our 2030 climate commitment.

### Comment

# C12.1b

## (C12.1b) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with your customers.

### Type of engagement & Details of engagement

Education/information sharing

Run an engagement campaign to educate customers about the climate change impacts of (using) your products, goods, and/or services

### % of customers by number

### % of customer - related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5

33

### Please explain the rationale for selecting this group of customers and scope of engagement

General Mills has selected to partner with a group of customers to create retailer events focused on driving consumer education and incremental merchandising on brands with a planet-forward action.

General Mills is partnering with our retailers on the Good for the Future program, which creates opportunity to connect with customers and consumers through shared values. We partner on retailer events focused on driving incremental merchandising on brands with a planet-forward action. This group currently consists of 14 customers selected due to their scale (they represent our highest volume customers) and because they have sustainability and climate targets that are aligned with our climate ambition. We estimate that together these customers account for approximately one-third of our customer-related Scope 3 emissions.

We are also partnering with key retailers to advance our nature commitments, help consumers navigate in store and online and increase the convenience of sustainable items.  An example of this is partnering with Amazon so that our Organic and Fair-Trade products are a part of the Amazon Climate Pledge Friendly badge program to ensure consumers can make informed choices.

General Mills is also driving engagement with our customers and consumers to facilitate understanding of the new Nature Valley package that is recyclable through in store drop off, re-engage consumers' in reducing landfilled material and stimulate recycling. We have learned that strong partnerships across the full supply chain have been key to unlocking unique solutions such as this.

### Impact of engagement, including measures of success

General Mills sees that customer partnerships and shared values can help to drive shared sustainability goals such as greenhouse gas reductions. With Walmart, in 2022, we participated in a Joint Sustainability Meeting with Wal-Mart where we shared a vision for a regenerative future and how we might collectively regenerate 1 million acres of farmland. These talks have continued and will continue into next year. These joint conversations have successfully deepened our partnership with a key retailer toward achieving the General Mills goal of advancing regenerative practices on 1 million acres and our collective goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, a goal which is publicly stated by both companies.

In addition to deepening connections with customers, we continue to advance these engagements to connect further with our consumers. The Good for the Future campaign includes multiple engagement points including both online and in store opportunities to engage and educate the consumer. Success for this program is measured by the percentage of participation of retailers from the previous year. We consider the program successful if we retain 100% of the previous year's retailers and continue to expand the program. Therefore, this program was a success in 2022 as we were able to retain the participation of all retailers from the prior year and grew in engagement opportunities and into online platforms. Additionally, our initial pilot of products in the Amazon Climate Pledge Friendly badge program ensures that our consumers can continue to make informed choices more seamlessly. We have seen value in Amazon’s program and intend to continue to advance the work to secure the Climate Friendly Pledge badge for additional products.

We leveraged a variety of communication methods to drive awareness for both the customer and consumer of the Nature Valley wrapper being recyclable through in store drop off. Part of this education includes ensuring customers know that this technology is purposefully not patented, and that we welcome other food brands to apply the technology to their product portfolios.

# C12.1d

## (C12.1d) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with other partners in the value chain.

We consider other partners in our value chain to be farmers, research institutions, conservation groups and agricultural research-related foundations. General Mills has a regenerative agriculture commitment to advance regenerative practices on 1 million acres by 2030 which supports our company's broader climate goal of reducing GHG emissions across our entire value chain by 30% by 2030 and net zero emissions by 2050. This commitment helps to rebuild and restore soil health and function, ultimately improving the quality of our ingredients, as well as helps decrease physical climate-related impacts to our supply chain. This is why we engage with our other partners in the value chain, as they have the ability to significantly support the achievement of these goals. We do this through pilot programs and research partnerships to increase market opportunities and operational efficiency. From this strategy, we are able to provide technical assistance and one-one-one coaching to farmers, to show them best practices that can increase efficiency and maximize crop yield helping to lower emissions

