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

At Mondelēz International (MDLZ), our purpose is to empower people to snack right by delivering the right snack, at the right moment, made the right way. That means delivering a broader range of delicious, high-quality snacks that nourish life's moments, made with sustainable ingredients and packaging that consumers can feel good about.

With global net revenues of $26.6 billion in 2020, we are leading the future of snacking with our iconic global and local brands such as Oreo, belVita and LU biscuits; Cadbury Dairy Milk, Milka and Toblerone chocolate; Sour Patch Kids candy and Trident gum. Our snacks are enjoyed by consumers in over 150 countries, and we have operations in more than 80 countries, with close to 80,000 employees in our factories, offices, research & development facilities and distribution activities around the world. Our business operates in 4 regions, with Europe and North America representing the largest share of 2020 net revenue.

Guided by our purpose, we are forging ahead in our own distinctive way to make snacking right for everyone. We’re focused on making our snacks more sustainable by using less energy and water and creating less waste, while using ingredients consumers know and trust. We have specific, time-bound goals to which we hold ourselves accountable and we’re continuing to make progress and scale our efforts to deliver meaningful change. As a global company, Mondelēz International aims to lead where we matter most, and drive change where the world needs it most, ultimately creating a future where people and planet thrive. Our sustainability goals focus on reducing key end-to-end environmental impacts. In 2020 we released new public, ambitious goals to achieve by 2025:

- Scaling our Cocoa Life sustainability program so that Cocoa Life will produce 100% of the cocoa volume we require for our chocolate brands
- Scaling human rights due diligence to 100% of Cocoa Life communities in West Africa
- Scaling Harmony Wheat to source 100% wheat for biscuits in Europe (by 2022)
- Achieving 100% traceable forest-monitored palm oil and continued 100% RSPO certified
- Setting science-based targets to reduce end-to-end CO2 emissions by 10%, with a focus on protecting and restoring forests
- Reducing 10% of water usage in priority areas where water is most scarce
- Reducing 15% of food waste in manufacturing and 50% from distribution
- Advancing packaging innovation and tackling plastic waste with 100% of packaging designed to be recyclable and labelled with recycling information, and 5% reduction in overall virgin plastic & 25% reduction in virgin rigid plastic over 2020 base
- Including portion amounts and mindful snacking information on all packages globally
- Invest in innovative Sustainable Futures impact investment ventures and funds

We work together in collaboration with partners, external advisors, regulators and stakeholders, to focus on maximizing our long-term positive impact. Every year, external experts update our enterprise wide carbon footprint that enables us to track and report our emissions and identify carbon hot spots that help shape our priorities and goals. We are committed to transparent reporting of our impact and progress against our goals, which we publish in our annual Snacking Made Right report.

Forward-Looking Statements

This CDP submission contains forward-looking statements. Words, and variations of words, such as “will,” “expect,” “anticipate,” ”estimate” and similar expressions are intended to identify these forward-looking statements, including, but not limited to, statements about climate-related risks and opportunities. These forward-looking statements are subject to a number of risks and uncertainties, many of which are beyond Mondelēz International’s control, which could cause Mondelēz International’s actual results to differ materially from those indicated in these forward-looking statements. Please see Mondelēz International’s risk factors, as they may be amended from time to time, set forth in its filings with the SEC, including its most recently filed Annual Report on Form 10-K and Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. Mondelēz International disclaims and does not undertake any obligation to update or revise any forward-looking statement in this submission, except as required by applicable law or regulation.

C0.2

(C0.2) State the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting year</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>End date</th>
<th>Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years</th>
<th>Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2020</td>
<td>December 31, 2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C0.3
(C0.3) Select the countries/areas for which you will be supplying data.

Argentina
Australia
Austria
Bahrain
Belgium
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Brazil
Bulgaria
Canada
Chile
China
China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
Colombia
Costa Rica
Croatia
Czechia
Denmark
Ecuador
Egypt
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Ghana
Greece
Honduras
Hungary
India
Indonesia
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Japan
Kazakhstan
Lebanon
Lithuania
Malaysia
Mexico
Morocco
Netherlands
Nicaragua
Nigeria
Norway
Pakistan
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Puerto Rico
Romania
Russian Federation
Saudi Arabia
Serbia
Singapore
Slovakia
Slovenia
South Africa
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Taiwan, Greater China
Thailand
Turkey
Ukraine
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Uruguay
Viet Nam

(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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in the value chain only [Agriculture/Forestry/processing/manufacturing/distribution only]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing/Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct operations only [Processing/manufacturing/distribution only]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both direct operations and elsewhere in the value chain [Processing/manufacturing/distribution only]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes [Consumption only]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
We do not own or manage land, though we do work directly with farmers through our Cocoa Life, Harmony, and other agricultural initiatives. We consider agricultural emissions in our climate disclosure and report emissions from land use change (including deforestation) related to agriculture. Since 2009, we (and our predecessor company) have performed a lifecycle assessment of the air, water, and land impacts of our operations, from farm through consumption and disposal. Agriculture is by far the largest impact on air, water, and land, which is why we invest in sustainable agriculture.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural commodity</th>
<th>% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity</th>
<th>Produced or sourced</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>Sourced</td>
<td>The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one product category as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>More than 80%</td>
<td>Sourced</td>
<td>The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one or more of our product categories as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify (Cocoa and cocoa products)</td>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>Sourced</td>
<td>The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one or more of our product categories as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Oil</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>Sourced</td>
<td>The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one or more of our product categories as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1. Governance

C1.1

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of individual(s)</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
<td>Our CEO, who is also the Chairman of the Board of Directors (the Board), reviews and gives final signoff on our Snacking Made Right Impact Strategy. In 2020, the CEO approved our 2025 public commitments in sustainable snacking, including our commitment to reduce deforestation through sourcing 100% of the cocoa volume for our chocolate brands sustainably through our Cocoa Life program, a 10% reduction of end to end emissions, and a 10% absolute reduction in water at priority manufacturing sites. As head of the Mondelēz International Leadership Team (MLT), our executive committee, the CEO approves sustainability strategy, programming and required budget proposed by our VP and Chief of Global Impact (our CSO) as part of our strategic planning process. The CEO approves key performance indicators and has direct responsibility for the company's delivery on these commitments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency with which climate-related issues are scheduled for board-level oversight</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td>The Governance Committee is responsible for overseeing sustainability as part of our Snacking Made Right impact strategy and receives regular briefings from our CSO. Its members are directly responsible for overseeing environmental &amp; social sustainability, including climate change, circular packaging solutions and social impact. This oversight covers critical sustainability policies, programming, strategy development &amp; progress on related key performance indicators. Our ERM process includes consideration of climate change risks, which in turn incorporates deforestation-related risks. It is ongoing &amp; implemented at all levels of our operations &amp; across business units to identify, assess, monitor, manage and mitigate risk. It also facilitates open communication between management and the Board, so that the Board &amp; committees understand key risks to our business and performance, and the functioning of our risk management process, including who participates in the process and the information gathered in the assessment. Annually, the Audit Committee reviews and approves management’s recommendation for allocating to the full Board or another committee, or retaining for itself, responsibility for reviewing and assessing key risk exposures and management's response to those exposures. Management presents and provides reports to the Board or the appropriate committee on key risks &amp; the actions management has taken to monitor, control and mitigate these risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)</th>
<th>Reporting line</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Coverage of responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Half-yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other C-Suite Officer, please specify (Executive Vice President, General Counsel, Corporate &amp; Legal Affairs)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Other, please specify (Oversees climate-related risks and opportunities)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Half-yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Half-yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other C-Suite Officer, please specify (Executive Vice President &amp; Chief Supply Chain Officer)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Half-yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability committee</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Managing climate-related risks and opportunities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Half-yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Half-yearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C1.2a) Describe where in the organizational structure this/these position(s) and/or committees lie, what their associated responsibilities are, and how climate-related issues are monitored (do not include the names of individuals).

**Chief Executive Officer (CEO)**

Our CEO, who is also the Chairman of the Board, reviews and gives final signoff on our Snacking Made Right impact strategy, covering social and environmental responsibility.

In 2020, our CEO approved our 2025 public commitments in sustainable snacking, including our commitment to reduce deforestation through sourcing 100% of the cocoa volume for our chocolate brands sustainably through our Cocoa Life program, a 10% reduction of end to end emissions, and a 10% absolute reduction in water at priority manufacturing sites. As head of the MLT, our executive committee, the CEO approves sustainability strategy, programming and required budget proposed by the CSO as part of our strategic planning process. The CEO approves key performance indicators and has direct responsibility for the company’s delivery on these commitments.

**Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)**

Our CSO chairs a cross-functional Impact Steering Committee (ISC) with members from our key global functions and regions to manage our sustainability strategy. Our CSO regularly reports on sustainability to our CEO quarterly and to the Board Governance Committee. In partnership with a team of Senior Directors who act as subject matter experts on sustainable ingredients, environmental impact, sustainable packaging and social sustainability, the CSO leads the strategy development process and oversees the strategy through to implementation. In addition to setting our strategic roadmap for meeting our 2025 commitments, the CSO is responsible for the long-term sustainability vision for the company. The CSO oversaw the process of setting and validating our SBTi to reduce our end-to-end emissions 10% by 2025.

**Executive Vice President, Corporate & Legal Affairs and General Counsel**

Our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs is the executive sponsor of the Sustainability Committee. Mondelēz International’s cross-functional committee, chaired by our CSO with members from our key global functions and regions. As the executive sponsor, our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs meets more than quarterly with the committee to review progress and to align on key developments in the sustainability strategy including our carbon action plan and programming around water, waste and sustainable ingredients. Our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs is also part of the Mondelēz International Leadership Team (MLT) and has responsibility for the oversight of sustainability at the executive leadership level along with the CEO. In partnership with other MLT members, our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs approved the proposed 2025 commitments.

**Executive Vice President & Chief Supply Chain Officer**

Our Chief Supply Chain Officer (CSCO) sits on the Mondelēz International Leadership Team, which directly reviews and approves strategy, programming and the required budget proposed by the CSO as part of our strategic planning process. The CSCO oversees procurement, manufacturing and logistics and therefore reviews the forests-related agenda and helps deliver the KPIs for each of these areas in partnership with the business units.

**Sustainability Committee**

Our sustainability strategy is managed by a cross-functional sustainability committee, which is chaired by our CSO and includes members from our key global functions and regions. The committee meets more than quarterly to review progress and to align on key developments in the sustainability strategy. Executive sponsorship is provided by our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs, and our EVP and President, Europe. In addition to providing strategic guidance, members of the sustainability committee help to address challenges and provide resources for sustainability integration across the business.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C1.3a)
(C2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities?

Yes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time horizon</th>
<th>From (years)</th>
<th>To (years)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our short-term climate-related and financial goals are aligned (i.e., both look to one year ahead). Our programs related to climate change look at yearly goals to address longer-term issues. For finances, we also consider up to one year to be a short-term issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>For medium-term, our climate-related and financial reviews are different. The numbers provided here for the time horizon are for climate-related issues. For climate-related issues, we currently consider medium-term risks/opportunities to be those that may arise between one to six years ahead. This aligns with our 2025 goals, which address longer-term climate-related issues. For financial issues, we consider medium-term risks/opportunities to be those that may arise between one to three years ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>For long-term, our climate-related and financial reviews are different. The numbers provided here for the time horizon are for climate-related issues. For climate-related issues, we consider potential effects to thirty years and beyond. As an example, our goal to reduce CO2 in manufacturing aligns with current approaches to setting science-based targets to support the global effort to limit climate change to well below 2°C, which take a long-term approach. For finances, as a general matter, our long-term horizon is three to ten years, depending on the issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entitled to incentive</th>
<th>Type of incentive</th>
<th>Activity incentivized</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
<td>Monetary reward</td>
<td>Supply chain engagement</td>
<td>The Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Mondelēz International designs our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) to motivate our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) to achieve or exceed our annual financial and strategic goals. Our AIP includes a set of metrics – weighted at 20% – that measure progress against key strategic initiatives and are directly linked to the three pillars of our business strategy: growth, execution, and culture. Within the execution pillar, two key performance indicators relate to sustainability. The first measures our progress towards sourcing 100% of cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life by 2025. The second relates to the percentage of our packaging designed to be recycle-ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate executive team</td>
<td>Monetary reward</td>
<td>Supply chain engagement Other (please specify) (Sustainable packaging)</td>
<td>The Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Mondelēz International designs our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) to motivate our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) to achieve or exceed our annual financial and strategic goals. Our AIP includes a set of metrics – weighted at 20% – that measure progress against key strategic initiatives and are directly linked to the three pillars of our business strategy: growth, execution, and culture. Within the execution pillar, two key performance indicators relate to sustainability. The first measures our progress towards sourcing 100% of cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life by 2025. The second relates to the percentage of our packaging designed to be recycle-ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All employees</td>
<td>Non-monetary reward</td>
<td>Emissions reduction project Energy reduction project Environmental criteria included in purchases Supply chain engagement</td>
<td>For non-monetary: Each business unit has sustainability on their strategic plan and is held accountable. Therefore, incentives come in the form of internal recognition (publicly recognized by the CEO or highlighted with the Board, etc.) and external recognition (press releases, customers, etc.), which can drive incremental business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate executive team</td>
<td>Non-monetary reward</td>
<td>Other (please specify) (achievement of commitments and targets)</td>
<td>Our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) are expected to lead the business to meet our sustainability goals, including reducing our energy usage, water consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and waste generation as well as increasing our sustainable sourcing practices and design of recycle-ready packaging. To this end, our executive team get positive ratings and rankings in addition to positive investor feedback. Therefore, incentives come in the form of internal recognition (publicly recognized by the CEO or highlighted with the Board, etc.) and external recognition (press releases, customers, etc.), which can drive incremental business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)</td>
<td>Monetary reward</td>
<td>Supply chain engagement Other (please specify) (Sustainable packaging)</td>
<td>The Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Mondelēz International designs our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) to motivate our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) to achieve or exceed our annual financial and strategic goals. Our AIP includes a set of metrics – weighted at 20% – that measure progress against key strategic initiatives and are directly linked to the three pillars of our business strategy: growth, execution, and culture. Within the execution pillar, two key performance indicators relate to sustainability. The first measures our progress towards sourcing 100% of cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life by 2025. The second relates to the percentage of our packaging designed to be recycle-ready.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C2.2) Describe your process(es) for identifying, assessing and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities.

We consider impact to be substantive if it is of an equivalent magnitude to criteria used to assess risks in our Enterprise Risk Management framework at the level of “major” or above. We use the following criteria to define major impact in any given year:

1. Financial: operating income changed by 1 percent or more.

2. Reputational: major brand impact less than a year, due to negative national media, public, social media or political attention. Requires global or region team to manage partner relationships and public image.

3. Legal (risk only): violation of law potentially leading to serious sanctions and/or fines/penalties

4. Operational: major operational failure - business impacted for days: people, process and/or technology.

This definition applies to both direct operations and supply chain.

(C2.2b) How does your organization define substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

- Financial: operating income changed by 1 percent or more.
- Reputational: major brand impact less than a year, due to negative national media, public, social media or political attention. Requires global or region team to manage partner relationships and public image.
- Legal (risk only): violation of law potentially leading to serious sanctions and/or fines/penalties
- Operational: major operational failure - business impacted for days: people, process and/or technology.

Value chain stage(s) covered

- Direct operations
- Upstream
- Downstream

Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment

Annual

Time horizon(s) covered

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

Description of process

Our business faces various risks, including strategic, financial, operational and compliance risks. Identifying, managing and mitigating our exposure to these risks, along with effective oversight of such matters, are activities critical to our operational decision-making and annual planning processes. Management is responsible for the day-to-day assessment, management and mitigation of risk. The Board has ultimate responsibility for risk oversight, but it has delegated primary responsibility for overseeing risk assessment and management to the Audit Committee. Pursuant to its charter, the Audit Committee annually reviews and discusses our enterprise risk management (“ERM”) process, and global and business unit assessment and risk mitigation results. Our ERM process is ongoing and implemented at all levels of our operations and across business units to identify, assess, monitor, manage and mitigate risk. Our ERM process facilitates open communication between management and the Board, so that the Board and committees understand key risks to our business and performance, and the functioning of our risk management process, including who participates in the process and the information gathered in the assessment. Annually, the Audit Committee reviews and approves management’s recommendation for allocating to the full Board or another committee, or retaining for itself, responsibility for reviewing and assessing key risk exposures and management’s response to those exposures.

Management provides reports to the Board or the appropriate committee on key risks and the actions management has taken to monitor, control and mitigate these risks. Management also attends Board and committee meetings to discuss these reports and provide any updates. The committees report key risk discussions to the Board following their meetings. Board members may also further discuss the risk management process directly with members of management. While the Board oversees risk management, the ERM process is overseen by the Risk and Compliance Committee (MRCC). The executive sponsors of the MRCC are the EVP and Chief Financial Officer, and the EVP and General Counsel. MRCC oversees the ERM process to identifies, assesses and mitigates and monitors key risks to the company. Ownership of specific risks is assigned at the Leadership Team (MLT) level (MLT members report directly to the CEO). The risk universe considered during this process is wide and varied (including environmental and social sustainability) and considers external emerging trends, strategic and operational priorities over the next 3 years horizon. ERM methodology includes periodic risk register refresh, annual reviews with all business units, leveraging a risk mapping process that considers risk impact, (financial/ reputational/legal/operational), velocity, likelihood and preparedness. Based on the specific risk drivers, we develop our risk response strategies, which can be either mitigation (action plans), transfer (insurance), avoidance, or acceptance. We have identified a specific risk pertaining to Environment and Social Sustainability (ESS). Our sustainability-related risk assessment is guided by our ERM process; analysis of stakeholder and regulatory issues; our total greenhouse gas, land use, and water footprint; proprietary consumer insight data; and publicly available data on societal issues, including statistics and reports from authorities, non-governmental organizations, and peer companies. The following industry challenges related to climate change, sustainability, and wellbeing are captured in the ERM framework and ESS risk analysis:

- Increasing investor and stakeholder expectations for risk mitigation
- New government regulations and/or taxes & tariffs (sugar tax/obesity tax)
- Changes in consumer preferences and expectations
- Manufacturing, marketing, labor, and supply chain practices
- Increasing investor and stakeholder expectations for risk mitigation

Relevant risks that could materially affect our business and financial results are disclosed in the Annual Report on Form 10-K and included in section C2.3a below.
conditions, currency fluctuations and the effects of governmental agricultural or other programs affect the cost and availability of raw materials and agricultural materials used in our products. We address higher commodity costs and currency impacts primarily through hedging, higher pricing and manufacturing and overhead cost control. We use hedging techniques to limit the impact of fluctuations in the cost of our principal raw materials; however, we may not be able to fully hedge against commodity cost changes . . . and our hedging strategies may not protect us from increases in specific raw material costs. . . . [We] continue to monitor the long-term impacts of climate change and related factors that could affect the availability or cost of raw materials, packaging and energy.” We use various multi-dimensional tools and models throughout the company to support the identification of risks to facilitate timely and effective risk for our agricultural commodity supply chains. This includes on and off-site compliance monitoring, data analytics, and trend analysis for key commodities. For example, several current cocoa growing areas are at acute physical risk of becoming unproductive over the long term due to climate change. This affects several countries and regions globally. To identify these risks, we rely on in-depth assessments performed by international research organizations, such as International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT). Through supplier evaluations within our Cocoa Life program, farmers and partners increasingly cite ‘weather-related events’ as a leading cause for declining cocoa yield and declining viability of local farming businesses. Our sustainable agriculture programs, like Cocoa Life, help us respond to climate-related risks by promoting resiliency and climate adaptation through improved farming practices and natural resource conservation. Through this programming, we also engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives, such as the Cocoa & Forest Initiative, which formulates an aligned sector and government response to increase local forest coverage and adopt good environmental growing practices.

Value chain stage(s) covered
Direct operations

Risk management process
Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment
Annually

Time horizon(s) covered
Short-term
Medium-term

Description of process
At the asset level, we do business continuity planning for a variety of business matters. We have a business plan to react to disruptions caused by a given crisis, including potential facility interruptions, key sourcing interruptions and system interruptions. In addition we use insurance to protect our financial interest and to provide financial resource to support the extra expense associated with executing our business continuity plans where possible. We operate a Global Environment & Safety (E&S) Standards and Management System that involves crisis preparedness & risk management. At the asset level, facilities worldwide are required to assess E&S risks including asset-level risks and facility-level risks and implement these standards to address those risks. We use various multi-dimensional tools and models throughout the company to support the identification of risks to facilitate timely and effective risk management. All plants actively improve and/or maintain their property/asset protection (against fire, flood, wind and earthquake losses to their property) to protect the company from loss, focusing capital dollars on the plants with the highest impact. This helps to address potential physical risk associated with extreme weather due to climate change. To address transition risk, we monitor current and emerging regulations around carbon pricing schemes, such as the EU Emissions Trading System(ETS), to understand how this could impact our owned manufacturing facilities. We forecast site emissions through estimated future emissions based on the previous year, production during the new year, and site-specific trends. Our teams seek to introduce emissions reducing practices, such as renewable energy and energy efficiency projects at facilities covered under the EU ETS to reduce the number of required allowances and to reduce our emissions overall. For example, in 2020 one of our facilities in Ireland changed from heavy fuel oil to liquified natural gas in an effort to reduce emissions and allowances required for the facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance &amp; inclusion</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current regulation</td>
<td>Relevant, always included. We monitor current regulations and compliance with them as they directly and indirectly relate to climate risks. This is done at multiple levels, within a business unit and within the legal function. Identified risks are elevated within management appropriately and are part of our enterprise risk management (ERM) process. Examples would include regulation on carbon pricing or emissions trading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging regulation</td>
<td>Relevant, always included. We monitor emerging regulations as they directly and indirectly relate to climate risks. This is done at multiple levels, within a business unit and within the legal function. Identified risks are elevated within management appropriately and are part of our ERM process. Examples would include regulation on carbon pricing or emissions trading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Relevant, sometimes included. As opportunities arise, we review new technologies that may reduce our CO2 emissions and energy use to meet our corporate sustainability goals. An example is the use of satellite monitoring of deforestation in our cocoa and palm supply chains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Relevant, always included. We address legal compliance risk in our risk assessment. For example, in our 2020 10-K Annual Report (at page 20 of the document), we state: “Concern about climate change might result in new legal and regulatory requirements to reduce or mitigate the effects of climate change. These changes could increase our operating costs for things like energy or packaging through taxes or regulations, including payments under extended producer responsibility policies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Relevant, always included. We address market issues through a variety of ways, including through our sustainable agriculture programs, direct sourcing criteria, and commodity hedging. Risks considered include: environmental risks or controversies across our supply chain that could damage our reputation and brand image, such as deforestation in the palm oil sector. We manage it by our raw material sourcing programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Relevant, always included. We consider reputational risks associated with climate change during our ERM process. These risks are managed, ultimately, by the Governance Committee, which receives regular updates from our Chief Well-being, Sustainability, Public and Government Affairs Officer. Risks considered include: environmental risks or controversies across our supply chain that could damage our reputation and brand image, such as deforestation in the palm oil sector. We manage it by our raw material sourcing programs. We acknowledge the reputational risks related to environmental risk in our Form 10-K filed in 2020 (e.g., page 11-12 – reputation and brand image).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute physical</td>
<td>Relevant, always included. As acknowledged in our Form 10-K, we have identified the risk that severe weather may cause unanticipated business disruptions. At the asset level, we do business continuity planning for a variety of business matters. We have a business plan to react to disruptions caused by a given crisis, including potential facility interruptions. At the corporate level, we manage global reputational risks related to issues raised by continuity planning. An example would be the impact of hurricanes or severe storms on factory and distribution operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic physical</td>
<td>Relevant, always included. As acknowledged in our Form 10-K, we have identified the risk that severe weather and climate change-related events can affect commodity pricing and supply. At the asset level, we do business continuity planning for a variety of business matters. We have a business plan to react to disruptions caused by a given crisis, including key sourcing interruptions. At the corporate level, we manage global reputational risks related to issues raised by continuity planning and raw material sourcing programs. An example would be the impact of climate change on the availability of raw materials such as cocoa sourced from climate-sensitive regions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(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) Provide details of risks identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Risk 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Direct operations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Risk 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Emerging regulation**

**Carbon pricing mechanisms**

**Primary potential financial impact**

Increased indirect (operating) costs

**Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification**

<Not Applicable>

**Company-specific description**

Increased cost to generate and purchase energy due to fuel/energy taxes and regulations.

**Time horizon**

Medium-term

**Likelihood**

Likely

**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)**

100,000,000

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

We are directly impacted by fuel taxes for energy we buy in our direct operations, which contributes to our Scope 1 and 2 carbon footprint. In addition, we would be indirectly impacted by energy and carbon taxes applied elsewhere in our supply chain by increased costs from suppliers. Analysis of likely carbon pricing scenarios indicates a potential annual impact of $100 million on energy costs in our operations, assuming no change in the energy efficiency or proportion of renewable energy consumed. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

**Cost of response to risk**

40,000,000

**Description of response and explanation of cost calculation**

Our sustainability strategy and our targets to reduce energy consumption and CO2 emission in our operations constitute a concrete approach to mitigating these risks by anticipating regulatory requirements. This includes improving energy management systems and investing in energy efficient technologies in our factories at an estimated capital cost of $40 million over the period 2018-2025. In 2020, we succeeded in improving our overall energy efficiency by 9% over the 2013 baseline, leading to a total 117,000 tons reduction in CO2 emissions in our manufacturing plants. We are also using low-carbon renewable energy sources to reduce our CO2 emissions and anticipate this to be cost-neutral.

**Comment**

In disclosing these risks in C2.3a, we are not specifying that they are among the highest climate-related substantive risks or that the disclosed risks are the only substantive climate-related risks. Climate change is a real risk to our consumers, our business, our economy, and the planet at large. That's why we have set science-based targets to reduce our carbon footprint across our value chain – from farms growing our ingredients to the packaging around our products. We have set a target to reduce absolute end-to-end greenhouse gas emissions by 10% by 2025, compared to a 2013 baseline. This is in line with reductions in emissions necessary to keep global warming well below 2 degrees Celsius, as defined by the Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) guidelines and in line with the Paris Agreement, and an important milestone in our work towards creating a sustainable future for snacking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Risk 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Upstream

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Risk 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Chronic physical**

**Changes in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather patterns**

**Primary potential financial impact**

Increased direct costs
Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
As stated in our 2020 10-K Annual Report at page 20 of the document: "Scientific evidence collected by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change demonstrates that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere have caused and will in the future cause changes in weather patterns around the globe. These changes are expected to increase the frequency of extreme weather events and natural disasters and affect water availability and quality. These impacts increase risks for the global food production and distribution system. Decreased agricultural productivity caused by climate change might limit the availability of the commodities we purchase and use. These include cocoa, which is a critical raw material for our chocolate and biscuit portfolios that is particularly sensitive to changes in climate, as well as other raw materials such as wheat, vegetable oils, sugar, nuts and dairy." As stated in our annual report, a number of external factors such as changing weather patterns and conditions, commodity market conditions, currency fluctuations and the effects of governmental agricultural or other programs affect the cost and availability of raw materials and agricultural materials used in our products. We address higher commodity costs and currency impacts primarily through hedging, higher pricing and manufacturing and overhead cost control. We use hedging techniques to limit the impact of fluctuations in the cost of our principal raw materials; however, we may not be able to fully hedge against commodity cost changes, and our hedging strategies may not protect us from increases in specific raw material costs. We continue to monitor the long-term impacts of climate change and related factors that could affect the availability or cost of raw materials, packaging and energy. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

Time horizon
Long-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)
100000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
As stated in our 10-K, while we have not experienced this yet, based on realistic swings in commodity costs of some of our raw materials considered most vulnerable to climate change, we estimate a high potential impact on our cost of goods in an extreme scenario, such as prolonged adverse weather conditions affecting multiple production regions. We consider this extreme scenario to be unlikely so we have based our estimate on the potential impact of one or more significant commodities being impacted in the longer term (more than 6 years), which we consider more likely than not. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

Cost of response to risk
60000000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
Transforming our agricultural supply chains is an essential foundation for a sustainable future. We've launched innovative, industry-leading holistic programs in key commodities like cocoa and wheat. Cocoa Life a multi-year investment to empower more than 200,000 farmers and improve the lives of more than 1 million people. Harmony, our European wheat program, promotes biodiversity and good environmental practices in wheat production. Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers’ accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party supplies. Our cost of management is calculated according to our annual investment in our sustainable sourcing raw material programs in the of $60 million.