associated with their farming practices. Further, our partnerships with local and state conservation groups and with research institutions such as the Wilkin County Soil & Water Conservation District and the Soil Health Academy help in determining best practices to implement of regenerative agriculture systems to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This has been proven to be successful, as we have seen an overall increase in operational efficiency and an increasing number of farmers have recognized their preference for regenerative agriculture practices. The feedback suggests our pilot investments have been effective in driving change. As an example, we've received positive feedback from both farmers and Understanding Ag (UA) consultants since launching our Southern Plains regenerative agriculture pilot in spring of 2020. This pilot, along with the Northern Plains pilot, are designed to study how effective deep soil health training, 1:1 technical assistance, and peer-to-peer learning are in advancing regenerative agricultural systems in the region. After two years of participation, Understanding Ag consultants surveyed farmers to understand how the program has aided them in their journey. The results demonstrate the value of technical and social support programming in the understanding of soil health, implementation of techniques and related impacts, and the desire to continue advancing in the future. The feedback suggests our pilot investments have been effective in driving change.

# C12.2

### (C12.2) Do your suppliers have to meet climate-related requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?

Yes, suppliers have to meet climate-related requirements, but they are not included in our supplier contracts

# C12.2a

### (C12.2a) Provide details of the climate-related requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process and the compliance mechanisms in place.

#### Climate-related requirement

Implementation of emissions reduction initiatives

#### Description of this climate related requirement

At General Mills, we are responsible for maintaining high standards in our own operations and across our value chain. Through our Global Responsible Sourcing program, we uphold our Supplier Code of Conduct and drive ongoing supplier progress in the areas of health and safety, human rights, business integrity and the environment. This increases our influence to protect and respect the people who supply, transform and manufacture the goods and services we use to make our products.
In addition to complying with all applicable environmental laws, we expect suppliers to continually improve their own environmental performance, including, but not limited to, measuring, setting reduction targets, and implementing greenhouse gas emissions reduction initiatives, reducing, or optimizing the use of water, energy, and agriculture

inputs, and minimizing water pollution and waste. General Mills may require suppliers to provide information regarding environmental standards and metrics & measures, such as Scope 1-3 greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy usage. Through our Responsible Sourcing program, we seek to close out noncompliances. When a supplier does not comply with a standard set in our Supplier Code of Conduct, we partner with the supplier to provide resources or training as needed to address the noncompliance. If a resolution cannot be reached, the decision is escalated to leadership through our Business Performance Management process for final resolution and alignment.

**% suppliers by procurement spend that have to comply with this climate-related requirement**

100

**% suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this climate-related requirement**

92

**Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this climate-related requirement**

Certification
Supplier self-assessment
First-party verification
Second-party verification

**Response to supplier non-compliance with this climate-related requirement**

Retain and engage

## C-AC12.2/C-FB12.2/C-PF12.2

**(C-AC12.2/C-FB12.2/C-PF12.2) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?**

Yes

## C-AC12.2a/C-FB12.2a/C-PF12.2a

**(C-AC12.2a/C-FB12.2a/C-PF12.2a) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.**

**Management practice reference number**

MP1

**Management practice**

Land use change

### Description of management practice

We believe the most promising solution to reach our climate goals and create positive planetary outcomes is through regenerative agriculture, which we define as a holistic, principles-based approach to farming and ranching that seeks to strengthen ecosystems and community resilience. This inclusive approach is relevant to all types of farms – large and small, conventional and organic. Regenerative agriculture can help address climate change by pulling carbon from the atmosphere and sequestering it in the soil, improving soil health and driving other benefits, such as improving nutrient cycling, so less synthetic fertilizer is needed. These elements of regenerative agriculture help to contribute emission reductions toward our climate goals. This is important because today, the food system accounts for one-third of all GHG emissions, with around 70% from agriculture and conversion of natural lands to farmland. In 2022, Agriculture and transformation accounted for 39% of General Mills' scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, regenerative agriculture is a powerful lever for change across the agricultural supply chain and can help maintain a steady supply of high-quality ingredients while addressing some of the world's biggest environmental, social and economic challenges and opportunities.

General Mills works with partners and farmers to integrate six core principles of regenerative agriculture: Understand context of farm operation; Minimize disturbance; Maximize diversity; Keep the soil covered; Maintain living roots year-round; Integrate livestock.