Comment

Identifier
Risk 3

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

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver
Market
Other, please specify (Changing consumer behavior)

Primary potential financial impact
Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
As stated in our 10-K Annual Report we have identified shifting consumer preferences as a strategic and operational risk. "Negative perceptions concerning the health, environmental and social implications of certain food products, ingredients, packaging materials, sourcing or production methods could influence consumer preferences and acceptance of some of our products and marketing programs." We also stated on page 20 of the document: "Concern about climate change might cause consumer preferences to switch away from products or ingredients considered to have high climate change impact. . . Finally, the fact that consumers are exposed to rising temperatures could affect demand for our products, such as decreased demand we have experienced for chocolate during periods when temperatures are warmer." In 2020 we identified increasing awareness of consumers of packaging-related climate impacts in key markets as a risk.

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)**
50000000

**Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**
As indicated in our 2020 10-K Annual Report (at page 16 of the document), maintaining focus on sustainable ingredient sourcing and sustainable packaging to address evolving consumer preferences is important to our growth, and failure to satisfy consumer preferences could materially and adversely affect our reputation, brands, product sales, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. A potential financial impact from this risk would come from a decrease in revenue due to a decline in our chocolate and biscuit categories where we know through consumer insights that sustainable ingredients and packaging are top sustainability concerns. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

**Cost of response to risk**
90000000

**Description of response and explanation of cost calculation**
Transforming our agricultural supply chains is an essential foundation for a sustainable future. We've launched innovative, industry-leading holistic programs in key commodities like cocoa and wheat. Cocoa Life a multi-year investment to empower more than 200,000 farmers and improve the lives of more than 1 million people. Harmony, our European wheat program, promotes biodiversity and good environmental practices in wheat production. Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers' accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party supplies. We are on a sustainable packaging journey to make all packaging recyclable by 2025, have 5% recycled content in our plastic packaging by 2025 and include recycling labeling on all packs by 2025. The challenge around plastics involves process, policy and perception. We take a holistic approach to sustainable packaging by also focusing on improvements in infrastructure and technology to collect and recycle plastics. The company currently invests over $30 million a year in technology, resources and recycling infrastructure and anticipates an acceleration in this investment over time. In total, between 2019 and 2025, Mondelēz International anticipates spending approximately $300 million in creating a sustainable future for plastics. Our cost of management is calculated according to our annual investment in our sustainable sourcing raw material and sustainable packaging efforts of approximately $90 million.

**Comment**

---

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

**Identifier**
Oppl

**Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?**
Upstream

**Opportunity type**
Resilience

**Primary climate-related opportunity driver**
Other, please specify (Increased reliability, climate-resilience of raw material supply chain)

**Primary potential financial impact**
Reduced direct costs

**Company-specific description**
In ingredient sourcing, we continue to leverage our global operating scale to secure sustainable raw materials and work with suppliers to drive meaningful social and environmental changes, focusing where we can make the greatest impact. For example, we launched our Cocoa Life program in 2012 and are investing up to $400 million through 2022 to build a sustainable cocoa supply. We are also improving sustainability in our wheat supply by working with farmers in North America and through our Harmony program in Europe. Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers’ accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party supplies. By implementing these sustainable agriculture programs, we help our supply chains to mitigate their emissions and to become more resilient to the effects of climate change, leading to more stable and secure supplies of key raw materials. For example, we source the majority of our cocoa from West Africa, where there is significant opportunity to improve farmers’ productivity and climate change resilience via our Cocoa Life program. In addition, we encourage more sustainable and climate resilient production of wheat through our Harmony and North American wheat sustainability programs and palm oil through our Palm Oil Action Plan.

**Time horizon**
Long-term

**Likelihood**
Likely

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

No, we do not have this figure

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
We anticipate that more sustainable and climate-resilient supplies of key raw materials will increase the security of supply and help to reduce exposure to fluctuations in availability and price volatility. The potential financial impact of this opportunity could not be estimated at this time.

Cost to realize opportunity
60000000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation
Transforming our agricultural supply chains is an essential foundation for a sustainable future. We’ve launched innovative, industry-leading holistic programs in key commodities like cocoa and wheat. Cocoa Life a multi-year investment to empower more than 200,000 farmers and improve the lives of more than 1 million people. Harmony, our European wheat program, promotes biodiversity and good environmental practices in wheat production. Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers’ accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party supplies. Our cost of management is calculated according to our annual investment in our sustainable sourcing raw material programs in the of $60 million.

Comment
In disclosing these opportunities in C2.4a, we are not specifying that they are among the highest climate-related substantive opportunities or that the disclosed opportunities are the only substantive climate-related opportunities.

---

Identifier
Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?
Direct operations

Opportunity type
Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver
Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Primary potential financial impact
Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description
We use significant energy in our factories to manufacture our products. Increased energy efficiency in our factories enables us to use less energy and therefore save costs per ton of production. For example, in our factories across the world we have opportunities to install energy efficient capital equipment for manufacturing processes such as ovens, steam production and refrigeration. Energy management systems enable us to track and monitor energy use and focus efforts to reduce consumption. In 2020, we significantly increased our use of renewable energy, from 8% to 23% of total energy used. This increase played a key part in enabling us to achieve a big reduction in CO₂ emissions – by 147,109 tons, from 1,336,793 tons in 2019 to 1,189,684 tons in 2020.

Time horizon
Medium-term

Likelihood
Very likely

Magnitude of impact
Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
25000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
Our sustainability strategy and our targets to reduce energy consumption include improving energy management systems and investing in energy efficient technologies in our factories result in cost efficiencies from lower energy consumption. We estimate savings of approximately $25 million over the period from 2018-2025. This is a broad estimate and not considered a forecast.

Cost to realize opportunity
40000000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation
Our sustainability strategy and our targets to reduce energy consumption and CO₂ emission in our operations constitute a concrete approach to mitigating these risks by anticipating regulatory requirements. This includes improving energy management systems and investing in energy-efficient technologies in our factories at an estimated capital cost of $40 million over the period 2018-2025. In 2020, we succeeded in improving our overall energy efficiency by 9%, from our 2013 baseline, leading to a total 117,000 tons reduction in CO₂ emissions in our manufacturing plants since the baseline year.

Comment
Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?
Direct operations

Opportunity type
Energy source

Primary climate-related opportunity driver
Use of lower-emission sources of energy

Primary potential financial impact
Reduced direct costs

Company-specific description
We use renewable energy in our factories through installation of on-site renewable energy at various facilities, and by power purchase agreements in Mexico, Brazil, Lithuania, Greece, India, Thailand, Italy and the US (from 2020), with other opportunities under investigation. Investing in renewable energy provides opportunities to help us reduce emissions and costs and grow our business in future.

Time horizon
Medium-term

Likelihood
Very likely

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)
40000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
We estimate that purchasing renewable electricity supplies in our factories will lead to a potential annual benefit in our operations of approximately $40 million from avoided carbon pricing by 2025, based on the proportion of our total energy consumption that is likely to come from low-carbon renewable sources. This is a broad estimate and not considered a forecast.

Cost to realize opportunity
0

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation
We are also using low-carbon renewable energy sources to reduce our CO₂ emissions and anticipate this to be cost-neutral as a result of renewable energy sources becoming cost competitive vs traditional fossil fuel sources in a number of markets.

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

(C3.1) Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your organization's strategy and/or financial planning?
Yes, and we have developed a low-carbon transition plan

C3.1a

(C3.1a) Is your organization’s low-carbon transition plan a scheduled resolution item at Annual General Meetings (AGMs)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Is your low-carbon transition plan a scheduled resolution item at AGMs?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No, and we do not intend it to become a scheduled resolution item within the next two years</td>
<td>Our Climate roadmap is a centerpiece of our annual Snacking Made Right report. This report is published around the same time of year as the Annual Shareholder meeting (ASM), where we speak about the work at a high level. In parallel to the ASM, we host dedicated investor sessions on ESG, where we go into more specific details on our climate work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C3.2

(C3.2) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy?
Yes, qualitative and quantitative
(C3.2a) Provide details of your organization’s use of climate-related scenario analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate-related scenarios and models applied</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050 Other, please specify (see Details for description.)</td>
<td>Every year, Mondelēz International works with external climate experts to conduct a comprehensive analysis of our environmental footprint, including carbon, water and land impacts across our entire value chain. We work with this purpose for direction where to prioritize our efforts and develop emissions reductions targets focusing on carbon hotspots. In 2020 we used forward-looking scenario analysis to inform our updated climate strategy that aligns Mondelēz International with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Paris Agreement to keep global warming below 2ºC relative to pre-industrial levels. We chose the 2ºC scenario in anticipation of setting and validating reduction targets through the Science Based Target Initiative. This analysis covered our business end-to-end, including emissions from land-use change in our agricultural commodity supply chain. Based on the 2ºC scenario analysis, Mondelēz International adopted science-based targets to reduce absolute end-to-end CO2 emissions by 10% vs 2018 baseline (goal validated 2019, announced Feb 2020), with a Well Below 2ºC commitment on our Scope 1-2. In addition to supporting our SBTi goal setting, results of our scenario analysis guide our business strategy and objectives around carbon, outlined in our 2025 carbon roadmap. The roadmap includes a plan for capital expenditures over a medium-term horizon (1-6 years) to help us achieve our 2025 public commitments while also initiating planning for the longer-term horizon. The strategy prioritizes hotspots within our value chain including our manufacturing and raw material footprint. This roadmap will be executed across the business, and our global value chain, via a network of Mondelēz International leaders focused on evolving their business practices to contribute toward our 2025 target. For example, we identified renewable energy in owned operations as an area of focus and have signed several large renewable energy contracts in key manufacturing regions in recent years. In 2020, our Australia team announced it will be switching to 100% renewable electricity for two Melbourne factories that make some of Australia’s favourite Cadbury, The Natural Confectionery Company and Pascall treats. In our upstream value chain, we increased our commitments to address deforestation in key agricultural commodities, which we know to be the largest contributor to our footprint based on the insight from our lifecycle assessment. Since we announced our commitment to combat deforestation in cocoa at the 2015 COP21 summit, we have been a driving force in the creation and ongoing work of the Cocoa Forest Initiative, a public private partnership between the cocoa industry and the governments of Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana. Mondelez International, along with 25 other companies, joined the Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action as co-chair, and worked closely with suppliers on protecting and restoring forest via our signature Cocoa Life program publishing our own Climate Report for the past two years outlining our progress against our climate strategy. As of 2020, our Palm Action Plan, requires traceable, forest-maintained palm oil from mills across our supply chain. The new requirements include traceability to plantation and satellite monitoring covering all palm oil concessions supplying mills attributed to the company, against the deforestation criteria set out in its Palm Oil Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?</th>
<th>Description of influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Products and services Yes</td>
<td>We understand our consumers are increasingly concerned about the environmental degradation caused by a growing global population, from the impacts of deforestation to plastic pollution in our oceans. In our annual report we flag this as a risk and identify the need to predict, identify and understand how these changes in consumer preferences and demand will impact the products they buy. We are responding to this risk by evolving our portfolio to offer new and improved products that meet these changing needs now, and as well as thinking about longer-term innovations to prepare for the future of snacking. Our consumers shouldn’t have to worry about the impact their snacking choices have on the planet. We want them to be confident that when they choose our brands, they are choosing snacks made the right way. Our sustainable sourcing programs are helping us deliver snacks made the right way over the next 5 years. By 2025, 100% of our cocoa volume for chocolate brands will be sourced through Cocoa Life. In Europe, all EU biscuits will be made with sustainably sourced wheat from our Harmony program by 2022. By informing our consumers about our commitment to sustainable sourcing through on-pack communication we can address consumers concerns around the impact their snack has on the environment and leverage this as an opportunity to gain trust and love for our brands. An example of how this comes to life in our brands and products is the launch in 2020, of NoCeO, Mondelēz International’s first carbon neutral snack. NoCeO was launched through SnackFutures, our innovation and investment vehicle that capitalizes on emerging trends in snacking. By design, this cracker is a low carbon product from its locally sourced, organic ingredients to the manufacturing and production processes used to deliver the cracker to consumers. Additionally, through our sustainable packaging efforts, we are working toward zero packaging waste and a circular pack economy. By 2025, we aim to have all product packaging 100% recycle-ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain and/or value chain Yes</td>
<td>Emissions from our supply chain contribute the greatest share of emissions to our end-to-end carbon footprint, with raw material production accounting for around 70%. Resilience of our agricultural commodity supply is a major climate-related risk for a global snacking company like Mondelēz International. Specifically, impacts of extreme weather, deforestation, depleting freshwater resources and related commodity price increases are of concern within the short and long-term. In response to these risks, we continue to evolve and develop our signature sustainable agriculture programs as they are key in helping reduce our footprint, achieve our science-based target of 10% absolute reduction of emissions end-to-end by 2025 and secure a resilient raw material supply chain. Through our Palm Oil Action Plan, Cocoa Life and Harmony Wheat programs we incentivize farmers and raw material traders to reduce the environmental impact of commodity production through climate change preparedness practices such as agroforestry, fertilizer and pesticide management, and water stewardship. In our Cocoa Life program, we train farmers on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and Good Environmental Practices (GEP) that help increase their productivity while farming in more environmentally responsible ways. This helps us to achieve our strategy to help farmers grow more cocoa on less land, which improves their incomes and reduces the incentive to expand production into forested areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in R&amp;D Yes</td>
<td>In 2020, we saw more movement across the globe on climate-related regulations as part of broader climate action plans. For example, multiple states in the United States have introduced extended producer responsibility (EPR) mandates shifting the financial burden of product end-of-life disposal back to the producer. The evolving regulatory landscape presents a risk for Mondelēz International. Mondelēz International is well prepared to respond to these risks as our sustainability and R&amp;D teams have been working on packaging innovation efforts that strive toward a zero-packaging waste + circular pack economy. Our teams are redesigning our snack packages to reduce material and increase recyclability. Months ahead of schedule, we achieved our 2020 goal of taking action to reduce packaging materials by 65,000 tons since 2012. Year on year, we reduced packaging by 4,100 tons. Our actual reduction over these 8 years was over 68,000 tons. By 2025, 100% of our packaging will be designed for recyclability. Also, we set a virgin plastic reduction target for 2025 that will result in a 5% absolute reduction in virgin plastic use in overall plastic packaging relative to 2020, including a 25% cut in virgin plastic in its rigid plastic packaging. These actions are expected to result in a 10,000-ton reduction of virgin plastic packaging in five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Yes</td>
<td>There are numerous climate-related risks that could directly impact our operational decisions, including regulatory changes in carbon pricing, severe weather and depleting water resources interrupting operations. Our manufacturing teams play a huge part in our 2025 carbon roadmap to achieve our 10% absolute reduction goal. To deliver our targets to reduce emissions from operations, we plan capital expenditures over a medium-term horizon (1-6 years) to support investments to improve energy management systems and install energy-efficient technologies in our factories. These investments help us reduce exposure to increased energy costs from carbon pricing and to benefit from opportunities to reduce costs through more efficient manufacturing processes. In Europe, energy efficiency and renewable energy projects in our operations help us to reduce the annual allowances required by the ETS scheme. Large contracts for renewable energy in key regions have helped us to reduce our energy-related emissions by 24% exceeding our 2020 target. We recognize opportunities to reduce operations costs by using energy more efficiently and increasing the proportion of energy we buy from low-carbon renewable sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C3.4 Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your financial planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial planning elements that have been influenced</th>
<th>Description of influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditures</td>
<td>Our 2025 sustainability plans, including our climate plan, are supported by an enterprise-wide roadmap, which allocates KPIs and associated investment requirements to each of our geographic, business units. The roadmap covers each year until 2025 and ensures that we have financial control of our sustainable agriculture, end-to-end environmental impact, packaging and social sustainability programs. It addresses all elements of our climate change risks and opportunities. Capital expenditures are planned by function and business unit over the medium term (1-6 years) to account for incremental investments and resource needed to achieve our targets. Climate related risks and opportunities influence our finance plans that are presented to the Board as part of the enterprise-wide sustainability plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C3.4a Provide any additional information on how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy and financial planning (optional).