We use an outcomes-based approach, as opposed to one based on practices, believing that regenerative systems are unique to each farm context and seek to deliver measurable improvements in the following areas: Soil health and carbon sequestration, biodiversity, cow and herd well-being, water quality and quantity, and farmer economic resilience.

### Your role in the implementation

Financial
Knowledge sharing

### Explanation of how you encourage implementation

We work to advance regenerative agriculture in a variety of ways, and in collaboration with farmers and industry experts:
• Context: We work to understand local context so that our actions align with unique needs and connect to complementary efforts to ensure a holistic approach.
• Education: In multiday workshops, farmers learn about regenerative principles and hear from local farmers about how they are practicing regenerative agriculture, to develop a regenerative mindset and view their operations differently.
• Coaching: Farmers receive one on- one coaching for three years to help develop and implement regenerative management plans.
• Community: We connect farmers practicing regenerative agriculture to one another, through field days, cafe meet-ups, and groups on social media, to build community and provide mutual support.

• Measurement: We are tracking changes in soil health, biodiversity, water quality and farmer economics over several years as farmers implement their regenerative management plans
• Market: We work to increase market opportunities for farmers using regenerative management practices.
We are a Founding Circle member of the Ecosystem Services Market Consortium and plan to pilot a market-based incentive mechanism so farmers can be paid for the environmental services they provide through regenerative agriculture. To advance adoption of regenerative agriculture, we have partnered with Soil Health Academy and Understanding Ag to activate pilots in priority ingredient sourcing regions. In addition to and in coordination with our pilots, we are collaborating with leading conservation organizations within key supply sheds to drive further progress in advancing regenerative agriculture systems including:
• Partnership with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) in the Great Lakes Basin and the Northern and Southern Great Plains to hire field conservation professionals who support farmers in areas that are important for fish and wildlife.
• Soil health programs with the Wilkin County, Walsh County, and Kittson County Soil & Water Conservation Districts in the Northern Plains, and with the Kansas Soil Health Alliance and the Oklahoma Conservation Commission in the Southern Plains.
• Partnership with ALUS Canada's Growing Roots regenerative agriculture community hubs in the prairie provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

**Climate change related benefit**

Emissions reductions (mitigation)
Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Increase carbon sink (mitigation)
Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)
Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

**Comment**

none

# C-AC12.2b/C-FB12.2b/C-PF12.2b

**(C-AC12.2b/C-FB12.2b/C-PF12.2b) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?**

Yes

# C12.3

**(C12.3) Does your organization engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate?**

**Row 1**

**External engagement activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate**

Yes, we engage directly with policy makers

Yes, our membership of/engagement with trade associations could influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Yes, we fund organizations or individuals whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

**Does your organization have a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes

**Attach commitment or position statement(s)**

Climate policy 2023.docx

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

The Public Responsibility Committee of the Board of Directors oversees the company's political activities, including our policy, disclosure of corporate political contributions, membership in major trade associations and independent political expenditures (although the company has not made any). The Global Impact Governance Committee (GIGC), led by our Chairman and CEO and overseen by the Board's Public Responsibility committee, is accountable for our sustainability program. The Chairman and CEO convenes the GIGC at least three times each year to establish, direct and oversee General Mills' positions on matters of significance to the company and its stakeholders concerning corporate social responsibility, environmental and sustainability issues, and philanthropy. We actively engage in public policy discussions to advance our environmental initiatives, including:

• Leading on regenerative agriculture
• Combating climate change
• Advancing water stewardship
• Addressing packaging
• Reducing food waste