### C4. Targets and performance

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

**Absolute target**

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

**Target reference number**

Abs 1

**Year target was set**

2020

**Target coverage**

Company-wide

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

Scope 1+2 (location-based) +3 (upstream & downstream)

**Base year**

2018

**Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)**

18903340

**Covered emissions in base year as % of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)**

80

**Target year**

2025

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

10

**Covered emissions in target year (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]**

17013006

**Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)**

<Calculated field>

**% of target achieved [auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

**Target status in reporting year**

New

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

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

**Target ambition**

Well-below 2°C aligned

**Please explain (including target coverage)**

Note: In 2020, MDLZ recalculated our 2018 baseline figures due to data improvements, emissions factor updates and methodological updates. The recalculated 2018 baseline, increased the original 2018 baseline by <1%, well below the SBTi 5% threshold that requires notification of the change. This will enable Mondelēz International to more accurately and consistently track progress against our targets in years to come. Due to this recalculation of our base year emissions in 2020, we have not begun reporting against our 2025 target. As stated on the SBTi website, in January 2020 we set our SBTi target to reduce absolute scope 1, 2, and 3 (purchased goods and
services and waste generated in operations) GHG emissions 10% by 2025 from a 2018 base year. The targets covering greenhouse gas emissions from company operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to Well-below 2°C. Purchased goods and services represent on their own 81% of our scope 3 emissions, therefore together with waste generation in operations, our scope 3 targets cover above the 2/3 threshold required by the SBTi criteria. Purchased goods and services figures includes emissions from land use change as detailed in section 6.5 that details our methodology for calculating scope 3 emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target reference number</th>
<th>Abs 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year target was set</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target coverage**

Company-wide

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

Scope 1+2 (market-based)

**Base year**

2013

**Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)**

1566367

**Covered emissions in base year as % of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)**

90

**Target year**

2020

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

15

**Covered emissions in target year (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]**

1331411.95

**Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)**

1189684

**% of target achieved [auto-calculated]**

160.321304011129

**Target status in reporting year**

Achieved

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

Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but it has not been approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative

**Target ambition**

Other, please specify

**Please explain (including target coverage)**

In 2015, we established new 2020 sustainability goals that placed us at the forefront of the fight against climate change and support our 2020 ambition to be the leader in well-being snacks while driving down costs and creating efficiencies to accelerate our growth. We used the science-based targets methodology to set absolute CO2 from energy emissions reduction goals from manufacturing by 15% from base year 2013 as part of our ambitious end-to-end approach. We consulted with the science-based target setting organizations at the time and supported the We Mean Business coalition in 2015. However, this goal is not validated by the current SBT Initiative and does not cover Scope 3 emissions. In our Snaking Made Right 2020 Progress Report, we report our 2020 CO2 reduction goal as "exceeded" as we reduced carbon emissions from manufacturing by 24%.

---

**C4.2**

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

Other climate-related target(s)
(C4.2b) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Target reference number
Oth 1

Year target was set
2015

Target coverage
Company-wide

Target type: absolute or intensity
Absolute

Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)
| Waste management | Other, please specify (% reduction in waste generated in manufacturing) |

Target denominator (intensity targets only)
<Not Applicable>

Base year
2013

Figure or percentage in base year
412536

Target year
2020

Figure or percentage in target year
335000

Figure or percentage in reporting year
284553

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]
165.062680561288

Target status in reporting year
Achieved

Is this target part of an emissions target?
No

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?
Other, please specify (Consumer Goods Forum)

Please explain (including target coverage)
Units are metric tonnes. In 2015, we established new 2020 sustainability goals. By 2020, we will reduce total manufacturing waste by 20%, focusing on total waste and not just non-beneficial waste. Our waste volumes are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures. We have exceeded our goal to reduce total waste by 20% by 2020, compared to 2013. We achieved 31% reduction versus baseline compared to 20% reduction target.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</th>
<th>Number of initiatives</th>
<th>Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under investigation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be implemented*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation commenced*</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>13288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>144045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to be implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C4.3b

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

Initiative category & Initiative type
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</th>
<th>Energy efficiency in production processes</th>
<th>Combined heat and power (cogeneration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope(s)</strong></td>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
<td>Scope 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary/Mandatory</strong></td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</strong></td>
<td>60170</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payback period</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>4-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated lifetime of the initiative</strong></td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</th>
<th>Energy efficiency in production processes</th>
<th>Cooling technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope(s)</strong></td>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary/Mandatory</strong></td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payback period</strong></td>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated lifetime of the initiative</strong></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</td>
<td>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</td>
<td>Scope(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste heat recovery</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency in production processes</td>
<td>2561</td>
<td>Scope 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope(s)</td>
<td>Voluntary/Mandatory</td>
<td>Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope 1</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>35528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</td>
<td>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency in production processes</td>
<td>902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process optimization</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon energy generation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope(s)</th>
<th>Estimated monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
<td>17668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope 1</td>
<td>1720979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
<td>93961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</th>
<th>Payback period</th>
<th>Estimated lifetime of the initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116569</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584108</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</td>
<td>Low-carbon energy generation</td>
<td>Solar PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated lifetime of the initiative</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</td>
<td>843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope(s)</td>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary/Mandatory</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</td>
<td>35116</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated lifetime of the initiative</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</td>
<td>108492</td>
<td>1337287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope(s)</td>
<td>Scope 2 (market-based)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary/Mandatory</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</td>
<td>1337287</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback period</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated lifetime of the initiative</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Summary of the renewable energy initiatives across Asian, Latin American, and North American sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</th>
<th>Waste reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</td>
<td>26365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope(s)</td>
<td>Scope 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary/Mandatory</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
0

Payback period
<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
3-5 years

Comment
Monetary saving number as reported in Snacking Made Right page 38. We believe the best way to tackle waste is to not generate it in the first place. To this end, we set bold goals, developed robust plans and executed the waste reduction agenda with strong governance and discipline. We applied different technologies and approaches to reduce waste, for example, using high-speed cameras to analyze processes, improving inspections and maintenance to reduce line stoppages, and developing more efficient changeover processes. And we continue to design processes and lines to minimize waste generation in the first place. As a result of our focused and transformational approach, our manufacturing sites achieved very strong results in waste in the 2013-2020 cycle: 31% reduction versus 20% reduction goal in absolute terms, despite production volume growth. This achievement is the result of the zero losses and 100% engagement approach taken in our supply chain, in which every single colleague is responsible for the identification and eradication of losses.

C4.3c

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards</td>
<td>At production facility level. Examples: EU Emission Trading Scheme (see relevant section of CDP); European IPPC legislation; UK Climate legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>Some examples: Earth Week initiatives, Environmental Month (with safety and health), environmental volunteering initiatives, Green Teams, carpool networks, incentives for biking and running to work, parking spots dedicated for hybrid vehicles. Our employee communications and engagement programs at all of our manufacturing and office sites worldwide includes energy/CO2 awareness activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated budget for energy efficiency</td>
<td>Dedicated budget for energy efficiency, renewable energy projects, and other emissions reduction activities in our operations enables us to meet our publicly available science-based CO2 reduction goal. In 2020, we invested over 5 million Dollars in energy efficiency projects and low-Carbon installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities</td>
<td>Dedicated budget for renewable energy projects and other emissions reduction activities in our operations enables us to meet our publicly available science-based CO2 reduction goal. In Australia, we have signed a ten-year agreement to source 100% renewable electricity for our Victorian manufacturing sites, reducing our Australia and New Zealand carbon emissions by 50% – 34,217 tons over 10 years (after verification).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C4.5

(C4.5) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products or do they enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions?

Yes

C4.5a

(C4.5a) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products or that enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions.

Level of aggregation
Company-wide

Description of product/Group of products
Packaging reduction was a key 2020 target for Mondelēz International. In 2020, we achieved ten months ahead of schedule our 2020 goal of taking action to reduce packaging materials by 65,000 tons since 2012. Year on year, we reduced packaging by 4,100 tons. Our actual reduction over these 8 years was over 68,000 tons. Overall, these changes have resulted in emissions avoidance because of the materials used and more efficient transportation.

Are these low-carbon product(s) or do they enable avoided emissions?
Avoided emissions

Taxonomy, project or methodology used to classify product(s) as low-carbon or to calculate avoided emissions
Other, please specify (Packaging reduction efforts across our entire product portfolio help us to avoid emissions.)

% revenue from low carbon product(s) in the reporting year
<Not Applicable>

% of total portfolio value
<Not Applicable>

Asset classes/product types
<Not Applicable>

Comment
In 2020 we set 2025 public commitments in packaging: •100% packaging designed to be recyclable and labeled with recycling information • 5% reduction in overall virgin plastic • 25% reduction in virgin rigid plastic

C5. Emissions methodology
C5.1

Provide your base year and base year emissions (Scopes 1 and 2).

Scope 1

Base year start
January 1 2018

Base year end
December 31 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
883722

Comment
The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and prior years. (See The Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 - 39.) Our Scope 1 emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start
January 1 2018

Base year end
December 31 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
960405

Comment
The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and also prior years. (See The Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 - 39.) Our Scope 2 location-based emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start
January 1 2018

Base year end
December 31 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
959819

Comment
The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and also prior years. (See The Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 - 39.) Our Scope 2 market-based emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

C5.2

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

US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Fugitive Emissions from Refrigeration, Air Conditioning, Fire Suppression, and Industrial Gases
US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Indirect Emissions From Purchased Electricity
US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion Sources
US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources
Other, please specify (US EPA Climate Leaders: Design Principles US EPA GHG Reporting Regulations: 40 CFR 98. )

C5.2a

Provide details of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and also prior years. (See The Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 – 39.) Our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

C6. Emissions data

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Start date**
- <Not Applicable>

**End date**
- <Not Applicable>

**Comment**
- Global scope 1 emissions remained flat comparing to previous year.

### 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**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope 2, location-based</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>674770</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Start date**
- <Not Applicable>

**End date**
- <Not Applicable>

**Comment**
- Our scope 2 market-based emissions reduced by 26% due to implementation of several renewable energy agreement, as part of our journey to decarbonize our internal manufacturing operations.

### C6.4 Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

- Yes
(C6.4a) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source</th>
<th>Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source</th>
<th>Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive transportations</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased product warehouses</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased sales cars</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
<td>Emissions are not relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain why this source is excluded
Deemed out of scope for Mondelēz International this year. These emissions were calculated for the previous reporting cycle and are insignificant, around 0.01% from total Mondelez emissions.

Explain why this source is excluded
Some leased product warehouses are operationally controlled but not included. GHG emissions based on available data have been determined to be insignificant (much less than 1%) compared to available data from our other product warehouses.

Explain why this source is excluded
Some sales cars are operationally controlled but not included. GHG emissions are insignificant (much less than 1%) compared to owned sales fleet.