## C12.3a

**(C12.3a) On what policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?**

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

Regenerative Agriculture and Soil Health

### Category of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Climate change mitigation

### Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Climate transition plans

Emissions – CO2

### Policy, law, or regulation geographic coverage

National

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

United States of America

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

Support with no exceptions

### Description of engagement with policy makers

General Mills is a leading voice on regenerative agriculture and encourage the U.S. Congress to strengthen collaboration between organizations, components of our supply chains and domestic agriculture producers to meet ambitious sustainability goals we have set for ourselves. We encourage collaboration and investment by governments and the private sector, such as our support for the Foundation for Food and Ag Research (FFAR), a critical facilitator of public private partnerships between industry and farmers. Policy is critical tool to advance this work, including the 2023 Farm Bill. We applaud the passage of the bipartisan Growing Climate Solutions Act which will provide farmers with much-needed technical assistance to be able to participate in voluntary carbon markets. We helped establish the Ecosystem Service Market Consortium (ESMC) and their ecosystems market Eco-Harvest, which quantifies the benefits of sustainable agricultural practices so farmers can be paid for providing them. General Mills' Senior Agriculture Scientist, Dr. Steve Rosenzweig, PhD, testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in December 2020 on the importance of agriculture research. His testimony included an overview of regenerative agriculture, why General Mills has invested it in, the need for more public research, our public climate commitment, regenerative agriculture's role as a tool to mitigate climate change and our public private partnerships that further enhance our work. We responded to the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and Senate Democrats' Special Committee on Climate Crisis with our comments on the potential of regenerative agriculture to mitigate climate change, highlighting policies that help us support farmers through public private partnerships. We strongly support the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP), which relies on existing U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) authorities to invest in agricultural conservation efforts and leverages private-sector financial and technical resources, resulting in a multiplying effect unparalleled in other federal programs. We are constantly evaluating new federal, state and local policy opportunities to advance regenerative farming practices.

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

**Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

---

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

Combating Climate Change

**Category of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate**

Climate change mitigation

**Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate**

Climate transition plans

**Policy, law, or regulation geographic coverage**

National

**Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to**

United States of America

**Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation**

Support with no exceptions

**Description of engagement with policy makers**

General Mills has been a leader in recognizing the impacts of climate change to our planet, and our business. We have established industry-leading, science-based targets for carbon reduction.

We advocate for climate change policies that builds on this leadership at the state and federal level in the U.S.. We support a comprehensive, national climate policy; joined over 300 businesses for Ceres' annual LEAD on Climate 2022 Day to call on Congress to pass a resilient economic recovery plan while working toward long term climate solutions - including a price on carbon; have publicly called for the U.S. to remain in the Paris Climate Accord; and support the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Power Plan.

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

**Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Advancing Water Stewardship

**Category of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate**

Climate change mitigation

**Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate**

Climate transition plans

**Policy, law, or regulation geographic coverage**

National

**Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to**

United States of America

**Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation**

Support with no exceptions

**Description of engagement with policy makers**

The General Mills Water Policy states our commitment to pursue a long-term, multi-stakeholder water stewardship strategy - inclusive of our suppliers, local communities, governments, NGOs, and industry - focused on improving the health of priority watersheds where our operations and growing regions are located. We engage policy makers to drive more sustainable water practices. General Mills has membership in the California Water Action Collaborative, a platform for diverse stakeholders to come together and pursue collective action projects that will improve water security in California for people, business, agriculture and nature, and Connect the Drops, which educates California lawmakers about such efforts and advocates for policy solutions there. General Mills has signed on to the CEO Water Mandate and has set context-based goals and actions plans in accordance with the Alliance for Water Stewardship standard.

In 2021, we joined the Science-Based Target for Freshwater pilot for setting a target in accordance with our water footprint and potential for positive impact. This pilot affirmed our focus on agriculture and ingredients as the primary area where we can drive positive impact in water.