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

Purchased goods and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation status</th>
<th>Metric tonnes CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant, calculated</td>
<td>18744950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emissions calculation methodology
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Category 1- Purchased goods and services- includes all upstream emissions from the production of the goods and services purchased. This includes impacts associated with all raw ingredients (commodity and non-commodity) as well as packaging. Agricultural raw materials are the main source of CO2 scope 3 emissions, with packaging production contributing an important, but clearly secondary, source of emissions. Our most prominent commodities are: cocoa, wheat, dairy, sugar, palm oil. The supply chain was characterized based on the total mass of purchases of nearly 100 food input material categories and eight packaging material categories. For each of these material categories, information on the life cycle GHG emissions was taken from a variety of sources, Ecoinvent database, scientific literature and other available data. In cases where data for the exact commodity or category could not be found, the most suitable proxy available was selected to avoid large gaps. Emissions are determined as the mass purchased multiplied by these factors of GHG emissions per weight. For packaging materials, processing to produce a finished package has been assumed based on emissions information from the Ecoinvent database. In the case of agricultural commodities that require additional processing beyond the level of their representation in the database, insufficient information is available to represent such processes, except in the case that it takes place in one of our facilities.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
Note: In 2020, MDLZ recalculated our 2018 baseline figures due to data improvements, emissions factor updates and methodological updates. This will enable Mondelez to more accurately and consistently track progress against our targets in years to come. The recalculated 2018 baseline changed the original 2018 baseline by <1%. Scope 3 2019 numbers were updated according to this new methodology resulting in a higher footprint than was reported in 2019 CDP, resulting in a lower year over year change.
Capital goods

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Historically, Mondelēz International performed qualitative investigations and concluded that this scope 3 category was not relevant comparing to our total scope 3 emissions.

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

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
878704

Emissions calculation methodology
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Emissions from all direct uses of energy have been calculated based on amounts of electricity and fuel used throughout the company and applying cradle-to-gate emission factors from the Ecoinvent database, consistent with the methodology used throughout the Scope 3 calculations described here. From this result, the Scope 2 emissions, described above, were subtracted.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
2060253

Emissions calculation methodology
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Data excludes warehouses. We use third-party transportation companies (common carriers) to transport raw materials to manufacturing facilities. The primary GHG emission source from common carriers is CO2 from diesel fuel combustion. Transportation CO2 emissions for production materials were estimated based on a number of simplifying assumptions: average distance (e.g., source country to country of use), common modes of transport, average fuel efficiency, assumed shipment weights, etc. The calculation is based on the multiplication of life cycle emissions information for the relevant modes of transport (in units of emission per tkm) derived from the Ecoinvent database. Some emissions resulting from distribution of sold product were recategorized as Category 4, due to Mondelez being the entity financially responsible for that transport.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
57676

Emissions calculation methodology
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Emissions from landfill, incineration and recycling of operation waste, inbound packaging, etc. were considered in the calculation. Emission factors coming from the Ecoinvent 3.3 database, calculated using the Impact 2002+ method, were used.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
There was an overall YOY decrease, due to a decrease in mass going to waste treatment.
### Business travel

**Evaluation status**
Relevant, calculated

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
6575

**Emissions calculation methodology**
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Employee air, car, and rail business travel emissions were estimated using spend data and EIO-LCA emission model. The source of the latest emission factors is taken from Carnegie Mellon University Green Design Institute. (2019) Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (EIO-LCA) US 2007. Some Economic Input-Output data sourced from 2002 source (hotel stays, which was newly included this year), due to data limitations. All quantities calculated to adjust for inflation between data year and reporting year.

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
0

#### Please explain

Employee commuting

**Evaluation status**
Relevant, calculated

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
146793

**Emissions calculation methodology**
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Emissions estimated based on publicly-available regional car and public transit commute data. Assumed 26.81 mile distance round trip (for all modes), 240 days per year. Emission factors from EcoInvent 3.3 database, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ method, were used.

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
0

#### Please explain

There was an overall YOY decrease, due to a methodology change that refined mode assumptions and COVID-related impact.

### Upstream leased assets

**Evaluation status**
Not relevant, explanation provided

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
<Not Applicable>

**Emissions calculation methodology**
<Not Applicable>

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
<Not Applicable>

#### Please explain

Despite the existence of some leasing activities in Mondelēz International, leasing assets is not part of our core business. Emissions from leased assets were qualitatively evaluated and considered irrelevant as they were not material enough to evaluate.

### Downstream transportation and distribution

**Evaluation status**
Relevant, calculated

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
100499

**Emissions calculation methodology**
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. This year, because Mondelēz International is financially responsible for product transport to retail, the emissions of distribution of sold product has been recategorized to Category 4. Emissions also include those resulting from retail storage. Production volumes (minus an assume distribution loss) and product categories inform the extent to which refrigeration is required at retail, ultimately resulting in a calculation of energy required to refrigerate relevant products at stores. This energy quantity is mapped to an electricity consumption emission factor from the EcoInvent database.

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
0

#### Please explain

CDP
Processing of sold products
Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
As a snack company, the vast majority of our products is sold for direct consumption, without any additional industrial processing. Therefore, emissions due to processing sold products are deemed irrelevant as they are not material enough to evaluate.

Use of sold products
Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
59203

Emissions calculation methodology
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The emissions reported here reflect a rough prediction of the emissions from the use of products. The end-of-life of the food products themselves is not included. The emissions during the use of products include refrigeration for dairy, egg based products and cheeses. Assumptions have been made based on the proportion of the total of our products sold that are likely to undergo each use. For simplicity, it has currently been assumed that all use activities are fueled by electricity. Approximations are then made of the amount of electricity use required per kilogram of product. These approximations are made based on preliminary estimates of typical consumer behaviors and are generic among product categories. The total amount of electricity use is then estimated based on emissions factors taken from the Ecoinvent database for several countries or an adapted dataset from IEA electricity statistics.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain

End of life treatment of sold products
Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
1029495

Emissions calculation methodology
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The end-of-life of packaging is determined based on the amount of various categories of packaging material that have been purchased in the relevant time period (with the assumption that this is also representative of the amount of packaging disposed in the same period). The proportions of various fates (landfilling, recycling and incineration) of each material have been determined by information available for several countries, which has then been applied as an approximation of disposal routes within each of the five global sales regions. Emissions information is taken from the Ecoinvent database to determine the amount of GHG emissions occurring during the landfilling, recycling and incineration of any given material. Generally, a “cut-off” approach was taken to end of life allocation. This means that in the case of recycling, full burden is applied at the input, but emissions and credits associated with end of life treatment are excluded from the scope.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain

Downstream leased assets
Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
In Mondelēz International operations there are a few, very limited instances where we are asset lessors, as this activity is not part of our core business. We qualitatively evaluated emissions from this category and considered them irrelevant.
Franchises

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Mondelēz International is a snacking company that sells directly, mostly to retailers and distributors. Franchises are not applicable to Mondelez business model.

Investments

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Historically, Mondelēz International performed qualitative investigations and concluded that this scope 3 category was not relevant comparing to our total scope 3 emissions.

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
The majority of our upstream emissions have been reported in other categories.

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
The majority of our downstream emissions have been reported in other categories.
Please explain
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The end-of-life of packaging is determined based on the amount of packaging material that have been purchased in the relevant time period (with the assumption that this is also representative of the amount of packaging disposed in the same period). The proportions of various fates (landfilling, recycling and incineration) of each material have been determined by information available for several countries, which has then been applied as an approximation of disposal routes within each of the five global sales regions. Emissions information is taken from the Ecoinvent database to determine the amount of GHG emissions occurring during the landfilling, recycling and incineration of any given material. Generally, a “cut-off” approach was taken to end of life allocation. This means that in the case of recycling, full burden is applied at the input, but emissions and credits associated with end of life treatment are excluded from the scope.

Activity
Consumption

Scope 3 category
Use of sold products

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)
59203

Please explain
Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. This year, some emissions resulting from distribution of sold product were recategorized as Category 4, due to Mondelēz International being the entity financially responsible for that transport.
(C-AC6.8a/C-FB6.8a/C-PF6.8a) 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) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>19049</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default emissions factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain
Calculations were made using default emission factors for biogenic fuels as provided by DEFRA.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain
From the methodology used to calculate transportation emissions it is not possible to estimate biogenic emissions from biofuels.
We calculate GHG emissions for our key commodities as part of our annual corporate footprinting exercise. Commodity data provided as metric tons of commodity per business region and business unit, broken down by sourcing region. Line items were mapped to emission factors from the WFLDB 3.4 or Ecoinvent 3.3, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ (vQ2.29) (March 2019) impact assessment method. EFs were supplied for climate change impacts with and without LUC. For commodities, where possible – the Dryad LUC tool was used to develop a custom country-specific LUC (Dryad is a tool developed by Quantis in compliance with the Quantis NCS Guidance). Dryad allows for increased transparency on drivers of LUC impacts (vegetation loss, peatland drainage, soil erosion, etc.). The tool, however, is dependent on data availability from the FAO -- therefore it does not cover all commodities and sourcing regions (ex. dairy commodities are currently not covered by Dryad). When Dryad LUC EF values are unavailable, the default Blonk tool built into WFLDB 3.4 and ecoinvent 3.3 datasets was used. While the Blonk tool LUC values lack transparency, they are widely used and generally accepted to be credible.
C-AC6.9a/C-FB6.9a/C-PF6.9a Report your greenhouse gas emissions figure(s) for your disclosing commodity(ies), explain your methodology, and include any exclusions.

Palm Oil

Reporting emissions by
Total
Emissions (metric tons CO2e)
536289
Denominator: unit of production
<Not Applicable>
Change from last reporting year
About the same

Please explain
Small year to year changes are tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020. Improved methodology used in the 2020 re-baseline corrected 2019 palm oil emissions data to 525,735.

Sugar

Reporting emissions by
Total
Emissions (metric tons CO2e)
710351
Denominator: unit of production
<Not Applicable>
Change from last reporting year
About the same

Please explain
Small year to year changes are tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020.

Wheat

Reporting emissions by
Total
Emissions (metric tons CO2e)
1943862
Denominator: unit of production
<Not Applicable>
Change from last reporting year
Higher

Please explain
Observed year to year changes are directly tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020.

Other

Reporting emissions by
Total
Emissions (metric tons CO2e)
12707247
Denominator: unit of production
<Not Applicable>
Change from last reporting year
About the same

Please explain
Other includes Cocoa and cocoa products (7,495,962 metric tonnes CO2e) and Dairy (5,211,285 metric tonnes CO2e). Small increases in year over year emissions from Cocoa are due to the use of updated Land Use Change emissions factors for key sourcing regions causing the carbon footprint to increase overall. Improved methodology used in the 2020 re-baseline corrected 2019 Cocoa emissions data to 7,294,257. Note: These corrected 2019 numbers were not verified by SGS and are therefore directional only. Small year to year changes in Dairy are directly tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020.
(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
0.0000590382

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)
1527318

Metric denominator
unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total
25870000000

Scope 2 figure used
Market-based

% change from previous year
13.9

Direction of change
Decreased

Reason for change
Our scopes 1 and 2 emissions reduced 13% versus previous year, driven by scope 2 emissions reduction due to the implementation of several renewable energy initiatives during the year 2020. Savings from these projects are better explained in section 8. Energy efficiency projects also generated a reduction, even though less impactful, as presented in section 4.3.

Intensity figure
17.79614176

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)
1527318

Metric denominator
full time equivalent (FTE) employee

Metric denominator: Unit total
85823

Scope 2 figure used
Market-based

% change from previous year
19.95

Direction of change
Decreased

Reason for change
Our scopes 1 and 2 emissions reduced 13% versus previous year, driven by scope 2 emissions reduction due to the implementation of several renewable energy initiatives during the year 2020. Savings from these projects are better explained in section 8. Energy efficiency projects also generated a reduction, even though less impactful, as presented in section 4.3. Our number of employees increased from 80,000 in 2019 to 85,823 this year, also contributing to the reduction of this intensity figure by 19%.

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenhouse gas</th>
<th>Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)</th>
<th>GWP Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify (CO2e)</td>
<td>852548</td>
<td>IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>276619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>310095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America (LATAM)</td>
<td>94175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, Australasia, Middle East and Africa</td>
<td>171659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

By activity

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>733609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Fleet</td>
<td>72476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales fleet</td>
<td>46464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C-AC7.4/A-C-FB7.4/A-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) 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 category**
- <Not Applicable>

**Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**
- 733608.53

**Methodology**
- Default emissions factor

**Please explain**
- Scope 1 manufacturing includes fuel combustion and fugitive emissions at manufacturing sites.

**Activity**
- Distribution

**Emissions category**
- <Not Applicable>

**Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**
- 118939.64

**Methodology**
- Default emissions factor

**Please explain**
- Scope 1 emissions reported here for distribution include impacts from private fleet and sales fleet.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)</th>
<th>Purchased and consumed low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in Scope 2 market-based approach (MWh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>189786</td>
<td>95401</td>
<td>500767</td>
<td>217576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>256487</td>
<td>265417</td>
<td>853001</td>
<td>22634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America (LATAM)</td>
<td>34135</td>
<td>33316</td>
<td>274333</td>
<td>145182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, Australasia, Middle East and Africa</td>
<td>280539</td>
<td>280437</td>
<td>579261</td>
<td>57008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C7.6c

(C7.6c) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>656528</td>
<td>574833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manufacturing</td>
<td>104419</td>
<td>99937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 renewable energy consumption | 108492 | Decreased | 6.15 | Many renewable energy projects reached Commercial Operation during 2020. The most impactful was the VPPA in the USA, that delivered alone 85,000 Tons of CO2e reduction. Other large sites like Puebla in Mexico and VSA in Brazil also started running on renewable electricity. Several other on-site solar installations started operating in 2020, for example, in China, Spain, France and Italy. Total reduction due to RE, 108,492 CO2e Tons represents 6.15% of the gross scopes 1 and 2 emissions in 2019, 1,762,939 Tons. Expectation is to continue this positive trend on RE, as more projects will go live in 2021. |
| Change in renewable energy consumption | 9188 | Decreased | 0.52 | We estimate that energy efficiency projects delivered 9,188 CO2e Tons in 2020, considering the projects that were concluded during the year. Total reduction due to energy efficiency represents 0.52% of the gross scopes 1 and 2 emissions in 2019, 1,762,939 Tons. The trend for 2021 is to increase the amount of energy reduced, as the pandemic, hopefully, wanes. |
| Change in methodology | 85157 | Decreased | 4.83 | Until 2019, emissions from electricity in offices and warehouses were calculated using an estimation based on the number of headcounts. Starting in 2020, we included square footage of the facilities in the data collection from these sites and the estimation of electricity consumed became much more accurate, generating a reduction. Expectation for 2021 is to continue reducing electricity consumption in non-manufacturing sites, as COVID19 still limits gathering and travel. |
| Change in physical operating conditions | 11034 | Decreased | 0.63 | We decreased the amount of miles run by our owned sales fleet, which generated a 11,034 CO2e Tons during 2020. We expect to increase miles run by sales fleet in 2021, as the pandemic wanes. |
| Other | 21750 | Decreased | 1.23 | We estimated that the updated scope 2 CO2e conversion factors generated a reduction of approximately 21,750 CO2e Tons, which represents 1.23% of 2019 gross scopes 1 and 2 emissions, 1,762,939 CO2e Tons. Most of the countries where we operated improved their Carbon emission factors without action from our side. In parallel, we have improved our data collection of CO2 factors from suppliers, which improves our accuracy of the actual emissions and also reduces our Carbon emissions. |

(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) 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) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired heat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired steam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C8.2a

**Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
<th>MWh from renewable sources</th>
<th>MWh from non-renewable sources</th>
<th>Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)</td>
<td>LHV (lower heating value)</td>
<td>54342</td>
<td>2987509</td>
<td>3041851 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>442460</td>
<td>1670295</td>
<td>2112695 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired heat</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>6274</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>10201 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired steam</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>16604</td>
<td>67860</td>
<td>84464 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>5741</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>5741 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total energy consumption</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>525361</td>
<td>4763954</td>
<td>5289315 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C8.2b

**Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C8.2c

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

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

- **Biodiesel**
  - Heating value: LHV (lower heating value)
  - Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization: 1159.47
  - MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity: 0
  - MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat: 0
  - MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam: 0
  - MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration: 0
  - Emission factor: 5.008 kg CO2e per GJ
  - Emissions factor source: DEFRA 2020
  - Comment: Biodiesel used as fuel for generator in one of our sites in India.

- **Bagasse**
  - Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization: 17679
  - MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity: 0
  - MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat: 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission factor</th>
<th>kg CO2e per GJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emission factor source</td>
<td>DEFRA 2020 - Using wood pallets as reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Bagasse used in Mondelez sites to produce steam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuels</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butane</td>
<td>LHV (lower heating value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization</th>
<th>6254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Emission factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission factor</th>
<th>kg CO2e per GJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We consume butane as fuel at only one location, the estimated usage is 10% for steam and 90% for ovens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuels</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>LHV (lower heating value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization</th>
<th>6424</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Emission factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission factor</th>
<th>kg CO2e per GJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emission factor source</td>
<td>DEFRA 2020 - coal (industrial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have one boiler in the whole supply chain that consumes coal, in an area with very limited fuels available. The site is in process to replace this boiler for another that also consumes biomass, so that we can start consuming responsibly sourced biomass progressively, until availability is sufficient to eliminate the usage of coal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuels (excluding feedstocks)</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Gas Oil</td>
<td>LHV (lower heating value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

**14919**

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

**14919**

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

**0**

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

**0**

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

<Not Applicable>

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

**0**

**Emission factor**

**79.1222**

**Unit**

kg CO2e per GJ

**Emissions factor source**

DEFRA 2020 - Fuel Oil

**Comment**

We don't have details on the usage of heavy oil per site. We estimate that the majority of it is used as fuel for emergency electricity generators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuels (excluding feedstocks)</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Distillate</td>
<td>LHV (lower heating value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

**29687**

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

**29687**

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

**0**

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

**0**

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

<Not Applicable>

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

**0**

**Emission factor**

**75.8611**

**Unit**

kg CO2e per GJ

**Emissions factor source**

DEFRA 2020 - Gas Oil

**Comment**

We don't have detailed information on the consumption of light distillate per site. We estimate it is mostly used to generate electricity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuels (excluding feedstocks)</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)</td>
<td>LHV (lower heating value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

**36123**

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

**0**

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

**36123**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel Consumption</th>
<th>MWh fuel consumed</th>
<th>Emission factor</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-generation of steam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63.9722</td>
<td>kg CO2e per GJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generation of cooling</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generation of electricity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generation of heat</td>
<td>1350871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generation of steam</td>
<td>1523322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generation of cooling</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emissions factor source:** DEFRA 2020

**Comment:** We don't have details on the usage of LPG per site but we estimate the majority of it is used to generate heat.

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks):**

**Natural Gas**

**Heating value**

LHV (lower heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

2874194

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

0

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

1350871

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

1523322

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

<Not Applicable>

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

0

**Emission factor**

56.5944

**Unit**

kg CO2e per GJ

**Emissions factor source**

DEFRA 2020

**Comment**

We estimated that 47% of our natural gas is used in ovens and the rest is used in boilers.

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks):**

**Propane Gas**

**Heating value**

LHV (lower heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

19908

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

0

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

19908

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

0

**Emission factor**

58.4934

**Unit**

kg CO2e per GJ

**Emissions factor source**

Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (US EPA 2020)

**Comment**
We don't have details on the usage of Propane gas in our operations, but we estimated the majority of it is used to generate heat.

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**
Other, please specify (Rapeseed Oil)

**Heating value**
LHV (lower heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**
841

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
841

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

**Emission factor**
5.008

**Unit**
kg CO2e per GJ

**Emissions factor source**
DEFRA 2020 - Biodiesel

**Comment**
We use rapeseed oil at our manufacturing site in Sweden, in a boiler.

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**
Wood

**Heating value**
LHV (lower heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**
34363

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
17181.56

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
17181.56

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration
0

**Emission factor**
4.2917

**Unit**
kg CO2e per GJ

**Emissions factor source**
DEFRA 2020 - wood pellets

**Comment**
We don't have details on the usage of wood per site but we estimate half of it is used to generate steam and the other half for heat.

---

**C8.2d**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross generation (MWh)</th>
<th>Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)</th>
<th>Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)</th>
<th>Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>68917</td>
<td>68917</td>
<td>5741</td>
<td>5741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>1431178</td>
<td>1431178</td>
<td>18023</td>
<td>1413156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>1564608</td>
<td>1564608</td>
<td>34861</td>
<td>1529747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
C8.2e

(C8.2e) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in C6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing method</th>
<th>Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon technology type</td>
<td>Geothermal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>6026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Geothermal energy purchased at the Caramagna site, in Italy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing method</th>
<th>Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon technology type</td>
<td>Geothermal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>5631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Geothermal electricity purchased at the Sucat site, in the Philippines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing method</th>
<th>Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon technology type</td>
<td>Hydropower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>4111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Hydropower purchased for the Malanpur plant, in India.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing method</th>
<th>Standard product offering by an energy supplier supported by energy attribute certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon technology type</td>
<td>Solar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>3294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Solar electricity purchased for Malanpur plant, in India.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing method</th>
<th>Standard product offering by an energy supplier supported by energy attribute certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon technology type</td>
<td>Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Electricity from solar supplied by local utilities in Portland, United States.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing method</th>
<th>Standard product offering by an energy supplier supported by energy attribute certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon technology type</td>
<td>Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Electricity from solar supplied by local utilities in Portland, United States.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
United States of America

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
618

Comment
Electricity from wind supplied by local utilities in Portland, United States.

Sourcing method
Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Wind

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
South Africa

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
11078

Comment
Electricity from wind bought during winter months in Port Elizabeth, South Africa

Sourcing method
Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator without energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Wind

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
Mexico

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
39706

Comment
Electricity from wind purchased through a PPA in Mexico, for Ecatepec and Puebla sites.

Sourcing method
Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Wind

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
Greece

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
6431

Comment
Wind energy purchased with certificated for our operation in Athens, Greece.

Sourcing method
Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Low-carbon energy mix

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
Lithuania

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
10163

Comment
100% Renewable energy contract with local utility supplier backed up by certificates for our site in Kaunas, Lithuania.

Sourcing method
Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Hydropower

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
India

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
32876

Comment
Hydropower electricity supplied to our facility in Baddi, India.

Sourcing method
Power purchase agreement (PPA) with on-site/off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-carbon technology type</th>
<th>Biomass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Renewable electricity from sugarcane bagasse provided by a local sugar supplier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sourcing method**
Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-carbon technology type</th>
<th>Nuclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Electricity from nuclear supplied to our site in Bern, Switzerland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-carbon technology type</th>
<th>Biomass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>104690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Renewable electricity generated from sugarcane bagasse for our two sites in Brasil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sourcing method**
Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator without energy attribute certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-carbon technology type</th>
<th>Hydropower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Electricity from a hydropower plant in Peru supplied to our site in Lima.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sourcing method**
Other, please specify (Virtual Power Purchase Agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-carbon technology type</th>
<th>Solar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor</td>
<td>216340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Renewable energy certificates from a solar plant in the United States, obtained through a 12 year Virtual Power Purchase Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C9. Additional metrics

(C9.1) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.
C10. Verification

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Verification/assurance status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope 1</td>
<td>Third-party verification or assurance process in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)</td>
<td>Third-party verification or assurance process in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope 3</td>
<td>Third-party verification or assurance process in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**
  - Reasonable assurance

- **Attach the statement**
  - Mondelez - GHG Verification Statement 2020 v1.1.pdf

- **Page/ section reference**
  - pp 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**
Reasonable assurance

**Attach the statement**
Mondelez - GHG Verification Statement 2020 v1.1.pdf

**Page/ section reference**
pp 1-3

**Relevant standard**
ISO14064-3

**Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**
100

---

(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 (upstream & downstream)

**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**
Mondelez - GHG Verification Statement 2020 v1.1.pdf

**Page/ section reference**
pp 1-3

**Relevant standard**
ISO14064-3

**Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**
100

---

(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?

No, we do not verify any other climate-related information reported in our CDP disclosure
C11. Carbon pricing

(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.
EU ETS

C11.1b

(C11.1b) Complete the following table for each of the emissions trading schemes you are regulated by.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU ETS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period start date</td>
<td>January 1 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period end date</td>
<td>December 31 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances allocated</td>
<td>40909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances purchased</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e</td>
<td>40909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of ownership</td>
<td>Facilities we own and operate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>At the start of 2020, Mondelēz International had over 39,000 allowances on account. In order to cover the difference of what needed to be surrendered for 2020, Mondelēz International purchased 6,300 allowances. This purchase included extra EUAs in the case that a transfer of EUAs between facilities did not happen in time for surrendering.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C11.1d

(C11.1d) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?

Mondelēz International records and tracks the allowances given to each of concerned European facilities each year. We forecast site emissions through estimated future emissions based on the previous year, production during the new year and site-specific trends. This allows us to ensure we have enough allowances for each facility as well as giving time to prepare for any shortfall in allowances.

Our teams are constantly looking to introduce emissions reducing practices, such as renewable energy and energy efficiency projects, at facilities covered under the EU ETS, in order to reduce the number of required allowances. For example, in 2020 one of our facilities in Ireland changed from heavy fuel oil to Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) in an effort to reduce emissions and allowances required for the facility.

C11.2

(C11.2) Has your organization originated or purchased any project-based carbon credits within the reporting period?
No
(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
Offer financial incentives for suppliers who reduce your upstream emissions (Scopes 3)

% of suppliers by number
68

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
27

**Rationale for the coverage of your engagement**
Our goal is that by 2025, we will source 100% of the cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life. At the end of 2020, we reached 188,043 farmers in 2,169 communities. Cocoa Life works in six key origins (ordered by program size and priority): Ghana, Cote d’Ivoire, Indonesia, India, Brazil, Dominican Republic. Through Cocoa Life, we incentivize farmers to participate in programs aimed at improving the sustainability of smallholder businesses, to protect and restore forests, and to empower local communities. Participating farmers can freely participate in all offered program activities and receive resources such as trees and planting material through the program. In addition, Cocoa Life offers a financial incentive in the form of a price premium to participating farmers. We invest in practices and resources to improve farmer productivity on existing land to promote forest conservation. As of 2020, we have trained 246,262 community members and farmers as of 2020 on good environmental practices through the Cocoa Life program.

**Impact of engagement, including measures of success**
In May 2021, we published Cocoa Life’s 2020 Annual Report as part of our Snacking Made Right 2020 Progress Report. The report shows that engaging suppliers in the Cocoa Life program is having a positive impact: • Cocoa yields are continuously improving, and results show that as cocoa farms become more efficient, their yield increases. This is an important development, as farms that can do more with less land are able to create spare land that can be used for other income-generating activities, helping make cocoa farming a prosperous business. • More communities are steering their own development and Cocoa Life Communities can become drivers of change. Through the use of planning and advocacy tools, these communities have been able to attract the funding and resources needed to develop — an important step because sector change will only be sustained if local actors feel empowered to do so. • Farmers are choosing not to expand into protected forests and encouraging and enabling cocoa farmers and communities to protect the land where cocoa is grown. • Farmers are choosing not to expand into protected forests and encouraging and enabling cocoa farmers and communities to protect the land where cocoa is grown. This is an important development, as farms that can do more with less land are able to create spare land that can be used for other income-generating activities, helping make cocoa farming a prosperous business. • More communities are steering their own development and Cocoa Life Communities can become drivers of change. Through the use of planning and advocacy tools, these communities have been able to attract the funding and resources needed to develop — an important step because sector change will only be sustained if local actors feel empowered to do so. 

**Comment**
In partnership with the United Nations Development Programme, as of 2020 we distributed 2,186,243 economic shade trees on cocoa farms in Ghana, Cote d’Ivoire and Indonesia to restore forest lands and make farmer cocoa yields more productive. Cocoa Life efforts are also aimed at helping farmers become more resilient to climate change. Our climate change strategy addresses deforestation in our raw material supply chain, with a particular focus on cocoa and palm oil. Cocoa Life is an integrated cocoa sourcing strategy, addressing farming, community, livelihoods, youth and environment. As part of Cocoa Life’s climate change strategy, we have REDD+ partnerships with the governments of Cote d’Ivoire and Ghana, focused on addressing deforestation in cocoa producing areas. Cocoa Life helps to transform markets by connecting consumers with cocoa origin communities through the use of an on-pack logo on selected brands, including Cadbury Dairy Milk, Cote d’Or and Marabou. In addition to Cocoa Life, we incentivize farmers to participate in programs aimed at improving the sustainability of smallholder businesses, to protect and restore forests, and to empower local communities. Participating farmers can freely participate in all offered program activities and receive resources such as trees and planting material through the program. In addition, Cocoa Life offers a financial incentive in the form of a price premium to participating farmers. We invest in practices and resources to improve farmer productivity on existing land to promote forest conservation. As of 2020, we have trained 246,262 community members and farmers as of 2020 on good environmental practices through the Cocoa Life program.