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

**Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Addressing Packaging and Food Waste

**Category of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate**

Climate change mitigation

**Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate**

Climate-related targets

Transparency requirements

Other, please specify

Food Security

**Policy, law, or regulation geographic coverage**

National

**Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to**

United States of America

**Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation**

Support with no exceptions

**Description of engagement with policy makers**

We promote policies to effectively and efficiently increase packaging recycling rates and reduce waste. In the U.S., we are a leader in AMERIPEN – the American Institute for Packaging and the Environment – which conducts research and advocates for policy changes to achieve these goals at both the state and federal level. As a leading member of the Consumer Brands Association, we support their convening of the Recycling Leadership Council which built a public policy framework to fundamentally reimagine the U.S. recycling system. General Mills signed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's America Recycles Pledge to build on our existing efforts to address the challenges facing our nation's recycling system and to identify solutions that create a more resilient materials economy and protect the environment. General Mills was named by the United States Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency and Food and Drug Administration as a 2030 Food Waste and Loss Champion. General Mills is leading in a host of multi-sector as well as industry coalitions aimed at reducing and ending food waste and loss: The Food Waste Reduction Alliance, a partnership of U.S. food manufacturers, grocery retailers and restaurants and foodservice companies. The non-profit organization, ReFED ("Re-think Food Waste through Economics and Data"), which is advancing food waste prevention and surplus food recovery solutions by aligning and mobilizing cross-sector coalitions that include local, state and federal governments, non-profit organizations, food companies, waste management companies, entrepreneurs and others.

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

**Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

## C12.3b

**(C12.3b) Provide details of the trade associations your organization is a member of, or engages with, which are likely to take a position on any policy, law or regulation that may impact the climate.**

**Trade association**

Other, please specify

AMERIPEN

**Is your organization's position on climate change policy consistent with theirs?**

Consistent

**Has your organization attempted to influence their position in the reporting year?**

Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

**Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the trade association's position, and any actions taken to influence their position**

As a leader in AMERIPEN, we are deeply engaged in their entire public policy strategy, including developing committee structure and consultant relationships, establishing coalition structure, recruiting members, and engaging daily on strategy execution. AMERIPEN is a recognized leader in the packaging policy space and has coordinated several engagements in key states.

**Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year (currency as selected in C0.4)**

**Describe the aim of your organization's funding**

**Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

# C12.3c

**(C12.3c) Provide details of the funding you provided to other organizations or individuals in the reporting year whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate.**

**Type of organization or individual**

Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) or charitable organization

**State the organization or individual to which you provided funding**

CERES

**Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency as selected in C0.4)**

35,000

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

General Mills joins over 300 businesses for Ceres' annual LEAD on Climate 2022 Day to call on Congress to pass a resilient economic recovery plan while working toward long term climate solutions - including a price on carbon credits. The funding figure provided is the annual membership dues paid during the reporting year.

**Have you evaluated whether this funding is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

**Type of organization or individual**

Research organization

**State the organization or individual to which you provided funding**

Foundation for Food and Ag Research

**Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency as selected in C0.4)**

32,000

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

Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the climate: General Mills is a leading voice on regenerative agriculture. We invest to help support farmers as they shift toward more sustainable practices and encourage collaboration and investment by governments and the private sector, such as our support for the Foundation for Food and Ag Research (FFAR), a critical facilitator of

public private partnerships between industry and farmers and academic research. One area of FFAR that we support is the FFAR Fellows program where we contribute about $32,000 per year to support PhD students and their research. This figure does not represent our total funding of regenerative agriculture advocacy, but is an illustrative example of how our company is engaging to advance research in this space.

**Have you evaluated whether this funding is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?**

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

## C12.4

**(C12.4) Have you published information about your organization's response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).**

**Publication**

In voluntary sustainability report

**Status**

Complete

**Attach the document**

general-mills-global-responsibility-2023-entire-report.pdf

**Page/Section reference**

Planet Section, p. 27 - 53

**Content elements**

Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

**Comment**

2023 (Fiscal 2022 data) Global Responsibility Report

**Publication**

In mainstream reports

**Status**

Complete

### Attach the document

GMI-2022-Proxy-Statement.pdf

### Page/Section reference

p.9-10

### Content elements

Emission targets
Other metrics

### Comment

2022 Proxy Statement

---

### Publication

In mainstream reports

### Status

Complete

### Attach the document

GMI-2022-Annual-Report.pdf

### Page/Section reference

p  3-4, 12-13, 31

### Content elements

Governance
Risks & opportunities

### Comment

2022 Annual Statement

---

### Publication

In voluntary communications

### Status

Complete

### Attach the document

ESG Webcast 2022.docx

### Page/Section reference

p. 1-113

**Content elements**

Risks & opportunities
Emission targets
Other metrics
Other, please specify
ESG linked Financing

**Comment**

2022 Force for Good ESG Webcast for Investors

## C12.5

**(C12.5) Indicate the collaborative frameworks, initiatives and/or commitments related to environmental issues for which you are a signatory/member.**

| | Environmental collaborative framework, initiative and/or commitment | Describe your organization's role within each framework, initiative and/or commitment |
|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | Business Ambition for 1.5C<br>Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member<br>RE100<br>Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)<br>UN Global Compact<br>We Mean Business | We directly control only a small portion of our value chain, so driving transformation across the entire system requires leadership and collaboration with suppliers, farmers, ingredient and packaging producers, product transport providers, retailers and consumers. Combating climate change also requires collective action across industries and our broader society. |

# C13. Other land management impacts

## C-AC13.2/C-FB13.2/C-PF13.2

**(C-AC13.2/C-FB13.2/C-PF13.2) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in C-AC12.2a/C-FB12.2a/C-PF12.2a that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?**

Yes

## C-AC13.2a/C-FB13.2a/C-PF13.2a

**(C-AC13.2a/C-FB13.2a/C-PF13.2a) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.**

### Management practice reference number

MP1

### Overall effect

Positive

### Which of the following has been impacted?

Biodiversity
Soil
Water

### Description of impacts

We are on a journey to make a meaningful difference through regenerative agriculture. We define regenerative agriculture as a holistic, principles-based approach to farming and ranching that seeks to strengthen ecosystems and community resilience. This inclusive approach is relevant to all types of farms – large and small, conventional and organic. Regenerative agriculture is a powerful lever for change across the agricultural supply chain and can help maintain a steady supply of high-quality ingredients while addressing some of the world's biggest environmental, social and economic challenges and opportunities. We believe regenerative agriculture works best when the farming or ranching operation is viewed as a living ecosystem.

Our approach seeks to drive adoption of regenerative agriculture principles – and measure environmental and economic outcomes – across five key areas: biodiversity, water management, soil health, cow & herd well-being, farmer livelihoods and community resilience

One example of the impact of regenerative agriculture is on water.  California is a key supply shed for General Mills for about 50 ingredients, including almonds. Our engagement on regenerative agriculture helps reduce negative agricultural impacts on water quality and quantity, helping protect and restore clean groundwater.

Our business has its greatest land exposure in row crop farming for things like wheat, oats, and corn as well as dairy.  It is in these farming systems within our supply shed areas that we believe we can have the largest impact on biodiversity by helping to advance regenerative agriculture. Improving biodiversity is a targeted outcome of our approach, with regenerative agriculture principles focused on improvements to the whole ecosystem, including animals, invertebrates, plants and microorganisms. We support grassland protection and regeneration across our major grain sourcing regions in the U.S. through our partnership with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) and also address tropical biodiversity through forest-positive strategies that support habitats and drive other targeted regenerative agriculture outcomes.

### Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Yes

**Description of the response(s)**

California is a key supply shed for General Mills for about 50 ingredients, including almonds. In California's Central Valley land conversion and water use practices have accelerated local climate change leading to reduced snowpack and increasingly intense wildfires and droughts. Higher temperatures are expected to increase pest pressure that attacks almonds. Our engagement on regenerative agriculture helps reduce negative agricultural impacts on water quality and quantity, helping protect and restore clean groundwater. In F21, our Larabar brand funded research by the Ecdysis Foundation on 7 farms to evaluate how regenerative practices on almond orchards link to outcomes, including water infiltration rates and soil water holding capacity. Preliminary research results indicate positive water results from regenerative approaches, for example a 6x faster water infiltration rate vs. conventionally managed soil, indicating potential for reduced irrigation intensity, improved groundwater recharge, and improved drought resilience. We are funding research by UC Davis on 6 farms to examine water balance on regenerative vs. conventional almond orchards. We have ongoing conversations with several almond suppliers to determine how best to collaborate to advance regenerative almonds. Success of our supply shed engagement is measured by year-on-year increase in farmers who are adopting regenerative agriculture associated with our funded programs. Through 2022 we have engaged 235,700 acres in programs designed to advance regenerative agriculture.  Measuring outcomes today is a significant undertaking, requiring time, manual field sampling, and expensive data analysis. We are leading the industry in developing robust scientific methodologies to monitor and study outcomes such as biodiversity associated with regenerative actions. We are using satellite imagery to track changes in agriculture practices implemented in key supply sheds such as reduced/no-till and regenerative principles like length of time with a living root in the soil, on the landscape over time and model the resulting impacts. We are developing more scalable approaches to monitoring biodiversity across farms, utilizing microphones for recording birds and light sensors to detect insects, and are investing in research to enable further build out of impact metrics related to biodiversity, water and resiliency.