**Type of engagement**
Compliance & onboarding

**Details of engagement**
Included climate change in supplier selection / management mechanism
Code of conduct featuring climate change KPIs
Climate change is integrated into supplier evaluation processes
% of suppliers by number
100

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
3

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
The % of suppliers by number noted above represents the proportion of our palm oil supply covered by our Palm Oil Action Plan. Our goal is for 100% of our palm oil to be traceable to the mill from suppliers with aligned policies by 2025. We expect our suppliers to adhere to MDLZ palm oil sourcing principles at the parent group level within their own company, as well as oversight of their suppliers’ adherence to these principles at parent group level. In addition to suppliers’ published policies, we also expect suppliers to demonstrate implementation, progress vis-a-vis the most updated version of our Palm Oil Action Plan. This is a prerequisite of doing business with us. We evaluate their performance against it annually. We call out our suppliers to act faster to eliminate deforestation and to map and monitor all palm oil plantations and concessions. Specifically, we have asked our suppliers to commit to palm oil concession mapping as a vital step to accountability and change.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
In 2020, 100% of our palm oil supply was RSPPO certified. 98% was traceable to the mill and 99% from suppliers with policies aligned to Palm Action Plan. RSPPO efforts directly relate to reducing climate impacts by working to eliminate deforestation. If a supplier fails to meet the terms of our action plan, we start by working with them to fix the problem. But when there is a significant breach of our principles, we exclude suppliers until the breach is addressed. We investigate claims against our suppliers and take action against verified deforestation allegations and any producers shown to be part of groups we’ve previously excluded. These cases highlight the urgent need for sector-wide monitoring to provide one source of verified data about deforestation by palm oil plantation companies. Our current engagement via the CGF-FPC towards creating minimum criteria for monitoring and development of monitoring and response framework is in line with our philosophy of tackling issues via common aligned sector wide approach and act collectively with the force for good. From 2020, we require traceable, forest-monitored palm oil from mills across our supply chain. The new requirements include traceability to plantation and satellite monitoring covering all palm oil concessions supplying mills attributed to the company, against the deforestation criteria set out in its Palm Oil Action Plan. All mills must be identified on Global Forest Watch, with no active grievances against concessions in their direct supply or operated by the same producer groups elsewhere. In addition, suppliers must have third-party assurance of their monitoring process and systems used and be subject to cross-check by Mondelēz International. As of 2020, we excluded 98 concessions or mills linked to upstream suppliers that were found to be involved in deforestation, because we believe urgent action is needed across the entire supply chain to protect the Earth’s forests and deliver benefits to countries that produce palm oil.

Comment
Volume was used as a proxy for % of suppliers in calculating % suppliers above and therefore the percentage provided indicates the share of annual palm volume coming from suppliers in direct engagement with our sustainable palm program in 2020. Note: The % supplier indicates % of our total palm suppliers directly engaged in this supplier engagement activity. The % supplier-related scope 3 emissions is based on metric tons CO2e emissions disclosed in C6.5.

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
24

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
2

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
In 2007, our leading biscuit brand in France, LU, decided to source wheat grown in a better way and so Harmony was born. Today, our Harmony program has grown into an industry-leading and well-respected program for sustainable farming. More than 1,500 farmers across Europe have joined the initiative and 100 percent of the wheat supply to our French bakeries comes from the Harmony fields. Through Harmony, we work with farmers across Europe to grow wheat in a way that helps conserve water, cares for the soil, protects and promotes biodiversity, and reduces carbon emissions. We also engage with governments and NGOs throughout the process, and 10 percent of farmers are audited each year by an independent organization to ensure compliance with the Harmony Charter. In addition to our work in Europe, since 2015, we’ve partnered with Michigan State University (MSU) and our supplier of soft white wheat, Cooperative Elevator Company (Coop), a 100+ year old cooperative. In partnership with MSU and Coop, we engage a group of about 100 family farmers each year to track their farming practices, use of inputs such as fertilizer, and their yield. The group anonymously tracks their own year-on-year performance, as well as their performance versus peers. Growers in this program collaborate and learn from each other, to produce the highest quality Triscuit wheat while considering the ecological footprint.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
The Harmony Wheat program has led to a 20 percent reduction in pesticide use, and nearly 10 million bees and more than 25 species of butterflies have been observed in flowers sown around the Harmony fields. Each year, the Harmony Charter is reviewed and updated as part of our continuous improvement approach. In 2016, we began an ambitious monitoring system to measure and assess the environmental and economic impact of Harmony practices. Working in partnership with SMAG, a software solutions provider for the agricultural sector, and Agrosolutions, we’ve developed an automated reporting approach to calculate and monitor 12 key economic and environmental indicators on Harmony farms. The results will be used to inform continuous improvement with farmers and to advocate for the continued shift toward sustainable wheat. In 2018, MSU analyzed data over three years of the program and determined that farmers who used advanced agronomy practices improved their yields between 1.5 and 4 bushels per acre more than those who didn’t. Growers in this program collaborate and learn from each other, to produce the highest quality Triscuit wheat while considering the ecological footprint. As they enjoy a higher yield than peers outside the program, MSU and Coop’s agronomy team are working to make the learnings more widely accessible to all 1,100 Coop growers.

Comment
Note: Volume was used as a proxy for # of suppliers in calculating % suppliers above and therefore the percentage provided indicates the share of annual wheat volume coming from suppliers in direct engagement with our sustainable wheat programs in 2020. The % supplier-related scope 3 emissions is based on metric tons CO2e emissions disclosed in C6.5.

Type of engagement
Innovation & collaboration (changing markets)

Details of engagement
Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce climate impacts on products and services

% of suppliers by number
51

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)
Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
Since 2013, Mondelēz International committed to reduce by 2020 65,000 tons of packaging material by optimizing our packaging formats, while also minimizing food waste. In order to achieve our targets, a packaging optimization program was established with half of our total packaging supply base and actioned through our legal agreements where suppliers commit to generate optimization/reduction ideas which are jointly reviewed and tracked with pre-defined annual targets. The optimization program encourages innovation and reduce packaging products and services.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
In 2020 Mondelēz International exceeded the packaging reduction goal eliminating a total of 68,000 tons since 2013. Our packaging optimization program has been deployed across 51% of our suppliers tackling 81% of our total global spend. This program has been driven through our commercial agreements with specific clauses where supplier agrees that optimization ideas are an important component of a successful customer-supplier relationship, therefore they commit to provide innovative ideas to look for end-to-end opportunities to drive the most optimized specifications for each of the packaging components they supply to us. Dedicated supplier resources are agreed to manage this platform and the optimization manager/team is responsible to build, present, and track a strong pipeline to ensure pre-defined annual targets are met. All ideas proposed from suppliers require joint approval and possible joint implementation by both Mondelēz International and Supplier. Once a project is approved, both companies will dedicate the required resources to implement the project. In this way the project pipeline is jointly guaranteed throughout the term of the agreement.

Comment
Note: The % of suppliers by number indicate percentage of total packaging suppliers who are engaged in this packaging optimization program. The % supplier-related scope 3 emissions is based on metric tons CO2e emissions disclosed in C6.5.

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
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
Agroforestry

Description of management practice
Introduction of shade trees and agroforestry practices on cocoa farms to reduce emissions and increase productivity and climate change resilience.

Your role in the implementation
Financial
Knowledge sharing
Operational
Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation
As of 2020, our Cocoa Life program, in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme, distributed 2,186,243 economic shade trees on cocoa farms in Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire and Indonesia to restore forest lands and make farmer cocoa yields more productive. In addition, we invest in agroforestry research, development and implementation as part of the solution and have identified a knowledge gap on the topic as it relates to the financial impact for smallholders. This is why we are running trials and research with farms to introduce agroforestry at different levels of tree density and introduced an incentive model to promote agroforestry practices. Our Payments for Environmental Services (PES) pilot programs incentivize farmers and communities to protect forests and adopt forest-friendly farming techniques such as planting complementary crops alongside cocoa.

Climate change related benefit
Emissions reductions (mitigation)
Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

Comment
Guided by the measurable key indicator results reported in our Cocoa Life 2020 Annual Report, our Cocoa Life program will refine its focus to key areas of intervention where we can make the biggest impact, including combating deforestation through both conservation and restoration cocoa farming practices. Achieving zero deforestation globally requires public-private partnerships. Cocoa origin governments must have the right policies and commitments in place and align on agroforestry principles. We will continue to publicly report our impact results and encourage more industry members to implement integrated and holistic approaches to broaden the collective impact at scale.

Management practice reference number
MP2

Management practice
Biodiversity considerations

Description of management practice
Farmers in our Harmony program implement the following actions for biodiversity: • At least 3% of every Harmony wheat field dedicated to flowers or hedges • Inter-season crops • Actions to sensitize farmers to the issue of biodiversity • Responsible use of pesticides

Your role in the implementation
Knowledge sharing
**Operational**

**Explanation of how you encourage implementation**

Through Harmony, we work with farmers across Europe to grow wheat in a way that helps conserve water, cares for the soil, protects and promotes biodiversity, and reduces carbon emissions. We also engage with governments and NGOs throughout the process, and 10 percent of farmers are audited each year by an independent organization to ensure compliance with the Harmony Charter. As a result, the program has led to a 20 percent reduction in pesticide use, and nearly 10 million bees and more than 25 species of butterflies have been observed in flowers sown around the Harmony fields.

**Climate change related benefit**

Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

**Comment**

At the end of 2020, 76 percent of our biscuits across the EU were made with Harmony wheat, including brands such as LU, Oro, LiGA, and Fontaneda. While we’ve made solid progress so far, we know there is still more to be done. Our ambition is to source 100 percent of our wheat need in the EU by 2022. To date, more than 1,600 farmers have joined the program. In 2020, 215,330 tons of wheat flour was produced by our 17 millers and 26 cooperatives.

**Management practice reference number**

MP4

**Management practice**

Fertilizer management

**Description of management practice**

Farmers in our Harmony program grow wheat in a sustainable way to prevent the usage of pesticides and fertilizers, preserve water and soil reduce carbon emissions, through:

- Rigorous Selection of seeds for the resilience and quality of our biscuits
- Crop rotation to minimize treatment
- Principled use of water and reasoned treatment at the last resort

In North America, our wheat farmers are adopting innovative practices to optimize pesticide and fertilizer use, growing all of the wheat we need for our Triscuit brand, with a lower environmental footprint.

**Your role in the implementation**

Knowledge sharing

Operational

Procurement

**Explanation of how you encourage implementation**

Through Harmony, we work with farmers across Europe to grow wheat in a way that helps conserve water, cares for the soil, protects and promotes biodiversity, and reduces carbon emissions. We also engage with governments and NGOs throughout the process, and 10 percent of farmers are audited each year by an independent organization to ensure compliance with the Harmony Charter. As a result, the program has led to a 20 percent reduction in pesticide use, and nearly 10 million bees and more than 25 species of butterflies have been observed in flowers sown around the Harmony fields. Since 2015, we’ve partnered with Michigan State University (MSU) and our supplier of soft white wheat, Cooperative Elevator Company (Coop), a 100+ year-old cooperative. In partnership with MSU and Coop, we engage a group of about 100 family farmers each year to track their farming practices, use of inputs such as fertilizer, and their yield. The group anonymously tracks their own year-on-year performance, as well as their performance versus peers.

**Climate change related benefit**

Emissions reductions (mitigation)

**Comment**

At the end of 2020, 76 percent of our biscuits across the EU were made with Harmony wheat, including brands such as LU, Oro, LiGA, and Fontaneda. While we’ve made solid progress so far, we know there is still more to be done. Our ambition is to source 100 percent of our wheat need in the EU by 2022. To date, more than 1,600 farmers have joined the program. In 2020, 215,330 tons of wheat flour was produced by our 17 millers and 26 cooperatives. In 2018, MSU analyzed data over three years of the program and determined that farmers who used advanced agronomy practices improved their yields between 1.5 and 4 bushels per acre more than those who didn’t. Growers in this program collaborate and learn from each other, to produce the highest quality Triscuit wheat while considering the ecological footprint. As they enjoy a higher yield than peers outside the program, MSU and Coop’s agronomy team are working to make the learnings more widely accessible to all 1,100 Coop growers.

**Management practice reference number**

MP3

**Management practice**

Governmental or institutional policies and programs

**Description of management practice**

Programs to address deforestation risks linked to key supply chains, cocoa and palm oil, by engaging in sector-wide action coordinated with governments in key producing countries: Cote d’Ivoire and Ghana (cocoa) and Indonesia (palm oil).

**Your role in the implementation**

Financial

Knowledge sharing

Operational

**Explanation of how you encourage implementation**

In 2015, Mondelēz International was the first company to raise the issue of deforestation in the cocoa industry at the COP21 summit in Paris and the first chocolate maker to sign Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with the governments of Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire. We are a founding member of the Cocoa and Forests Initiative (CFI), a collaboration among the governments of Cote d’Ivoire and Ghana – the world’s two largest cocoa producers – as well as 30 cocoa and chocolate companies and other partners, is committed to ending deforestation, restoring forested areas and eliminating illegal cocoa production. Our action plans align to the CFI’s three focus areas of Forest Protection & Restoration, Sustainable Production & Farmers’ Livelihoods and Social Inclusion & Community Engagement, and feature the following commitments:

- We are one of the first chocolate companies to commit to map 100% of the farms in our Cocoa Life program in key origins to ensure that farmers are not operating in forested land. We’ve already mapped 71% of these farms covering 258,177 ha, using Global Forest Watch to assess the risk of tree loss. We’ve also engaged with primer forest levels and identified forested areas to be conserved.

- **Climate protection & restoration**
  - We’re the first organization to establish a strategy to reduce carbon emissions. We also engage with governments and NGOs throughout the process, and 10 percent of farmers are audited each year by an independent organization to ensure compliance with the Harmony Charter. As a result, the program has led to a 20 percent reduction in pesticide use, and nearly 10 million bees and more than 25 species of butterflies have been observed in flowers sown around the Harmony fields.