# C15. Biodiversity

## C15.1

### (C15.1) Is there board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues within your organization?

| | Board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues |
|---|---|
| Row 1 | |

# C15.2

**(C15.2) Has your organization made a public commitment and/or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity?**

| | Indicate whether your organization made a public commitment or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity |
|---|---|
| Row 1 | |

# C15.3

**(C15.3) Does your organization assess the impacts and dependencies of its value chain on biodiversity?**

### Impacts on biodiversity

**Indicate whether your organization undertakes this type of assessment**

### Dependencies on biodiversity

**Indicate whether your organization undertakes this type of assessment**

# C15.4

**(C15.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to biodiversity-sensitive areas in the reporting year?**

# C15.5

**(C15.5) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?**

| | Have you taken any actions in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? |
|---|---|
| Row 1 | |

# C15.6

**(C15.6) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?**

| | Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance? | Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | | |

## C15.7

**(C15.7) Have you published information about your organization's response to biodiversity-related issues for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).**

| Report type | Content elements | Attach the document and indicate where in the document the relevant biodiversity information is located |
|---|---|---|

# C16. Signoff

## C-FI

**(C-FI) 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.**

## C16.1

**(C16.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.**

| | Job title | Corresponding job category |
|---|---|---|
| Row 1 | Chairman and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) | Chief Executive Officer (CEO) |

# SC. Supply chain module

## SC0.0

**(SC0.0) If you would like to do so, please provide a separate introduction to this module.**

## SC0.1

**(SC0.1) What is your company's annual revenue for the stated reporting period?**

| | Annual Revenue |
|---|---|
| Row 1 | 18,992,800,000 |

# SC1.1

**(SC1.1) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.**

**Requesting member**
Costco Wholesale Corporation

**Scope of emissions**
Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**
Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**
10,395

**Uncertainty (±%)**
15

**Major sources of emissions**
Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**
No

**Allocation method**
Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**
619,854,175

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**
Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**

Costco Wholesale Corporation

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

2,423

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

619,854,175

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

### Requesting member

Costco Wholesale Corporation

### Scope of emissions

Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

628,965

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products,

Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

619,854,175

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

---

**Requesting member**

PepsiCo, Inc.

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

32

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

2,219,142

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

**Requesting member**

PepsiCo, Inc.

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

7

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2,219,142

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

### Requesting member

PepsiCo, Inc.

### Scope of emissions

Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1,923

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2,219,142

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

### Requesting member

Target Corporation

### Scope of emissions

Scope 1

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

### Allocation level
Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e
8,933

### Uncertainty (±%)
15

### Major sources of emissions
Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

### Verified
No

### Allocation method
Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member
533,558,407

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied
Currency

### Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

### Requesting member
Target Corporation

### Scope of emissions
Scope 2

### Scope 2 accounting method
Market-based

### Scope 3 category(ies)

### Allocation level
Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e
2,082

### Uncertainty (±%)
15

### Major sources of emissions
Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

### Verified
No

### Allocation method
Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member
533,558,407

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied
Currency

### Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

### Requesting member
Target Corporation

### Scope of emissions
Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

540,587

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

533,558,407

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

**Requesting member**

CVS Health

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

413

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

24,848,379

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**

CVS Health

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

96

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

24,848,379

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2, Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

### Requesting member

CVS Health

### Scope of emissions

Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

25,005

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products,

Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

24,848,379

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2020 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

---

**Requesting member**

UNFI

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

7,121

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

426,379,427

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

**Requesting member**

UNFI

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

1,660

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

426,379,427

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 - Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

### Requesting member

UNFI

### Scope of emissions

Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

430,851

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

426,379,427

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

### Requesting member

Empire Company Limited (Sobeys)

### Scope of emissions

Scope 1

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

### Allocation level
Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e
3,592

### Uncertainty (±%)
15

### Major sources of emissions
Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

### Verified
No

### Allocation method
Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member
215,215,131

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied
Currency

### Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

### Requesting member
Empire Company Limited (Sobeys)

### Scope of emissions
Scope 2

### Scope 2 accounting method
Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

837

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

215,215,131

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 - Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**

Empire Company Limited (Sobeys)

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 3

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

217,349

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

215,215,131

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

**Requesting member**

Walmart, Inc.

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

67,681

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

4,043,524,617

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**

Walmart, Inc.

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

15,776

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

4,043,524,617

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 - Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

### Requesting member

Walmart, Inc.

### Scope of emissions

Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4,095,004

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products,

Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

4,043,524,617

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

---

**Requesting member**

Wal Mart de Mexico

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

286

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

17,211,587

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**

Wal Mart de Mexico

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

67

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

17,211,587

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 - Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

### Requesting member

Wal Mart de Mexico

### Scope of emissions

Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

17,311

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

17,211,587

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

### Requesting member

Ahold Delhaize

### Scope of emissions

Scope 1

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

### Allocation level
Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e
6,930

### Uncertainty (±%)
15

### Major sources of emissions
Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

### Verified
No

### Allocation method
Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member
413,458,783

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied
Currency

### Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

### Requesting member
Ahold Delhaize

### Scope of emissions
Scope 2

### Scope 2 accounting method
Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**
Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**
1,615

**Uncertainty (±%)**
15

**Major sources of emissions**
Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

**Verified**
No

**Allocation method**
Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**
413,458,783

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**
Currency

**Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made**
Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 - Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**
Ahold Delhaize

**Scope of emissions**
Scope 3

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

419,310

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

413,458,783

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

**Requesting member**

Sigma Foods

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

95

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

6,248,964

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**

Sigma Foods

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

22

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

6,248,964

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

### Requesting member

Sigma Foods

### Scope of emissions

Scope 3

### Scope 2 accounting method

### Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

### Allocation level

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5,770

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products,

Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

6,248,964

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

---

**Requesting member**

Accor

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 1

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

64

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

4,142,400

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

**Requesting member**

Accor

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 2

**Scope 2 accounting method**

Market-based

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

**Allocation level**

Company wide

**Allocation level detail**

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

15

**Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**Major sources of emissions**

Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing

**Verified**

No

**Allocation method**

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

**Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

4,142,400

**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Currency

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.

---

**Requesting member**

Accor

**Scope of emissions**

Scope 3

**Scope 2 accounting method**

**Scope 3 category(ies)**

Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 2: Capital goods
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 5: Waste generated in operations
Category 6: Business travel
Category 7: Employee commuting
Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
Category 10: Processing of sold products
Category 11: Use of sold products
Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
Category 14: Franchises

**Allocation level**

Company wide

### Allocation level detail

### Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3,847

### Uncertainty (±%)

30

### Major sources of emissions

Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Upstream leased assets, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, Use of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Downstream leased assets, Franchises, and Other (upstream).

### Verified

No

### Allocation method

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4,142,400

### Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Currency

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

Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2022 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.6. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.

## SC1.2

**(SC1.2) Where published information has been used in completing SC1.1, please provide a reference(s).**

## SC1.3

**(SC1.3) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?**

| Allocation challenges | Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges |
|---|---|
| Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective | Carbon intensity varies by product and we do not track emissions by product, only by plant |
| Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level | We allocate by % sales to a particular customer rather than actual emissions associated with those specific products sold to that customer. |

## SC1.4

**(SC1.4) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?**

## SC2.1

**(SC2.1) Please propose any mutually beneficial climate-related projects you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.**

## SC2.2

**(SC2.2) Have requests or initiatives by CDP Supply Chain members prompted your organization to take organizational-level emissions reduction initiatives?**

## SC4.1

**(SC4.1) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?**

# Submit your response

**In which language are you submitting your response?**

English

**Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP**

| | I understand that my response will be shared with all requesting stakeholders | Response permission |
|---|---|---|
| Please select your submission options | Yes | Public |

**Please confirm below**

I have read and accept the applicable Terms