- **Sustainable Land Use & Farmers’ Livelihoods**
  - In palm oil, we worked with the Government of Indonesia and other partners to develop the Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (SPO) Initiative to help strengthen smallholder farmers, support national policy reform and reduce deforestation through public-private partnerships. This led to the publication in 2017 of Indonesia’s first-ever National Action Plan (NAP) for sustainable palm oil, which provides a national framework for reform. We also helped Conservation International and other partners to create the Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods, an initiative focused on collective action to drive economic development, reduce poverty and improve natural resource management in the Indonesian provinces of North
Sumatra and Aceh. The project supports the aims of the NAP.

Climate change related benefit
Emissions reductions (mitigation)
Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

Comment
For palm oil: We also helped Conservation International and other partners to create the Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods, an initiative focused on collective action to drive economic development, reduce poverty and improve natural resource management in the Indonesian provinces of North Sumatra and Aceh. The project supports the aims of the NAP.

Management practice reference number
MP5

Management practice
Land use change

Description of management practice
Programs to address deforestation in key supply chains--cocoa and palm oil--by engaging suppliers (traders) and producers.

Your role in the implementation
Financial
Knowledge sharing
Operational
Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation
Our climate change strategy addresses deforestation in our raw material supply chain, with a particular focus on cocoa and palm oil. Our Palm Oil Action Plan requires suppliers to improve practices across their own entire operations and require the same from their upstream suppliers. It also focuses on risk assessment and engagement of third-party suppliers to drive accountability for traded oil. Key requirements include: 1. Take full responsibility for eliminating deforestation in their own operation and upstream supply chain by mapping and monitoring all plantations and adopting a “suspend and engage” approach requiring immediate suspension of companies involved in deforestation. 2. Action against the exploitation of worker human rights through adopting the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) Priority Industry Principles on forced labor. 3. Improve traceability and transparency by maintaining, and regularly publishing, universal mill lists with group level owners clearly indicated, as well as using satellite technology to map and monitor sources of palm. 4. Demonstrate implementation of supplier progress against this updated Palm Oil Action Plan as a prerequisite of doing business with Mondelēz International. 5. From 2020, we require traceable, forest-monitored palm oil from mills across our supply chain. New requirements include traceability to plantation and satellite monitoring covering all palm oil concessions supplying mills attributed to the company, against the deforestation criteria set out in its Palm Oil Action Plan. Due to education and training provided through the Cocoa Life program, farmers are choosing not to expand into protected forests and are focused on protecting the land where cocoa is grown. Since 2016, we have promoted a coordinated strategy and supply chain transparency by openly publishing our farm mapping updates online. This marked the first time a large cocoa sourcing company had disclosed locations of the cocoa farms they source from. As of 2020, 71% (167,795) of Cocoa Life registered farms, spanning over 258,177 ha, have been mapped and they are not in priority protected forest areas. In partnership with the United Nations Development Programme, as of 2020 we distributed 2,186,243 economic shade trees on cocoa farms in Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire and Indonesia to restore forest lands and make farmer cocoa yields more productive.

Climate change related benefit
Emissions reductions (mitigation)
Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

Comment

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) Do you engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence public policy on climate-related issues through any of the following?
Direct engagement with policy makers
Trade associations
Other

C12.3a
(C12.3a) On what issues have you been engaging directly with policy makers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of legislation</th>
<th>Corporate position</th>
<th>Details of engagement</th>
<th>Proposed legislative solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify (Sustainable palm oil)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We co-chair the Consumer Goods Forum’s Palm Oil Working Group, which published palm oil sourcing guidelines for members during 2015; we sat on Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil board from 2014-2018 and contributed actively to the development of RSPO Principle and criteria for sustainable production of palm oil; we supported the NY Declaration on Forests; we supported UNDP's work with the Government of Indonesia and companies to support the scale-up of sustainable palm oil in Indonesia via a commodity platform approach. This led to the publication in 2017 of Indonesia’s first-ever National Action Plan (NAP) for sustainable palm oil, which provides a national framework for reform. Currently we co-chair CGF - Forest positive coalition of action and contribute towards development of standards and roadmaps towards elimination of deforestation from commodity supply chains.</td>
<td>The goal is to support the scale-up of sustainable palm oil in Indonesia via jurisdictional initiatives such as the Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods, an initiative set up by Conservation International and public-sector partners focused on collective action to drive economic development, reduce poverty and improve natural resource management in the Indonesian provinces of North Sumatra and Aceh. The project supports the aims of the NAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate finance</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We announced our commitment to combat deforestation in cocoa at the UN Climate Summit COP21, where world leaders met in Paris to negotiate a new climate agreement. Mondelēz International committed to lead private sector action in Côte d'Ivoire’s national program to combat deforestation in cocoa. These actions will contribute to the United Nations sponsored REDD+ programme, with financial support from the World Bank. In January 2018, we agreed to a similar REDD+ partnership with the government of Ghana. In October 2018, we published a case study on our pilot REDD+ programme in Côte d'Ivoire, which is publicly available online.</td>
<td>In Côte d'Ivoire, we work together with the Ivorian government and other experts to map and monitor forested areas, and train farmers in good agricultural practices and agroforestry. In Ghana, Mondelēz International is contributing $5 million USD over five years to the Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Program (GCCFRP), which aims to significantly reduce the high rate of deforestation and forest degradation, as well as their associated greenhouse carbon emissions, from cocoa farming within Ghana’s High Forest Zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C12.3b) Are you on the board of any trade associations or do you provide funding beyond membership?

Yes

(C12.3c) Enter the details of those trade associations that are likely to take a position on climate change legislation.

Trade association: Consumer Goods Forum

Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Please explain the trade association’s position

The Consumer Goods Forum (“CGF”) is a global, parity-based industry network that is driven by its members to encourage the global adoption of practices and standards that serve the consumer goods industry worldwide. It brings together the CEOs and senior management of some 400 retailers, manufacturers, service providers, and other stakeholders across 70 countries, and it reflects the diversity of the industry in geography, size, product category and format. Its member companies have combined sales of EUR 3.5 trillion and directly employ nearly 10 million people, with a further 90 million related jobs estimated along the value chain. It is governed by its Board of Directors, which comprises more than 50 manufacturer and retailer CEOs. The Consumer Goods Forum’s environmental sustainability work positions the consumer goods industry as a leader in tackling climate change, reducing waste and improving environmental stewardship in global supply chains. In pulling its weight to tackle climate change, the CGF has identified three key areas where its members are well-positioned to effect significant change. These are: • Reducing food waste across operations and throughout the rest of the value chain • Tackling deforestation • Phasing out the most polluting refrigerants To help the industry align around a common set of targets, CGF members have publicly committed to certain business practices through resolutions on deforestation (2010), refrigeration (2010 and 2016) and food waste (2015); these issues continue to be recognised as significant sources of greenhouse gasses. There is additional work with stakeholders to drive progress towards broader international goals, such as those set by the UN Sustainable Development Goals with a focus on developing partnerships (SDG 17). The CGF’s environmental work is also working on SDG 12 (ensure sustainable consumption for all), SDG 13 (Combat climate change and its impacts) and SDG 15 (Protect the planet). By joining forces and acting collectively, members of The Consumer Goods Forum can have a transformative impact.

How have you influenced, or are you attempting to influence their position?

We actively help develop CGF’s refrigeration, deforestation and food waste positions and we resolved to do our part in achieving the Forum’s goal of assisting countries achieve net-zero deforestation. We remain active in helping CGF develop its work in this area and co-chaired the development of sourcing guidelines for palm oil - published during 2015 - and contributed to discussions between CGF and the Tropical Forest Alliance.

(C12.3d) Provide details of the other engagement activities that you undertake.

In December 2019, we signed the United for the Paris Agreement letter of support for staying in the Paris Agreement: [https://www.unitedforparisagreement.com/](https://www.unitedforparisagreement.com/)

In 2016, we were one of more than 600 US-based companies that signed the “Business Backs Low-Carbon USA” letter calling on US policy makers to continue to support the transition to a low-carbon economy and the Paris Agreement.

(C12.3f)
C12.3f What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with your overall climate change strategy?

To maintain consistency, engagement is coordinated by a corporate sustainability team, which includes key functions involved in setting and delivering sustainability strategy, including the Corporate and Government Affairs function, which has responsibility for external engagement. In addition, our Public and Government Affairs team includes sustainability as part of its integrated global strategy. Decisions to participate in engagement relating to climate change are reviewed by key members of the sustainability and public and government affairs teams, under the leadership of the Vice President and Chief Impact Officer and VP and Chief of Global Communications and Government Affairs.

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**
2020_MDLZ_Snacking_Made_Right_Report.pdf

**Page/Section reference**

**Content elements**
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

**Comment**
Our Snacking Made Right annual report explains our response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in p

**Publication**
In mainstream reports

**Status**
Complete

**Attach the document**
MONDELEZ-INTERNATIONAL-INC_10K_2021.pdf

**Page/Section reference**
pp 8-9- Sustainability and Wellbeing section pp 20- Macroeconomic and Industry Risks- Climate change might adversely impact our supply chain or our operations

**Content elements**
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emission targets

**Comment**

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?

No

C15. 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.
(C15.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Corresponding job category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President and Chief of Global Impact, Sustainability, and Well-being</td>
<td>Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC. Supply chain module

(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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26581000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC0.2

(SC0.2) Do you have an ISIN for your company that you would be willing to share with CDP?

Yes

SC0.2a

(SC0.2a) Please use the table below to share your ISIN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISIN country code (2 letters)</th>
<th>ISIN numeric identifier and single check digit (10 numbers overall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>6092071058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesting member</th>
<th>Scope of emissions</th>
<th>Allocation level</th>
<th>Allocation level detail</th>
<th>Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e</th>
<th>Uncertainty (±%)</th>
<th>Major sources of emissions</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Allocation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahold Delhaize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>506462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made:

As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that Ahold Delhaize will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelēz International provides to Ahold Delhaize via this process and Ahold Delhaize will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by Ahold Delhaize related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to Ahold Delhaize is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesting member</th>
<th>CVS Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of emissions</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation level</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation level detail</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e</td>
<td>60646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty (±%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major sources of emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation method</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that CVSHealth will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelez International provides to CVSHealth via this process and CVSHealth will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by CVSHealth related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to CVSHealth is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesting member</th>
<th>J Sainsbury Plc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of emissions</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation level</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation level detail</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e</td>
<td>91942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty (±%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major sources of emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation method</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that Sainsbury will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelez International provides to Sainsbury via this process and Sainsbury will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by Sainsbury related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to Sainsbury is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesting member</th>
<th>Kesko Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of emissions</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation level</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation level detail</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e</td>
<td>17831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty (±%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major sources of emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation method</td>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that KESKO will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelez International provides to KESKO via this process and KESKO will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by KESKO related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to KESKO is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.
KESKO related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to KESKO is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

**Requesting member**

S Group

**Scope of emissions**

Please select

**Allocation level**

Please select

**Allocation level detail**

<Not Applicable>

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

25774

**Uncertainty (±%)**

No

**Major sources of emissions**

Please select

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that S Group will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelēz International provides to S Group via this process and S Group will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by S Group related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to S Group is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

**Requesting member**

Target Corporation

**Scope of emissions**

Please select

**Allocation level**

Please select

**Allocation level detail**

<Not Applicable>

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

221189

**Uncertainty (±%)**

No

**Major sources of emissions**

As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that Target Corporation will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelēz International provides to Target Corporation via this process and Target Corporation will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by Target Corporation related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to Target Corporation is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

**Requesting member**

Walmart, Inc.

**Scope of emissions**

Please select

**Allocation level**

Please select

**Allocation level detail**

<Not Applicable>

**Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

1900280

**Uncertainty (±%)**

No

**Major sources of emissions**

Please select

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that Target Corporation will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelēz International provides to Target Corporation via this process and Target Corporation will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by Target Corporation related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to Target Corporation is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.
Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Data covers Walmart global including Sam's. As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that Walmart, Inc. will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelēz International provides to Walmart, Inc. via this process and Walmart, Inc. will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by Walmart, Inc. related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to Walmart, Inc. is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

Requesting member
Wal Mart de Mexico

Scope of emissions
Please select

Allocation level
Please select

Allocation level detail
<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e
117689

Uncertainty (±%)
No

Major sources of emissions

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Data covers Walmart Mexico & Central America. As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that Wal Mart de Mexico(Walmart) will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelēz International provides to Walmart via this process and Walmart will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by Walmart related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to Walmart is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

Requesting member
Coop Danmark A/S

Scope of emissions
Please select

Allocation level
Please select

Allocation level detail
<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e
23811

Uncertainty (±%)
No

Major sources of emissions

Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

As this is sensitive confidential information for our company, we expect that Coop Danmark A/S will maintain the confidentiality of any information that Mondelēz International provides to Coop Danmark A/S via this process and Coop Danmark A/S will use the information solely for purposes of the CDP. Our company should not be identified in any external communications by Coop Danmark A/S related to the CDP without our prior approval. Lastly, it is important to note that any data that we are providing to Coop Danmark A/S is our best estimate and we do not warrant or represent to the accuracy of the information that we provide for this process.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation challenges</th>
<th>Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing the different emission factors of diverse and numerous geographies makes calculating total footprint difficult</td>
<td>Mondelēz has various product categories with different emissions profiles, depending on raw materials, production processes and technologies. Our annual footprint analysis is performed at an enterprise level not product level. And our product mix varies across different markets and customers. Therefore, in order to have our emissions allocated to each different customer in each market, we would need to allocate a very large amount of resources to generate a very complex model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

No

SC2.2

(SC2.2) Have requests or initiatives by CDP Supply Chain members prompted your organization to take organizational-level emissions reduction initiatives?

No

SC4.1

(SC4.1) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?

No, I am not providing data

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am submitting to</th>
<th>Public or Non-Public Submission</th>
<th>Are you ready to submit the additional Supply Chain questions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investors</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes, I will submit the Supply Chain questions now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms