Evonik Industries AG

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

04/09/2025, 10:57 am

Contents

[internal]

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:
☑ English

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

Select from:
☑ EUR

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Privately owned organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Evonik is one of the world's leading specialty chemicals companies. Our strengths include the balanced spectrum of our business activities, end-markets, and regions. Around 80 percent of sales generated by our growth divisions come from marketleading positions, which we are systematically expanding. This strong competitive position is based on collaboration with customers, innovative capability, and integrated technology platforms. Our specialty chemicals products make an indispensable contribution to the benefits of our customers' products, which generate their success in global competition. Close cooperation with customers enables us to build up a deep knowledge of their business, so we can offer products tailored to their specifications and extensive technical service. Technology centers and customer competence centers play an important role in this around the world. Market-oriented research and development is an important driver of profitable, resource-efficient growth. Sustainability is integrated into our strategic management process. Our goal for the future is to substantially increase the proportion of sales from attractive growth businesses with a clear focus on sustainability (Next Generation Solutions). Evonik supports the objectives of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. That is underscored by our commitment to the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) 3. We aspire to be climate-neutral by 2050. Evonik has a presence in more than 100 countries, and 84 percent of sales are generated outside Germany. We have production facilities at 104 locations in 27 countries on six continents and are therefore close to our markets and our customers. Our largest production sites, for example, in Marl, Wesseling, and Rheinfelden (Germany), Antwerp (Belgium), Mobile (Alabama, USA), Shanghai (China), and Singapore, have integrated technology platforms, most of which are used by several operating units. Consequently, our procurement activities also have a global focus. Raw materials and supplies, technical goods and services, energy, and other operating supplies are sourced

either regionally or globally. Forward-Looking Statements:The following answers to the questions of the Carbon Disclosure Project prepared by Evonik include forward-looking statements that are subject to risks and uncertainties, including those pertaining to the anticipated benefits to be realized from the proposals described herein. Evonik has based these forward-looking statements on its views with respect to future events and financial performance. Actual financial performance could differ materially from that projected. Forward-looking statements represent estimates and assumptions only as of the date that they were made. The information contained in these answers is subject to change without notice and Evonik does not undertake any duty to update the forward-looking statements, and the estimates and assumptions associated with them, except to the extent required by applicable laws and regulations.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.4.3) Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.4.4) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 1 emissions data for

Select from:
☑ 2 years

(1.4.5) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 2 emissions data for

Select from:
☑ 2 years

(1.4.6) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 3 emissions data for

Select from:

☑ 2 years

[Fixed row]

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

15500000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

238295092

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

DE000EVNK013

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

D2R90Y117

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

EVNK01

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

B5ZQ9D3

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

41GUOJQTALQHLF39XJ34

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

327288155

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Slovakia
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Norway
☑ Turkey
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Luxembourg
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for all facilities

(1.8.2) Comment

Data is provided for all production facilities. Sites without production activities, e.g., warehouses, RD&I facilities, offices, etc. are not reported.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ako

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.747999

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

134.381573

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Americana

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-22.729113

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-47.347173

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ami-Machi

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.016169

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

140.246337

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Antwerp

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.307393

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.31539

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Arifiye

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.703845

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

30.388103

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Barra do Riacho

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-19.83155

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-40.062489

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bayport - Pasadena

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.626079

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.041048

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bekasi-Cikarang

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-6.280365

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

107.14223

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bekasi-Timur

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-6.249116

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

107.013564

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Birmingham (USA) - Lakeshore Pkwy

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.44037

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.850126

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bitterfeld

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.635592

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

12.295575

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Blair

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.538206

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-96.103547

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bonn-Beuel

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.740798

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

7.128155

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Calvert City

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.044797

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-88.353416

Row 17

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Castro

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-24.048119

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-50.392051

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Changchun

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.86486

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

125.38602

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Charleston

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.983818

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.931797

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chester

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.836168

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.372279

Row 21

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Clayton

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.480908

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-2.183736

Row 22

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Dahlenburg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.18882

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

10.74218

Row 23

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Darmstadt

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.876567

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.634729

Row 24

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Deer Park

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.731447

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.100568

Row 25

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Delfzijl

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.311594

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

6.965865

Row 26

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Dombivli

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

19.204258

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

73.097976

Row 27

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Dossenheim

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.442434

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.666165

Row 28

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Duisburg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.497146

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

6.762357

Row 30

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Essen - Goldschmidtstr.

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.463132

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

7.01901

Row 31

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Etowah

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.278652

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-84.539889

Row 32

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Garyville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.045163

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.629596

Row 33

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Geesthacht

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.437999

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

10.345874

Row 34

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Gibbons

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.855769

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-113.256852

Row 35

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Greensboro

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.043312

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.789462

Row 36

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ham

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.74619

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

3.084927

Row 37

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hamina - Telakkatie

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

60.553499

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

27.169125

Row 38

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hanau-Wolfgang

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.119612

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.964153

Row 39

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Havre de Grace

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.545887

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.09717

Row 40

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Herne

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.514028

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

7.184226

Row 41

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hopewell

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.293145

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-77.265958

Row 42

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Isehara

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.39275

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

139.298086

Row 43

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Janesville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.671082

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-89.041975

Row 44

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Jhagadia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

21.646728

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

73.150232

Row 45

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Jilin

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.93478

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

126.51843

Row 46

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Krefeld

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.319638

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

6.5795

Row 47

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

La Zaida

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.325852

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.427248

Row 48

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lafayette, IN

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.391757

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.934358

Row 49

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lafayette, LA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.167554

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-91.986714

Row 50

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lauterbourg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.962184

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.197698

Row 51

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lenzing

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

47.977172

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.622834

Row 52

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Leverkusen

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.010944

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

6.994601

Row 53

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Little Rock

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.655764

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-92.306821

Row 54

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Luumäki

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

60.911763

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

27.562974

Row 55

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Maitland

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.446398

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.923829

Row 56

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mapleton

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.565464

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-89.72323

Row 57

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Marl

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.678795

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

7.09492

Row 58

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Medicine Hat

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.059972

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-110.721912

Row 59

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Memphis - Stiles Dr.

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.189782

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.052291

Row 60

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Milton

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.779308

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-88.96771

Row 61

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mobile

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.51587

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-88.138124

Row 63

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Morrinsville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-37.659269

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

175.529131

Row 64

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Morrisburg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.912888

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.15732

Row 65

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Nanjing

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.2241

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

118.90889

Row 66

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Nanning

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

23.15866

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

108.27461

Row 67

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Nanping-Laizhou

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

26.57261

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

118.27638

Row 69

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Obernburg am Main

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.835075

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

9.152302

Row 70

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Onzonilla

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.542756

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-5.580743

Row 71

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ostende

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.213979

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

2.975958

Row 72

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pandino

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.412063

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

9.546938

Row 73

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pasadena

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.7183

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.1921

Row 75

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Puerto General San Martin

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-32.715927

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-60.738692

Row 76

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Qingdao

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.07408

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

120.14777

Row 78

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rayong

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

12.730339

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.139088

Row 79

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Reserve - Plant

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.0696

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.5784

Row 80

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rheinfelden

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

47.570628

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

7.806436

Row 81

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rheinmünster

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.75211

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.01166

Row 82

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rodange - Route de Longwy

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.544707

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

5.819198

Row 83

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Roussillon

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.360759

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.79787

Row 84

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sandnes

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

58.852884

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

5.748928

Row 85

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saratoga Springs

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.063994

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.834454

Row 86

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Schörfling

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

47.95241

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.615545

Row 87

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Shanghai- MUSC

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.786593

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

121.458189

Row 88

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Shanghai-Xinzhuang

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.08584

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

121.38891

Row 89

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Singapore - Banyan Avenue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.256566

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.664549

Row 90

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Singapore - Gul Crescent

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.309593

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.662729

Row 91

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Singapore - Sakra Avenue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.2594

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.70722

Row 92

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Singapore - Tuas Road

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.309626

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.6502

Row 94

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Slovenska Lupca

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.752063

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

19.239865

Row 95

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Steinau

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.317292

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

9.443592

Row 96

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Taoyuan City

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.075933

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

121.183354

Row 98

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Tonawanda

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.973215

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-78.924886

Row 100

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ulsan

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.50146

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

129.31448

Row 101

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Umbogintwini

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.021687

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

30.87925

Row 102

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Vernon - Los Angeles

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.0136

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-118.2132

Row 103

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Waterford

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.820781

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.675161

Row 104

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Weißenstein

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

46.68239

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.72339

Row 105

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Weiterstadt

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.89113

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.614545

Row 106

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Wesseling

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.83326

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

6.976192

Row 107

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Weston

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.771848

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-84.098046

Row 108

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Wichita

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.5735

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-97.4266

Row 109

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Witten

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.439962

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

7.352646

Row 110

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Wittenburg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.50142

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

11.098296

Row 111

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Yokkaichi

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.940694

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

136.658464

Row 112

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Zhenjiang

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.22826

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

119.42665

Row 113

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Zubillaga

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.694292

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-3.004477

Row 114

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rizhao, Zhuhai Road

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.149059

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

119.328619

Row 115

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saraburi

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

13.742811

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

100.550273
[Add row]

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

Bulk inorganic chemicals

☑ Chlorine and Sodium hydroxide

☑ Soda ash

Bulk organic chemicals

☑ Polymers

Other chemicals

☑ Specialty inorganic chemicals

☑ Specialty organic chemicals

☑ Other, please specify :Pharma excipients and cell culture ingredients, medical device materials, feed additives (amino acids, probiotics), food additives

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

Palm oil

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

90000

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm kernel oil derivatives

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.22.19) Please explain

palm is a strategic feedstock for specific business lines

Soy

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Manufacturing

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

Select from:
☑ Direct soy only

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

500

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Soy derivatives

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders relevant and included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

The basis for our mapping is our Portfolio Sustainability Assessment according to the WBCSD method. This assessment is audited annually and decribes positve and negative signals for Product-Application-Region-Combinations (PARC) along the entrie value chain. We have mapped our entire chemcical sales in presently approximatedly 600 PARC units. The PSA is integrated into our strategy process, so any positive or negative signal can be adressed with strategic levers and is considered in resource priorization and portfolio steering.
[Fixed row]

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End-of-life management

(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

Select all that apply

☑ Preparation for reuse

☑ Recycling

[Fixed row]

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

Palm oil

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

(1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:
☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped for this sourced commodity

Soy

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ Tier 1 suppliers
[Fixed row]

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

0

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

actual business year

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

3-year time horizon of Mid-term Planning

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

4

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

15

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

We quantify all long-term statements for the time period 2028 to 2040. This includes the 10 year timeframe of the Strategic Management Process (SMP), but goes beyond to capture scenario effects on long-term decision in Innovation and CapEx allocation.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

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

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:
☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply
☑ Site-specific
☑ Local
☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools
☑ WRI Aqueduct
☑ WWF Water Risk Filter
☑ Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer
☑ WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter
☑ IBAT – Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool
☑ TNFD – Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures
☑ LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare) approach, TNFD

Enterprise Risk Management
☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards
☑ Life Cycle Assessment
☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :WBCSD Portfolio Sustainability Assessment

Other

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Tornado

☑ Landslide

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Pollution incident

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

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

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Soil erosion

☑ Water stress

☑ Sea level rise

☑ Coastal erosion

☑ Temperature variability

☑ Scarcity of land resources

☑ Land loss to desertification

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

☑ Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

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

☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Ocean acidification

☑ Groundwater depletion

☑ Declining water quality

☑ Rationing of municipal water supply

☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level

☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Limited or lack of transboundary water management

☑ Increased pricing of water
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
☑ Limited or lack of river basin management
☑ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards
☑ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Changing customer behavior
☑ Uncertainty in the market signals
☑ Other market, please specify **:**Loss of our product application due to transformation of the industry driven by sufficiency, consistency, or efficiency

Reputation

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

Technology

☑ Transition to bio-based chemicals
☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies
☑ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources
☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems
☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
☑ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources
☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities
☑ Water utilities at a local level
☑ Other commodity users/producers at a local level

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We have substantially improve a) the granularity of our risk and opportunity profile b) the monitization of transition and physical risks as EBITDA impact c) the quantification of scenarios with the help of NGFS Version IV scenario data and other scenario data sources. We also have engaged our organization in workshops to better define transition risks and opportunities, risks and opportunities of climate change and the exposure of our manufacturing sites to phsical risks of climate change.

[Add row]

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

	Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed	Description of how interconnections are assessed
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Our transition plan provides an overall picture including interconnections betweens Dependencies, Impacts, Opportunities and Risks*

[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

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

☑ Areas of importance for ecosystem service provision

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

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

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

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Priority location are assessed in the scope of our risk and opportunity analysis based on different tools (WWF Water and Biodiversity Risk Filter, IBAT). This evaluation is yearly updated.

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

Select from:

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

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

2024-09-04_List_Priority_Location_Water_Biodiversity.xlsx
[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Frequency of effect occurring: dependent on the respective effect (e.g., "once" for market risks like changing customer preferences, but "yearly" for flooding of production assets. once, quarterly, every two years etc. Time horizon over which the effect occurs: i.e., short-, medium-, and long-term in line with your time horizons reported in 2.1. Likelihood of effect occurring: i.e., the percentage chance the effect will occur Often, multiple metrics are used together as part of a matrix approach. If using a matrix approach, describe how the metrics selected in column 6 “Metrics considered in definition” are used in combination and their respective weightings. Describe how often the metrics, and their thresholds, are selected, reviewed, and updated.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Frequency of effect occurring: dependent on the respective effect (e.g., "once" for market risks like changing customer preferences, but "yearly" for flooding of production assets. once, quarterly, every two years etc. Time horizon over which the effect occurs: i.e., short-, medium-, and long-term in line with your time horizons reported in 2.1. Likelihood of effect occurring: i.e., the percentage chance the effect will occur Often, multiple metrics are used together as part of a matrix approach. If using a matrix approach, describe how the metrics selected in column 6 "Metrics considered in definition" are used in combination and their respective weightings. Describe how often the metrics, and their thresholds, are selected, reviewed, and updated.
[Add row]

(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health?

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

With respect to all chemical substances we do work with "Binding technical documents (BTD)". These BTDs do provide a guideline to assess severity classes for each chemical substance depending on the amount of potentially released chemical substance. We do differentiate between severitiy class "5" which means "very low risk level" for water and environment up to severity class "1" which is defined as potentially "disastrous". Based on the result of our assessments technical measures are put in place for risk mitigation. e.g. for the production of our feed additive methionine we do need to control the chemical reaction with hydrocyanic acid, a very toxic chemical. Based on our BTDs very comprehensive measures to avoid any incident are in place; e.g. regular and intensive trainings for the personnell in charge, high quality personal protective equipment is provided and highly sensitive technical sensor are installed. We follow specific standards, including ISO 14001; This applies to the whole of the Evonik Group and is based on legal requirements, internal policies, and standard operating procedures. Our divisions and regions are subject to annual audits to monitor compliance with DIN EN ISO 14001 validation at our production locations. Any failure of complying with legal requirements has to be presented to the board as part of our annual management review.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:
☑ Phosphates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Reduction of excess P flows is part of oursustainability focus area "SafeguardEcosystems". It is relevant for the sourcing ofbio-based raw materials and our animal nutritionand aquaculture products lead to a significantreduction of nitrogen excretion in poultry, swine,salmon and shrimp production. In ourmanufacturing plants Phosphates is an additional standard effluent parameters. A high concentration may lead to eutrophication i.e.un-controlled growth of water plants

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

In our production effluent undergoes multi-step chemical andphysical treatment in our wastewater treatment facilities. Separate drainage systems prevent production effluent and coolingwater becoming mixed. This means that cooling water can be discharged into rivers with rainwater without treatment. Wehave also built high-performance collector systems as part of our water protection measures. These are used forintermediate storage of peak wastewater loads which could overburden the wastewater treatment facilities. In this way,wastewater can subsequently be fed gradually to the treatment plants. Wastewater discharged from our sites is carefullymonitored by regular sampling and continuous measuring equipment. Procedures are implemented successfully if sites arenot subject to any violation of legal requirements. Efficiency and success of the process is evaluated by randomized internalaudits (at least every three years) checking also legal compliance and annual third parties audits during the process ofverifying the limited assurance engagement on the chapters of environmental performance in the sustainability report.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Nitrates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Reduction of excess N flows is part of oursustainability focus area "SafeguardEcosystems". It is relevant for the sourcing ofbio-based raw materials and our animal nutritionand aquaculture products lead to a significantreduction of nitrogen excretion in poultry, swine,salmon and shrimp production. In ourmanufacturing plants Nitrogen is an additional standard effluent parameters. Ahigh concentration may lead to eutrophication i.e.un-controlled growth of water plants

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

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

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

A large service portfolio for the animal feed industry to reduce nitrogen excretion. In ourproduction process for nitrogen-containing products (amino acids, amines, we operate at highest N conversion rates, whichmaintains the nitrogen levels in waste water at a minimum. In our production effluent undergoes multi-step chemical andphysical treatment in our wastewater treatment facilities. Separate drainage systems prevent production effluent and coolingwater becoming mixed. This means that cooling water can be discharged into rivers with rainwater without treatment. Wehave also built high-performance collector systems as part of our water protection measures. These are used forintermediate storage of peak wastewater loads which could overburden the wastewater treatment facilities. In this way,wastewater can subsequently be fed gradually to the treatment plants. Wastewater discharged from our sites is carefullymonitored by regular sampling and continuous measuring equipment. Procedures are implemented successfully if sites arenot subject to any violation of legal requirements. Efficiency and success of the process is evaluated by randomized internalaudits (at least every three years) checking also legal compliance and annual third parties audits during the process ofverifying the limited assurance engagement on the chapters of environmental performance in the sustainability report.

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

In supply chain: raw materials comming fromnatural extraction or recycling operations. Inproduct use-phase and end of life,biodegradability of susbtances entering thewater cycle is an important sustainabilityassessment criteria. In manufacturing Chemicaloxygen demand (COD) accounts for the highestproportion of wastewater loads. This is theconcentration of all substances in thewastewater that can be oxidized under certainconditions. A very high concentration COD maylead to a low content of oxygen in the water. Anextreme low oxygen content of water may

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

We have R&D programs to enable acess to recycled raw materials, eliminating the need for natural extraction. We develope bio-degradable ingredients for personal-care application and work with our customers to reformulate their products to eliminate microplastic and other not readilybiodegradable chemicals from their products. In production we report any unintentional chemical spill or leakage and settargets as part of the integrated management system. Production effluent undergoes multi-step chemical and physicaltreatment in our wastewater treatment facilities. Separate drainage systems prevent production effluent and cooling waterbecoming mixed. This means that cooling water can be discharged into rivers with rainwater without treatment. We havealso built high-performance collector systems as part of our water protection measures. These are used for intermediatestorage of peak wastewater loads which could overburden the wastewater treatment facilities. In this way, wastewater cansubsequently be fed gradually to the treatment plants. Wastewater discharged from our sites is carefully monitored byregular sampling and continuous measuring equipment. Procedures are implemented successfully if sites are not subject toany violation of legal requirements. Efficiency and success of the process is evaluated by randomized internal audits (atleast every three years) checking also legal compliance.

Row 4

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Hazardous substances

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

The release of hazardous substances can resultin serious impact on the environment e.g.surface water or groundwater With repect todirect operation major incidents may lead to aninterruption of production. Thus, we ensure noout of plant toxicity in our operations handlinghazardous substances. We ensure that wesource only from suppliers with a propermanagement of hazardous substances. An weensure that hazardous substances are notreleased into the water cycle in the product usephase.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

We have developed the safety at Evonik initiative into a group-wide management approach to implement a safety culture inall areas of occupational, plant and transportation safety. It defines binding principles of action that give our managers andemployees reliable guidance on safety-compliant conduct in their daily work. Together with substance specific hazardanalysis measures to prevent any spilling or leaking of hazardous substances are put in place. Procedures are implementedsuccessfully if sites are not subject to any violation of legal requirements. Efficiency and success of the process is evaluatedby randomized internal audits (at least every three years) checking also legal compliance and annual third parties auditsduring the process of verifying the limited assurance engagement on the chapters of environmental performance in thesustainability report.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

(3.1.3) Please explain

Environmental risks for plastics exist in direct operation and in downstream value chain, but non with the potential to have substantive effect on the organization. The plastics topics are - Avoiding microplastic in cosmetic formulations - Non-biodegradable pharma excipients for therapies under pharma regulation - Avoiding production waste in high performance polymers

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- ☑ China
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ France
- ☑ Austria
- ☑ Netherlands
- ☑ New Zealand
- ☑ Taiwan, China
- ☑ Republic of Korea
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Finland
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Slovakia
- ☑ Singapore

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Evonik has GHG emitting production sites with scope 1 emissions falling under EU ETS and other carbon pricing mechanisms. In Europe the exposure to this risk is partially mitigated by free certificates, which will, in our opinion, not be issued anymore by 2034. This comes due to the introduction of the CBAM (Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism), which decreases free allocation from 2026 onwards to 2034 to zero. In the first place for certain products only, but expanding to all EU ETS1 activities by 2030. The EU also scheduled the pricing for the EU ETS2 by 2027, which will affect all sectors not eligible to the EU ETS1. In Canada, China and Singapore carbon prices have been announced to increase in future years. For Long-term projections we anticipate further countries adopting or extending carbon pricing schemes.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

- ☑ Medium-term
- ☑ Long-term
- ☑ The risk has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(3.1.1.15) Effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting year

For the actual year we quantify actual scope 1 emissions under a carbon pricing regime. In 2024 we will have direct cost for EU ETS1 certificates and due to carbon taxes in countries like Canada and Singapore. Other regions with carbon pricing regimes and effecting Evonik are rather insignificant for the time being.

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

The financial effect figures are calculated as annual direct cost arising from emission trading schemes like the EU ETS1 or emission taxation like in Singapore. Direct cost from scope 1 GHG direct emissions and from indirect scope 2 emissions are included in our forecast in mid-term planning and are estimated to have an EBTDA impact. Possible deviations from planning are captured in our Enterprise Risk Management. For long-term projections, carbon pricing related to scope 1 & 2 emissions will add direct cost that translate into EBITDA impact.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.18) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

76000000

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

210000000

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

300000000

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

509000000

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

14042000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. The financial effect figures are calculated as annual direct cost arising from emission trading schemes or emission taxation. Direct cost from scope 1 GHG direct emissions and from indirect scope 2 emissions are included in our forecast of the actual business year and in mid-term planning. Possible deviations from planning are captured in our Enterprise Risk Management. For the actual year, and "Short-term" we quantify actual scope 1 emissions under a carbon pricing regime. For the "medium-term" horizon the number depends mainly on the development of the EU ETS carbon prices, which we expect to grow only moderately as industry will continue to have low capacity utilization and thus lower carbon emissions. We estimate that the maximum annual number will not exceed 30% of the 2023 number. For Long-term projections we quantify our future scope 1&2 emissions from 2028 to 2040. As the 2030 emissions will be in line with our SBTi commitment and are supported by measures and budget, we freeze the 2030 emissions until 2040 to calculate a scenario dependent exposure of the base case. The direct cost exposure we calculate with scenario derived carbon prices for 2025, 2030, 2035, and 2040 from the most recent NGFS scenario data (Version IV). For the minimum 2040 figures we take the "Current Policies" carbon prices und for the maximum 2040 figures we take the "Net-Zero" carbon prices.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

3096000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. For our SBTi 2030 targets we had estimated a total 700 million additional capital investment to reduce our scope 1&2 emission by 25% on a 2021 basis. For consistency reasons we calculated the long-term cost, estimating the average annual CapEx and OpEx for the 2028-2040 horizon. We considered steeper reductions of GHG emission, increasing abatement cost, changing fuel and electricity prices, and innovation efforts between 2030 and 2040. The cumulative estimate of CapEx, R&D and OpEx for the long-term horizon calculates to 3,096,000,000.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Evonik has decided to mitigate the direct cost risk by reducing our scope 1&2 emission along a well below 2-degree reduction pathway. The main levers to reduce our scope 1&2 emissions are securing access to non-fossil electricity, heat integration and electrification of heat, and many small efficiency projects leading to a reduced freshwater intake and better energy-efficiency. After 2030 we see additional opportunities in substituting natural gas-based steam reforming with green or blue hydrogen, electrification of dryers and further electrification of process heat. This response to the carbon pricing risk will ensure that our manufacturing facilities will maintain their license to operate as permitting and regulatory bodies will focus more on emission reduction of industrial manufacturing sites. This response also has emphasized the importance of heat integration and avoiding wasted heat in industrial manufacturing next to securing renewable electricity via PPAs as our operation will electrify more in the future. Our Project EAGER (Evonik Ambition for Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction) identifies opportunities and tracks the success of scope 1&2 related measures to ensure that we meet our 2030 climate targets. The SBTi aligned scope 1&2 emission reductions are also anchored in the Long-term Incentive Plan of board members and executives.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We procure calm oil and palm-kernel oil derived alcohols and esters as raw materials for our products in the scope of the EU Deforestation Regulation.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased capital expenditures

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The risk has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.1.1.15) Effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting year

The regulation requires us to implement new IT solutions to prove the absence of deforestation in locations, we are connected to via our palm-derivative supply chain. Ultimately, we would stop selling the products in scope of EU DR, if we are not able to verify deforestation free.

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

Ultimately, we would stop selling the products in scope of EU DR, if we are not able to verify deforestation free.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater traceability of commodities

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

We are unable to disintegrate the cost to verify deforestation-free from other sustainability related cost. In general, we expect increasing efforts to verify a certain sustainability performance in the supply chain, and our customers will also support this journey and ask for a credible sustainability performance in the supply chain.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Evonik is preparing its IT tools to deal verify sustainability performance for locations that are passed up to us via our supply chains. We engage with suppliers and with customers for a better environmental and social performance in our supply chains.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Increased pricing of water

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Spain

☑ Turkey

☑ South Africa

☑ United States of America

☑ Thailand

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Amur

☑ Douro

☑ Ebro

☑ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

For the sites located in regions facing high and very high water scarcity, we expected an increase of water costs at the long term.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The financial effect figures are a direct increase of production costs (water)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

201000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. (min. cumulative figure for 2025-2027: 0, max cumulative figure for 2025-2027: 201,000,000) For the minimum cumulative figure, we assume that an increase of water cost was not implemented in the considered regions. For long term projections, the financial effect figures are calculated as a direct increase of water costs. We determined with the WWF Water Risk filter sites with high and very water risks in the category water scarcity for 2050 in the pessimistic scenario. Then, we used the Water Risk Monetizer Tool from the Ecolab to monetize incoming water risks. The monetary value considers water availability, water quality and competing uses of water within local water basins across a 3-, 5- and 10-y time horizon. In this approach, costs and/or benefits that are not currently included in the water market price. These non-market values include, for example, human-health impacts, environmental impacts and the future costs associated with water treatment. We assume for the max figure and for the long-term time horizon an internalization of these water risks. Depending of the site location, it corresponds to a cost increase of 1 to 4 dollars per m3 water in the year 2034 (source: Water Risk Monetizer) and 2 to 8 dollars per m3 in the year 2040 (own assumption). We derived the figures for the years 2028 to 2040 based on the calculated values for 2034 and 2040.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. We are unable to disintegrate the water related responses from the responses on GHG reduction and energy efficiency, as GHG reduction are often correlated to reductions in energy use and freshwater intake. Measures to reduce specific freshwater intake are integrated heat management which enables a reduction of the cooling water demand, and process improvements reducing waste-water amount or load. Therefore, the cost for risk responses are included in the responses we have estimated for risk1.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Evonik has decided to mitigate water risks by reducing its specific freshwater intake by 3% between 2021 and 2030. This is to be achieved by a wide range of measures at our production sites. These measures were identified as part of the EAGER project. Reducing our freshwater intake – especially in sites facing water stress and increased water costs - will enable us to respond to this risk. WE additionally have workshops with sites in water scare regions to make them aware of the relevance of water, our impact, and to collect ideas to reduce freshwater intake.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Other market risk, please specify :1) Sufficiency: application reduction because circular. less material-intensive solutions 2) Consistency: Products or applications not aligned with sustainability expectations 3) Efficiency: applications loose against more efficient solutions

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Morocco
☑ Nigeria
☑ Tunisia
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Turkey
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Denmark
☑ Germany
☑ Ukraine
☑ Pakistan
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China

☑ New Zealand

☑ Republic of Korea

☑ United Arab Emirates

☑ United States of America

☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The change of customer behavior, driven by changing consumer preferences, policy changes, and the macro-economic environment, may lead to a demand change and/or different requirements for materials and ingredients for the 5 systems, our end-markets contribute to: 1) Food System and Agriculture 2) Manufactured Goods 3) Built Environment 4) Transport & Mobility 5) Health & Care. This risk is valid for all countries we sell to. However, the extend of this risk differs significantly for different markets. For example, for our feed additive business, the globally continued growth of poultry meat driven by a consumption shift from more expensive meat sources to poultry in times of high inflation is favorable. On the other side, high interest rates and inflation have a negative impact on construction and thus the demand for chemicals sold into the construction sector is reduced. Sufficiency-related risks we see in sectors with a lot of waste or very inefficient mode of action (i.e. automotive for urban mobility, textiles, consumer electronics). Consistency risks we see in sectors that transition to a non-fossil raw material basis or have other social or environmental sustainability impacts they need to reduce along the supply chain. Efficiency risks we see for example in market applications that are tied to high energy, water, material, or land consumption and will be inferior to alternative, often circular solutions.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Change in revenue mix and sources

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

For Long-term planning we estimate a substantial transformation of our downstream value chains driven by interconnected transformation drivers, such as demographics leading to labor shortages and fiscal pressure, high inflation, growing government dept, social tensions and migration, geopolitical conflicts, and physical impacts of climate change. Thus, we anticipate that our product portfolio will continue to change significantly in the coming decades and we will see a change of revenue mix and sources.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

375000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For Long-term projections until 2040 we describe for our Strategic Business Units (SBU) the main market transition risks for the applications of our products into in the 3 categories: sufficiency, consistency, and efficiency. We quantify these categories for different scenarios. We then identify the future revenue stream at risks and with a projection of the EBITDA margin calculate the future EBITDA impact of this risk category in the scenario space. The minimum market transition risk we see in the "Current Policies" scenario. The maximum value is with the "Low

Demand" Scenario, as this scenario assumes a significant adoption of circular business models in many sectors and consequently, a significant reduction of chemicals used in manufacturing.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

598000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. As a response to this risk, we estimated that the mid-range scenario long-term revenue at risk will be substitute by new products addressing future needs in the same magnitude. Our R&D focus on the 3 Innovation Growth Areas "Accelerate Energy Transition", "Enable Circular Economy", "Advance Precision Biosolutions" will put us in a good position to advance our portfolio to future needs. To quantify the cost in a cumulative manner - to be consistent with the cumulative risk exposure- we quantified the intangible and tangible assets we need to supply via investments to support the additional sales to address this risk. We are aware, that there is additional cost in R&D and marketing and

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The response will create additional production capacity for existing NGS or new NGS from our innovation pipeline. We anticipate NGS to grow much faster than PERFORMER, TRANSITIONER or CHALLENGED products (Portfolio Sustainability Assessment categories with neutral or negative sustainability signals along the value chain). Therefore, focusing on NGS growth will off-set any market transition risks we will encounter until 2030. Beyond 2030 leading to 2040, we will continue to focus on NGS growth. To ensure that we capture market signals on sustainability early enough, we perform the PSA annually for last year's business and for a projection within the strategy horizon, to verify the status of our NGS. Additionally, we steer our R&D resources allocated to projects towards NGS contribution.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Technology

☑ Transition to increasing renewable content

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ India
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Israel
☑ Latvia
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Croatia
☑ Hungary
☑ Iceland
☑ Ireland
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Malta
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Mexico
☑ Monaco
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Serbia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Ecuador
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal

☑ Romania
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ Liechtenstein
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea
☑ China, Macao Special Administrative Region
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Singapore
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Montenegro
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

With increasing pressure to reduce Scope 3 emissions coming from end consumers and OEMs, the pressure to find low-carbon feedstocks for our own products increases. Some of these low-carbon alternatives come as drop-in solutions with no or minor additional cost. No risk is attached to these solutions. For some feedstocks, there is not even a viable technical solution to produce them in a sustainable way. For these feedstocks, there is a risk to lose revenues to system competition or to competing process technologies with a different feedstock base. And some feedstocks are available with low Scope 3 emissions, but at a significantly higher price. For these latter cases, a new balance in the market will develop, shaped by buying power towards suppliers of sustainable feedstocks, pricing power towards customers and the balance of passing on additional feedstock cost and gain market shares by not passing on all cost increases. We are aware that non-GHG emission related social and environmental externalities are not yet properly priced in for renewable raw materials. As pressure on sustainable supply chains will increase with EU CSDDD and consumer pressure, we consider these additional risks by tracking carbon footprint, blue water footprint and agricultural land use for our main production platforms and alternative solution. As most of Evonik's products are specialty additives and represent a very small fraction of the materials used in end-markets and consumer applications, we se

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Change in revenue mix and sources

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The risk has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.1.1.15) Effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting year

The effect in the reporting year is rather small, because the new value chains and supply chains are yet to be formed. In the reporting year, the effect is mostly limited to trials, pilots and other activities with low overall significance.

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

For Long-term planning we estimate a substantial transformation of our upstream value chains driven by the demand for circular (recycled, bio-based or CO2-based) feedstocks in our end markets and the reduction of fuel-intensity of process heat by waste heat reduction and electrification. The demand pull will take place at different speed in different sectors and value chains. Personal care and automotive industries, the market pull is already seen, for other industries it will occur once the regulatory and/or consumer pressure is high enough. We therefore expect our feedstock structure and supplier structure to change significantly in the next decades. Depending on buying power for circular feedstocks and pricing power in our markets, the effects on our own financials will develop differently between our value chains and will shape our portfolio development.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.18) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

5000000

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

15000000

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

45000000

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

19000000

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

242000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For the actual business year we estimate our effort to secure circular raw materials to test the willingness to pay at 5,000,000 additional cost, we will be able to pass on to our customers to some extent. Midterm we expect to increase this number. For Long-term, we describe two categories in the scenario space: a) Competing Technologies with Advantages for Internalization of Cradle to Gate Manufacturing Externalities b) Manufacturing Landscape Transformation. For competing technologies, we estimate the distance to a planetary boundary compliant *cradle to gate footprint for GHG emissions, blue water intake and agriculture land use as potential cost risks with scenario specific prices of GHG emission, blue water and agricultural land. The ability to pass on these cost increases to customers reflects our anticipated future competitiveness of the production platforms under the scenario specific conditions and has a big influence on the future gross EBITDA impact. For manufacturing landscape transformation, we estimate the revenue at risk. With a simulation of future EBITDA margins, we calculate a gross future EBITDA impact. The NET Zero scenario represents the max level of gross risk exposure. The CURRENT POLICIES Scenario describes the min level of exposure. We have just started the assessment with default values and expect further accuracy in the coming years.*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

416000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. As a response to this risk, we estimated that the mid-range revenue at risk will be substitute by new products with renewable raw materials in the same magnitude. Our 3 Innovation Growth Areas “Accelerate Energy Transition”, “Enable Circular Economy”, “Advance Precision Biosolutions” will advance our portfolio to future needs. To quantify the cost in a cumulative manner - to be consistent with the cumulative risk exposure- we quantified the intangible and tangible assets we need to supply via investments to support the additional sales to address this risk. We are aware, that there is additional cost in R&D and marketing and sales, but we are unable to disintegrate them.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As a response to this risk, we ensure access renewable content for existing production platforms, and we develop new products with added customer value with renewable raw materials. We are engaging with our customers and suppliers to transition to a higher renewable content. Our product portfolio management ensures that we reduce carbon intensity and the renewable content in our raw material basis along our SBTi commitment. Our climate transition plan under construction guides long-term decisions to ensure progress beyond the SBTi time frame. The response will create additional production capacity for existing NGS or new NGS from our innovation pipeline aligned with our SBTi targets and the climate transition plan. We anticipate NGS to grow much faster than PERFORMER, TRANSITIONER or CHALLENGED products (Portfolio Sustainability Assessment categories with neutral or negative sustainability signals along the value chain). Therefore, focusing on NGS growth will off-set any market transition risks we will encounter until 2030. Beyond 2030 leading to 2040, we will continue to focus on NGS growth. To ensure that we capture market signals on sustainability early enough, we perform the PSA annually for last years sales and for a projection within the strategy time horizon, to verify the status of our NGS. Additionally, we steer our R&D resources allocated to projects towards NGS contribution. We incorporate *carbon intensity and renewable content KPIs in the R&D stage gate process to ensure that those requirements are included in the stop/go decisions for new solutions directly.*

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Indonesia
☑ Brazil
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Mexico
☑ Austria
☑ Singapore
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Chronic physical risks of climate change have a significant impact on all sectors we supply with our products. Temperature changes result in melting road surfaces and buckling railway lines as well as road damages due to melting of permafrost. Solar panels efficiency is negatively affected by higher temperatures. Thermal power plants are limited by cooling water temperatures. Data centers and housing require additional cooling. Heating demand in housing is reduced. Water has a nigher need for treatment and sanitation. Communicable diseases spread more easily, agriculture has major challenges with water supply, manufacturing operations need to perform under higher temperature and with reduce cooling water intake. Working conditions in manufacturing and professional use of hazardous substances will need to respond to high temperature and humidity. Where personal protection equipment is an option under mild ambient temperatures, worker protection ambitions and heat management plans will phase out product applications that demand the use of PPE. So, on the one side many of the applications of specialty chemicals in all economic sectors will undergo tremendous changes. On the other side we will see an effect on global GDP, as labor productivity will be severely affected. Heat stress impact is pronounced in countries with a high portion of GDP depending on human labor in agriculture and construction.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Change in revenue mix and sources

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

We expect to see a significant impact on the revenue mix and source, however due to the complexity of the matter we are unable to predict this change. The most appropriate way to quantify the exposure to this risk today is the exposure to GDP loss, which will directly translate into reduced demand for our products.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

261000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For the quantification we work with estimations on GDP loss in different scenarios. In the LOW DEMAND scenario we see the minimum figure, in the CURRENT POLICIES scenario we see the maximum number. We are aware that these numbers are largely underestimated because damage function simulations purely focused on labor productivity impacts do not properly capture the gross risks of heat stress.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

416000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. In R&D engage in significant efforts R&D on application technology, to adjust our offerings to customer needs as climate change progresses. But we are unable to disintegrate the number. Instead, we have taken the same approach as for other risks that materialize through a change in revenue sources. To quantify the cost in a cumulative manner - to be consistent with the cumulative risk exposure- we quantified the intangible and tangible assets we need to supply via investments to support the additional sales to address this risk.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

By making climate change adaptation a strategic focus in our application technology we ensure that we continuously evolve our product and service offerings and support our customers. To position ourselves close to our customers with our innovative ideas, minimize geopolitical risks, and enable us to respond quickly to regional trends, we are driving forward our globalization strategy, for example, through innovation hubs in attractive growth regions. Our R&D network includes more than 40 sites with core and special technology sites including the following sites with selected focus topics: • Marl/Essen (Germany): specialty chemicals from CO2-fermentation, Lithium-recycling and -recovery, water electrolysis for green hydrogen, leightweight applications, insulation materials and 3D Printing • Hanau/Darmstadt (Germany): Future mobility, viscosity modifier, pharmaceutical excipients and actice ingredients, Lipids for nucleic acid based medicines • Schörfling/Lenzing (Austria): Gas separation membranes for renewable natural gas and other gases • Allentown (Pennsylvania, USA): research focuses on applications for amines, high-performance polymers, and polyurethanes and carbon capture • Birmingham (Alabama, USA): Parenteral drug delivery and medical device solutions • Lafayette (Indiana, USA): High potent active pharmaceutical ingredients, Lipid innovation center • Vancouver (BC, Canada): Nucleic acid-based medicines and liposomal drug delivery, lipid nanoparticle formulations and aseptic packaging • Mumbai (India): research focuses on formulations for the pharmaceuticals industry and biodegradable oral excipients, catalysts for oils and lubricants and hydrogenation of oil and fats, and the development of applications for construction and agriculture • Shanghai (China): research focuses on applications for lithium-ion batteries, cosmetics, and silicone • Singapore: research focuses on cell cultures and skin models, coating additives

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Japan
☑ Brazil
☑ France
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ South Africa
☑ United States of America
☑ Belgium
☑ Germany
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ Indonesia

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Rhine
☑ Rhone
☑ Danube
☑ Parana
☑ Mississippi River
☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)
☑ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Flood events can impact our businesses' operations when water is overflowing industrial areas. Evonik has production sites in areas already facing high to very high flooding risks or expected to face high to very high flooding risks in the mid and long term according to the SSP 1 scenario pathway integrated into the WWF Water Risk Filter. In order to identify sites facing flooding risks, we are using data from the WWF Water Risk Filter (indicator BRC 2). For mid and long term projections we are also using data from the WWF Water Risk Filter (reference year 2030 and 2050 with optimistic and pessimistic scenarios). According to the WWF Water Risk Filter, 30 sites are expected to be located in areas with a high flooding risk, 22 sites in areas with very high flooding risks and 4 sites in areas with extreme flooding risks (2050/pessimistic).

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The risk has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.1.1.15) Effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting year

Flood events can impact our businesses' operations when water is overflowing industrial areas. Evonik has production sites in areas already facing high to very high flooding risks or expected to face high to very high flooding risks in the mid and long term according to the SSP 1 scenario pathway integrated into the WWF Water Risk Filter. In order to identify sites facing flooding risks, we are using data from the WWF Water Risk Filter (indicator BRC 2). For mid- and long-term projections we *are also using data from the WWF Water Risk Filter (reference year 2030 and 2050 with optimistic and pessimistic scenarios). According to the WWF Water Risk Filter, 30 sites are expected to be located in areas with a high flooding risk, 22 sites in areas with very high flooding risks and 4 sites in areas with extreme flooding risks (2050/pessimistic).*

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

Flooding of chemical plants leads to a limitation and/or a disruption in production. Based on interviews conducted with a few selected sites, an inundation depth 30-40 cm (depending of sites) would result in disruption of production. Nevertheless, lower inundation depth also have financial consequence: forklift trucks need to be brough to the highest area of the chemical site to keep them dried and cannot be used during the time of the flooding so that they cannot be used for transporting goods and necessary raw materials for production. Those limitations in production or disruption would directly result in EBIDTA losses. Additional CAPEX would also be necessary for repairing damages. The financial effect figures are calculated considering a business interruption for a selected number of operating days per year for sites located in watershed with high and very high flooding risks at mid and long term according to the WWF Water Risk Filter tool.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.18) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

8000000

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

22500000

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

67500000

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

668000000

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

748000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For the "medium" term horizon, we estimate the figures for 2025 to 2027 (cumulative), assuming that the financial effect will remain as high as for the year 2023 as the minimum number. For long term projections, the financial effect figures are calculated as annual direct cost arising from business interruption. With the WWF Water Risk filter we determined sites with high and very-high flooding risks (BRC 2) for 2030 and 2050. For a flooding risk below 3.4 no business interruption was considered, for a flooding risk between 3.4 and 4.2 (i.e. from medium to high), a business interruption of 5 days is assumed. For a risk index between 4.2 and 5 (i.e. high risk), 10 days of business interruption and for a risk index above 5 (i.e. extreme risk), 15 days of business interruption. The number of days of business interruption per year was multiplied by the site-specific business interruption damage. Then we could derive the overall costs for the reference year 2030 and 2050 in the optimistic (min) and pessimistic (max) scenarios.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Develop flood emergency plans

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. We do not have any financial cost available to estimate the cost impacts of these risks in terms of rise in insurance premiums and additional CapEx to make sites and supply chains more resistant to flooding events or to relocate manufacturing.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

In order to mitigate this risk, we develop flood emergency plans for exposed site. Future investment needs for flood resistant infrastructure and utilities or in the worst case for relocation are not available yet.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk8

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Spain

☑ Turkey

☑ Thailand

☑ South Africa

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Amur

☑ Douro

☑ Ebro

☑ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Evonik has several sites in regions expected to have high, very high and extreme risk of water scarcity in 2050 according to the SSP 1 and SSP3 scenario pathways integrated into the WWF Water Risk Filter. 11 sites are expected to be located in areas with a high water stress risk, 2 sites in areas with very water stress risks and 2 sites in areas with extreme water stress risks.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Water stress might lead to a limitation and/or a disruption in production depending of its length and magnitude. Based on interviews conducted with a few selected sites, several consequences might be resulting: limitation in water intake so that production need to be restricted or completely stopped in case of extreme drought.

Those limitations in production or disruption would directly result in EBIDTA losses. The financial effect figures are estimated considering a business interruption for a selected number of operating days per year for sites located in watershed with high and very high water stress risk for long term time horizon according to the WWF Water Risk Filter tool.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

21000000

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

68000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For long term projections, the financial effect figures are calculated as annual direct cost arising from business interruption. First, we determined with the WWF Water Risk filter sites with high and very water risks in the category water scarcity for 2030 and 2050 which are the two timelines available in the scenarios considered by the tool. Then, we made the following assumptions: no business disruption expected for a water scarcity index below 3.4 (i.e. from low to medium), for a water scarcity risk (BRC 1 for water scarcity) between 3.4 and 4.2 (high risk), a business interruption of 5 days is assumed. For a risk index between 4.2 and 5 (very high risk), 10 days of business interruption and for a risk index above 5 (extreme risk), 15 days of business interruption. The number of days of business interruption per year was multiplied by the site specific daily costs for non-production (insurance data). Then, we could derive the overall costs for the reference year 2030 and 2050 in the optimistic (min) and pessimistic (max) scenarios. We derived the figures for the years 2028 to 2040 based on the calculated values for 2030 and 2050.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. We are unable to disintegrate the water related responses from the responses on GHG reduction and energy efficiency, as GHG reduction are often correlated to reductions in energy use and freshwater intake. Measures to reduce specific freshwater intake are integrated heat management which enables a reduction of the cooling water demand, and process improvements leading to reduced waste-water volume or load. Therefore, we cost for risk responses are included in the responses we have estimated for risk1.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Evonik has decided to mitigate water risks by reducing its specific freshwater intake by 3% between 2021 and 2030. This is to be achieved by a wide range of measures at our production sites. These measures were identified as part of the EAGER project. Reducing our freshwater intake – especially in sites facing water stress and increased water costs - will enable us to respond to this risk.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk9

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Turkey
☑ Austria
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Hungary
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Singapore
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Amur
☑ Nile
☑ Douro
☑ Meuse
☑ Rhine
☑ Rhone
☑ Danube
☑ Seine
☑ Amazonas
☑ Elbe River

☑ Rio Grande
☑ Albany River
☑ Columbia River
☑ Delaware River
☑ Mississippi River
☑ Apalachicola River
☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra
☑ Alabama River & Tombigbee

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

SVHC exposure: The definition properties for substances of very high concern (SVHC) are extended for endocrine disruption (ED) and persistent-mobile-toxic (PMT) hazard classes. This will relate to a broader range of exposure to sales with products that contain 0.1% of SVHC. We understand that specific exposure differs for consumer use, widespread professional use, and contained industrial use, however the definitions of these applications are not well aligned yet along value chains. This is the reason, why we describe here the maximum exposure, purely on the basis of the potential hazard class exposure according the presently discussed candidate list. So, we consider this risk assessment as a worst case asssessment.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Change in revenue mix and sources

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

For Long-term planning we estimate that chemicals pollution will become much more regulated, not only in the EU. Consumer facing companies will but a high focus and reducing potential exposure of consumers and the environment to disputed chemicals. Substances with SVHC properties will be the primary focus of these efforts and we need to ensure that our products stay below the 0.1% threshold and enable our customers to do the same. Therefore, we anticipate the risk puts present revenues at risks and our effort to reformulate and pr substitute will generate new revenue opportunities.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

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

183000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For Long-term projections until 2040 we describe the worst case SVHC exposure for our production platform products as percentage of sales at risk, independent from the application in the use phase. Thus, the number represents a worse case for the future revenue at risk. With a projection of the EBITDA-margin we calculate the future EBITDA impact of this risk category in the scenario space. The minimum market transition risk we see in the "Current Policies" scenario. The maximum value is with the "NET ZERO" Scenario, as this scenario assumes global collaboration not only on climate change mitigation but also on bringing novel entities in the environment back into the planetary boundary. (min. cumulative figure 2028-2040: 0, max cumulated figure 2028-2040: 1,575,000,000)

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

292000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. As a response to this risk, we estimated that the long-term revenue at risk will be substitute by new products addressing future needs in the same magnitude. Our 3 Innovation Growth Areas "Accelerate Energy Transition", "Enable Circular Economy", "Advance Precision Biosolutions" will put us in a good position to advance our portfolio to future needs. To quantify the cost in a cumulative manner - to be consistent with the cumulative risk exposure- we quantified the intangible and tangible assets we need to supply via investments to support the additional sales to address this risk.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The response will create additional production capacity for existing NGS or new NGS from our innovation pipeline. We anticipate NGS to grow much faster than PERFORMER, TRANSITIONER or CHALLENGED products (Portfolio Sustainability Assessment categories with neutral or negative sustainability signals along the value chain). Therefore, focusing on NGS growth will off-set any market transition risks we will encounter until 2030. Beyond 2030 leading to 2040, we will continue to focus on NGS growth. To ensure that we capture market signals on sustainability early enough, we perform the PSA annually for previous year sales and for futre sales within the strategy horizon, to verify the status of our NGS. Additionally, we steer our R&D resources allocated to projects towards NGS contribution.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

15267000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

15267000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. As amount of financial metric take 2023 revenues As vulnerable we define the substantive exposure in any of the time-horizons to transition and physical risks For climate change, in the actual year we have a low number of app. 200 million sales that has a negative signal in 2023 PSA. Long-term, however, we consider our complete revenues at risk, as our entire portfolio in the given scenario space will be exposed to carbon pricing and physical risks along the value chain, all having an impact on revenue streams to at least some extent.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

70000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

70000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For water and forest, in the actual year we have a low vulnerability assessed in our Portfolio Sustainability Assessment of 560 million revenues tied to disputed chemical properties and 70 m revenues tied to biodiversity or *deforestation issues in our supply chain. These values will increase for the present portfolio as we will move towards a higher share of circular raw materials, as they have a high water and land footprint in the supply chain.*

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

560000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

560000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially *from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. For water and forest, in the actual year we have a low vulnerability assessed in our Portfolio Sustainability Assessment of 560 million revenues tied to disputed chemical properties and 70 m revenues tied to biodiversity or deforestation issues in our supply chain. These values will increase for the present portfolio as we will move towards a higher share of circular raw materials, as they have a high water and land footprint in the supply chain.*

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Assets

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

11819000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

11819000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. We assume that our tangible and intangible assets will be vulnerable to transition and physical risks of Climate Change.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Assets

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. The exposed assets we estimate as 0, as our assets can be transformed to raw materials not associated to these risks. Also, our measures to reduce scope 1&2 emissions will ensure that our asset exposure to these risks remains non-substantive

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Assets

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. The exposed assets we estimate as 0, as our assets can be transformed to raw materials not associated to these risks. Also, our measures to reduce scope 1&2 emissions will ensure that our asset exposure to these risks remains non-substantive

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

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

793000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

793000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

280000000

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. CapEx to address Climate Change risks to assets and revenue streams we as CapEx spending with an EAGER tag and as CapEx spending for or portfolio transformation via growth of our Next Gen Solutions. For 2023 the number is approximated to 280,000,000.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

0

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. The CapEx efforts are included in the CapEx efforts to address the climate related risk exposure and cannot be disintegrated.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ CAPEX

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

0

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by

law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. The CapEx efforts are included in the CapEx efforts to address the climate related risk exposure and cannot be disintegrated.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Amur

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). -   Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. -   The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. In this watershed, risks will be related to water scarcity, water quality and regulatory.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify **:**Black Sea

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. In this river basin, risks will be mainly related to water scarcity and quality.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Thailand

☑ Other, please specify **:**Gulf of Thailand

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. In this river basin, risks will be related to water scarcity, flooding and regulatory.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify **:**Indian Ocean

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding risk and water scarcity are the most material issues in this river bassin.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding, water quality and reputational risks will be the most material issues win this river bassin.

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☑ Other, please specify :Tiete

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). -   Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. -   The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding, water quality and reputational risks will be the most material issues win this river bassin.

Row 12

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Yalu Jiang

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding and reputational risks will be the most material issues in this watershed.

Row 16

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify **:**Yellow Sea & East China Sea

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

3

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Water scarcity, water quality, flooding and reputational risks will be the most material issues in this watershed.

Row 17

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify **:**Arabian Sea

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world.This riber bassin is expected to face risks related to water scarcity, quality, flooding but also regulary and reputational risks.

Row 18

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Arkansas and white River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. In this river bassin, risks will be related to water quality and regulatory.

Row 19

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Ebro

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Water quality will be the most material risk oin this river bassin.

Row 20

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Mississippi River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

4

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from *partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding, water qiuality and reputational risks are expected to be the most material in this watershed.*

Row 21

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Ohio

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). -   Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks.

The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding and reputational risks will be the most material issues in this river bassin.

Row 22

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☑ Other, please specify :South Atlantic

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding, regulatory and reputational risks will be the most material issues in this watershed.

Row 23

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Taiwan, China

☑ Unknown

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding, regulatory and reputational risks will be the most material in this river bassin.

Row 24

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding, regulatory and reputational risks will be the most material in this watershed.

Row 25

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Zhu Jiang

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Several parameters have been considered in order to define which of our production sites are affected with water risks with substantive effects: - Water risks are expected to have a substantive effect when according to the WWF Water Risk Filter the risk index of a site is 3.4 i.e. high and very high water risks in 2050 in the scenario SSP 3 (pessimistic). - Sites have a high operational water risk (which was assessed based on interviews with sites) and/or a high water intensity (i.e. high water use for cooling purposes or directly as product). We are looking at an overall water risk i.e. taking into account physical, regulatory and reputational risks. The risk index was calculated based on weighting factors provided by the WWF Water Risk Filter for the chemical and health care sector. Water is crucial for most of our manufacturing processes: ither for cooling or directly used as a product. - The percentage of our global revenue that could be affected is estimated and depends on a range of factors such as the impact type, magnitude and duration, as well as the unique nature of the knock-on impacts on manufacturing sites from partial or full business disruption. Nevertheless, this percentage remains low as the company has more than 100 sites all around the world. Flooding, reputational risks and regulatory are the most material in this river bassin.

[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*no comment needed*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ EU ETS
☑ Korea ETS
☑ Germany ETS
☑ Austria – ETS
☑ New Zealand ETS
☑ Fujian pilot ETS
☑ Alberta TIER - ETS
☑ Shanghai pilot ETS
☑ Singapore carbon tax

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

Alberta TIER - ETS

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

100

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

100

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

12/31/2022

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

14095

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

2901

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

16996

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

20511

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

NN

Austria – ETS

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

90

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

0

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

38623

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

38623

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

We act as a consumer of fuels and therefore only get the costs for püurchased allowances passed on by our supplier.

EU ETS

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

98

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

1147371

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

1077746

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

2517602

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Difference between sum of allocation and purchases vs. the emissions covered by surplus allowances

Fujian pilot ETS

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

100

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

100

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

115380

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

397

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

93085

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

22692

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

NN

Germany ETS

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

2.3

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

0

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

51649

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

51649

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Emisisons not verified yet

Korea ETS

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

100

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

100

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

56258

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

11

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

37710

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

NN

New Zealand ETS

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

100

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

100

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

9998

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

9998

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

NN

Shanghai pilot ETS

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

100

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

100

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

84553

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

28754

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

48994

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

NN
[Fixed row]

(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

Singapore carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

100

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

223014

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Currency is SGD
[Fixed row]

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

The Energy Management department (Evonik centre of competence for all relevant topics about energy economy) serves as central interface not only for the purchase of allowances and supporting the operational units when designing a purchasing strategy but also for monitoring the real emissions and the available allowances. Energy Management also supports the operational units in complying with the regulations. Among others, Energy Management is the central information hub within Evonik for emissions trading and carbon taxation systems.The strategy of Evonik around the world includes the consultation of the operational units and monitoring the regulatory developments. In consultation with the operational units and under consideration of the available certificates and the planned emissions, the needed allowances for the compliance will be purchased successively within the fourth trading period of the EU ETS as well as the German ETS. For the Fujian and Shanghai ETS, Evonik owns also a specialized department for supporting the operational units in this matter. An exchange between the EU and the Chinese department takes place, since both departments are being functionally steered by the same management.Same applies for the Korea ETS. Besides complying with the Fujian, Shanghai, EU, New Zealand and Korea ETS by purchasing certificates as well as the carbon taxation in Alberta, Austria and Singapore, Evonik is promoting internal energy efficiency measures via ISO 50001 (energy management system including energy policy, energy targets, energy performance indicators etc.), an internal service department improving the value chain globally (SEEC) and site-driven activities to reduce the need for certificates.Further more Evonik developed a new ambitious GHG emission reduction strategy and participates in the Science based Targets Initiative. This will help us to manage risks arising from the several global pricing regimes.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ Brazil

☑ Belgium

☑ Germany

☑ Slovakia

☑ Singapore

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Evonik has committed to reduce Scope 1&2 emissions by 25% until 2030 from a 2021 baseline. This is in line with a well below 2C trajectory of the Paris Climate Agreement and was validated by SBTi. One big lever in this respect is to switch purchased electricity to renewable sources. Evonik plans to have 100% purchased electricity from renewable sources by 2030. The next big lever is to switch own energy generation from coal to natural gas. Evonik has shut down its last coal fired power plants in Marl in Q2/2024 and produces heat and electricity from natural gas since then. The third big lever is our Next Generation Technologies. These are technologies that allow our operations to become more energy efficient. This increase in energy efficiency can be achieved either by optimizing or even changing the production process itself or by heat integration measures. Changes of the production process can be simple optimizations like the use of Advanced Process Control systems to ensure energy optimized process parameters. But it can also mean fundamental changes in the process with extensive R&D work to ensure that product characteristics are not changed by the new process. Heat integration can also be rather simple, like pre-heating of cold process streams with hot process or waste streams. But it can also be more sophisticated, with the use of heat pumps or mechanical vapor recompression.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

The anticipated effect on the financial position in the reporting period is dominated by the respective energy saving of each measure, but also reduced (or avoided) costs CO2 certificates play an important role in countries where CO2 pricing schemes are established. Financial effects are determined on a project basis and flow into the profitability calculation of each project, having a strong impact on prioritization of projects for implementation. Boundary conditions, such as energy prices and CO2 certificate prices are regularly updated to keep the assessment of the projects up to date.

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

The anticipated effect on the financial position in the future is dominated by the respective energy saving of each project, but also reduced (or avoided) costs CO2 certificates play an important role in countries where CO2 pricing schemes are established. Financial effects are determined on a project basis and flow into the profitability calculation of each project, having a strong impact on prioritization of projects for implementation. Boundary conditions, such as energy prices and CO2 certificate prices are regularly updated to keep the assessment of the projects up to date.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

2500000

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

33000000

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

50000000

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

0

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

0

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. The financial effect in the reporting year is the expected cumulated energy cost effect of relevant projects that are planned to be finalized in 2024. The financial effect in the medium-term is the expected cumulated energy cost effect of relevant projects that are planned to be finalized in 2025, 2026 or 2027. The minimum and maximum numbers represent different probabilities of realization of the projects. The financial effect in the long term is yet to be quantified based on scenario data and differentiated energy intensity targets.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. For our SBTi 2030 targets we had estimated a total 700 million additional capital investment to reduce our scope 1&2 emission by 25% on a 2021 basis. This equates to app. 75 million per year for additional CapEx until 2030. But to estimate the average annual investment for the long-term horizon we took into account that the decade between 2030 and 2040 will see steeper reductions of GHG emissions and that the abatement cost of measures will increase. Rising carbon costs will ensure that the measures still have a business case. The cost to realize this opportunity are included in the cost to address risk 1.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Projects with a positive (i.e., reducing) effect on GHG emissions are subject to the standard process for CAPEX allocation. Among others, achieving the committed 25% reduction of Scope 1&2 emissions by 2030 from a 2021 basis is a boundary condition in this process. All relevant projects have an associated CO2 effect and ensuring the SBTI target with the approved projects by 2030 is ensured in the planning process. We plan to switch the steam supply of our site in Antwerp from a dedicated CHP plant based on natural gas to a supply from a nearby waste incineration facility, where steam is produced as a by-product of incineration. This project is a good example for a resource efficiency opportunity, because it has a significant positive impact on energy cost and carbon emissions, which was the reason why this project was prioritized for realization.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We sell products which are based on raw materials falling into the scope of the EU Deforestation Regulation. Our ability to establish an IT solution to verify the absence of deforestation will allow us to have a better supply chain transparency and benefit our customers as they fulfill their deforestation-free obligations.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

We presently spend significant efforts to establish an IT solution that allows to interact with our suppliers and customers on the products and raw materials in scope. As we are confident that we establish a viable solution, we believe that we can benefit from a growing demand for deforestation-free products and have a better control over potential risks in our supply chain.

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

We presently spend significant efforts to establish an IT solution that allows to interact with our suppliers and customers on the products and raw materials in scope. As we are confident that we establish a viable solution, we believe that we can benefit from a growing demand for deforestation-free products and have a better control over potential risks in our supply chain.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

At the moment we are unable to quantify the cost for the opportunity.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We have identified the raw materials and products in scope of the regulation and interact frequently with suppliers and customers o verify that we can fulfill the requirements for existing products but also seize the opportunity to grow with EU-DR compliant products. We also interact with IT providers for solutions that allow us to fulfill the legal reqzirements to validate the absence of deforestation. At the same time these solutions shall fit to our data handling strategies and IT systems.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Improved resilience to future regulatory changes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ Spain

☑ France

☑ Germany

☑ Thailand

☑ South Africa

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :see. 3.2: Java, Yellow Sea & East China Sea, Arabian Sea

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Evonik with over 120 chemical manufacturing sites globally will see a rising exposure to regulatory risks in water scarce locations, where industry, agriculture and residential use compete for freshwater from water bodies that are also very relevant for biodiversity.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased value of fixed assets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Investments into site resilience will have a positive affect on the value of the fixed asset and also ensure a lower risk to business interruption and allow a more reliable supply chain steering.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Presently we are unable to quantify the necessary effort, as we have not fully understood the opportunity yet.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We perform workshops with highly exposed sites to make sites ware of the long-trm risiks and to understand the issue from a local perspective.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Increased resilience to impacts of climate change

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Spain
☑ France
☑ Germany
☑ Thailand
☑ Singapore
☑ South Africa

☑ Slovakia

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :see. 3.2: Java, Yellow Sea & East China Sea, Arabian Sea

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Evonik with over 120 manufacturing sites globally will see a rising exposure to acute and chronic physical risks of climate change. Investments to protect against these risks will increase the value of these fixed assets.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased value of fixed assets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Investments into site resilience will have a positive affect on the value of the fixed asset and also ensure a lower risk to business interruption and allow a more reliable supply chain steering.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Presently we are unable to quantify the necessary effort, as we have not fully understood the opportunity yet.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We perform workshops with highly exposed sites to make sites ware of the long-trm risiks and to understand the issue from a local perspective.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

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

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Argentina
☑ Netherlands
☑ Switzerland
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ France
☑ Sweden
☑ Belgium
☑ Denmark
☑ Germany

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We have several bio-based Next Generation Solutions (NGS) for fast moving consumer goods, cleaning applications, and health applications that not only avoid the use of fossil feed stock, but that use a biobased feed stock, which is not connected to deforestation and land use change. A prominent example are Rhamnolipids, which are 100% biodegradable and environmentally friendly. We consider biotechnology as a core competence of Evonik, to deliver bio-based and biodegradable products on a sustainable raw material and energy basis. Rhamnolipids, for example, are produced using a fermentation process that utilizes European corn sugar, eliminating the need for petrochemical feedstocks or tropical oils. Rhamnolipids are already used in numerous products today. Our innovation growth areas "Advance Precision Biosolutions" will accelerate this opportunity space with additional sales from existing and new solutions in this space.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

In the reporting period the opportunity has multiple effects on several financial aspects: • Revenue of NGS related to this opportunity • Higher capacity utilization of technology platforms that supply products for this opportunity • R&D expenditures to support this opportunity • Capital expenditures for new or existing production capacity related to this opportunity • Capital expenditures for acquisitions related to this opportunity • Additional direct cost for circular raw materials or renewable energy for products related to this opportunity To give an estimate for the reporting year we take the revenue growth over previous year for NGS related to this opportunity times previous year EBITDA margin.

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

For future time horizons the opportunity has multiple effects on several financial aspects: • Revenue of NGS related to this opportunity • Higher capacity utilization of technology platforms that supply products for this opportunity • R&D expenditures to support this opportunity • Capital expenditures for new or existing production capacity related to this opportunity • Capital expenditures for acquisitions related to this opportunity • Additional direct cost for circular raw *materials or renewable energy for products related to this opportunity To give an estimate for "mid-term" horizons, we consider only revenues growth of NGS related to this opportunity times the target EBITDA margin. For "long-term" horizon, we estimate the min and max NGS revenue growth from scenario data. To calculate the EBITDA impact we work with the target EBITDA margin.*

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

4600000

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

23800000

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

44100000

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

182000000

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

348000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by *law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. Basis are the NGS sales reported from our businesses in the PSA process prior to the annual strategy process. Reporting year: 2024 reporting year expected: 244,000,000 Growth NGS over 2023: 42,000,000 EBITDA Margin Evonik 2023: 10.8% Reporting year opportunity: 4,600,000 Mid-term: 2025-2027 mid-term expected: 433,000,000 Growth NGS mid-term: 189,000,000 for 3 years EBITDA Margin Evonik: 18% Min: -30%: 23,800,000 Max: 30%: 44,100,000 Long-term: Baseline Growth 2028-2040: 0% p.a. Based on Scenario specific end-market growth rates for NGS sales in scope we estimated NET-ZERO: CAGR 2028-2040: 8.84% p.a. LOW-DEMAND: CAGR 2028-2040: 0.46% p.a. FRAGMENTED WORLD: CAGR 2028-2040: 9.37% p.a. CURRENT POLICIES: CAGR 2028-2040: 1.03% p.a. Long-term sales: 2040 long-term Baseline: 433,000,000 (on 2027 level residing) Delta 2040 long-term FRAGM. WORLD: 1,933,000,000 (max) Delta 2040 long-term LOW DEMAND: 1009,000,000 (min) Long-term EBITDA opportunity: 2040 long-term Baseline: 0 2040 long-term FRAGM. WORLD: 348,000,000 2040 long-term LOW DEMAND: 182,000,000*

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

844000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. To quantify the cost in a cumulative manner - to be consistent with the cumulative opportunity exposure - we quantified the intangible and tangible assets we need to supply via investments to support the additional sales to address this opportunity. We are aware, that there is additional cost in R&D, marketing, and sales, but we are unable to disintegrate them. For consistency reasons, we only quantified additional assets to support additional revenue streams.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We will focus our growth investments on Next generation Solutions (NGS) to achieve our portfolio targets, which are anchored in our 2030 Sustainability Targets (50% NGS in our portfolio) and in our Long-term Incentive Plan. We will prioritize our innovation in specific Innovation Growth Areas: “Accelerate Energy Transition” is focused on solutions for the hydrogen economy, renewable natural gas, e-Mobility, carbon capture, wind and solar power and insulation materials for building energy efficiency to enable growth of the Clean Tech market, which by far show the highest growth rates in all scenarios. “Enable Circular Economy” will focus on attractive niches in the challenging environment of materials circularity including solutions for chemical recycling as well as the use of renewable or recycled raw materials. “Advance Precision Biosolutions” includes solutions that enable new pharmaceutical therapies, with a focus on nucleic acid based medicines, like used as Covid vaccines, and solutions for bio-based and bio-degradable specialty chemicals for cosmetic or cleaning applications

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp6

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

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

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Hungary
☑ Ukraine
☑ Portugal
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Israel
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland

☑ United States of America

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The effect of this opportunity are additional sales with "Next Generation Solutions" (NGS) with a positive sustainability contribution in energy efficiency and to enable the transition to renewable energy production, storage and distribution in many different sectors. Evonik's largest Clean Tech Opportunities are in i) energy transformation ii) efficient energy & mobility iii) green building v) sustainable consumer goods. Our annual Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA) ensures that the positive impact of our NGS is substantive for our downstream value chain and that we do not compromise this by any other negative sustainability signal along the value chain in the specific Product-Application-Region-Combination (PARC). This opportunity is linked to the risk 4 (market transition risk). We understand that system transformations in many sectors will affect the applications we today sell our product to. The focus of our capital investment and R&D resources on NGS allows us to generate sufficient opportunities to compensate future market transition risks. Our innovation growth areas "Accelerate Energy Transition" and "Enable Circular Economy" will accelerate this opportunity space with additional sales from existing and new solutions in this space.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

In the reporting period the opportunity has multiple effects on several financial aspects: • Revenue of NGS related to this opportunity • Higher capacity utilization of technology platforms that supply products for this opportunity • R&D expenditures to support this opportunity • Capital expenditures for new or existing production capacity related to this opportunity • Capital expenditures for acquisitions related to this opportunity • Additional direct cost for circular raw materials or renewable energy for products related to this opportunity To give an estimate for the reporting year we take the revenue growth over previous year for NGS related to this opportunity times previous year EBITDA margin.

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

For future time horizons the opportunity has multiple effects on several financial aspects: • Revenue of NGS related to this opportunity • Higher capacity utilization of technology platforms that supply products for this opportunity • R&D expenditures to support this opportunity • Capital expenditures for new or existing production capacity related to this opportunity • Capital expenditures for acquisitions related to this opportunity • Additional direct cost for circular raw materials or renewable energy for products related to this opportunity To give an estimate for "mid-term" horizons, we consider only revenues growth of NGS related to this opportunity times the target EBITDA margin. For "long-term" horizon, we estimate the min and max NGS revenue growth from scenario data. To calculate the EBITDA impact we work with the target EBITDA margin.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

10200000

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

39300000

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

73000000

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

65000000

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

165000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. Basis are the NGS sales reported from our businesses in the PSA process prior to the annual strategy process. Reporting year: 2024 reporting year expected: 1,961,000,000 Growth NGS over 2023: 93,000,000 EBITDA Margin Evonik 2023: 10.8% Reporting year opportunity: 10,100,000 Mid-term: 2025-2027 mid-term expected: 2,889 Growth NGS opp6 mid-term: 313,000,000 for 3 years EBITDA Margin Evonik: 18% Min: -30%: 39,400,000 Max: 30%: 73,100,000 Long-term: Baseline Growth 2028-2040: 0% p.a. Based on Scenario specific end-market growth rates for NGS sales in scope we calculated NET-ZERO: CAGR 2028-2040: 2.64% p.a. LOW-DEMAND: CAGR 2028-2040: 1.14% p.a. FRAGMENTED WORLD: CAGR 2028-2040: 2.00% p.a. CURRENT POLICIES: CAGR 2028-2040: 1.77% p.a. Long-term sales: 2040 long-term Baseline: 2,334,000,000 (on 2028 level residing) Delta 2040 long-term NET-ZERO: 917,000,000 (max) Delta 2040 long-term LOW DEMAND: 360,000,000 (min) Long-term EBITDA opportunity: 2040 long-term Baseline: 0 Delta 2040 long-term NET-ZERO: 165,000,000 Delta 2040 long-term LOW DEMAND: 65,000,000

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

366000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. To quantify the cost in a cumulative manner - to be consistent with the cumulative opportunity exposure - we quantified the intangible and tangible assets we need to supply via investments to support the additional sales to address this opportunity. We are aware, that there is additional cost in R&D and marketing and sales, but we are unable to disintegrate them. For consistency reasons, we only quantified additional assets to support additional revenue streams.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We will focus our growth investments on Next generation Solutions (NGS) to achieve our portfolio targets, which are anchored in our 2030 Sustainability Targets (50% NGS in our portfolio) and in our Long-tem Incentive Plan. We will prioritize our innovation in specific Innovation Growth Areas: “Accelerate Energy Transition” is focused on solutions for the hydrogen economy, renewable natural gas, e-Mobility, carbon capture, wind and solar power and insulation materials for building energy efficiency to enable growth of the Clean Tech market, which by far show the highest growth rates in all scenarios. “Enable Circular Economy” will focus on attractive niches in the challenging environment of materials circularity including solutions for chemical recycling as well as the use of renewable or recycled raw materials. “Advance Precision Biosolutions” includes solutions that enable new pharmaceutical therapies, with a focus on nucleic acid based medicines, like used as Covid vaccines, and solutions for bio-based and bio-degradable specialty chemicals for cosmetic or cleaning applications

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp7

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

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

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Oman

☑ Chile

☑ China

☑ Egypt

☑ Italy

☑ Spain

☑ Brazil

☑ Canada

☑ India
☑ Greece
☑ Israel
☑ Kuwait
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Argentina
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ France
☑ Poland
☑ Serbia
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Belgium
☑ Tunisia
☑ Ukraine
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ca
☑ Ma
☑ Ob
☑ Po
☑ Don
☑ Fly
☑ Ord
☑ Amur
☑ Bann
☑ Daly

- ☑ Drin
- ☑ Ebro
- ☑ Fane
- ☑ Lima
- ☑ Lule
- ☑ Tejo
- ☑ Vaal
- ☑ Baker
- ☑ Bravo
- ☑ Coruh
- ☑ Groot
- ☑ Indus
- ☑ Loire
- ☑ Meuse
- ☑ Neman
- ☑ Tarim
- ☑ Trent
- ☑ Tweed
- ☑ Verde
- ☑ Weser
- ☑ Chubut
- ☑ Danube
- ☑ Dniepr
- ☑ Doring
- ☑ Fuerte
- ☑ Maroni
- ☑ Mucuri
- ☑ Muonio
- ☑ Orange
- ☑ Pahang
- ☑ Mino
- ☑ Muga
- ☑ Nile
- ☑ Roia
- ☑ Spey
- ☑ Dasht
- ☑ Douro
- ☑ Foyle
- ☑ Gamka
- ☑ Gloma
- ☑ Perak
- ☑ Rapel
- ☑ Rhine
- ☑ Rhone
- ☑ Sepik
- ☑ Wilsa
- ☑ Yaqui
- ☑ Arnaud
- ☑ Balsas
- ☑ Biobio
- ☑ Gudena
- ☑ Huasco
- ☑ Iijoki
- ☑ Limari
- ☑ Maputo
- ☑ Palena
- ☑ Panuco
- ☑ Parana
- ☑ Rajang
- ☑ Seine

- ☑ Struma
- ☑ Tuloma
- ☑ Uwimbu
- ☑ Vardar
- ☑ Armeria
- ☑ Kaladan
- ☑ Kel Kit
- ☑ Krishna
- ☑ Liao He
- ☑ Limpopo
- ☑ Orinoco
- ☑ Oyapock
- ☑ Rezvaya
- ☑ Saigon
- ☑ Sakarya
- ☑ Vijose
- ☑ Amazonas
- ☑ Angerman
- ☑ Balkhash
- ☑ Burdekin
- ☑ Eilanden
- ☑ Godavari
- ☑ Grisalva
- ☑ Guadiana
- ☑ Incomati
- ☑ Olifants
- ☑ Oulujoki
- ☑ Rio Doce
- ☑ Salinas
- ☑ Skjern A
- ☑ Brantas
- ☑ Dniestr
- ☑ Fitzroy
- ☑ Garonne
- ☑ Helmand
- ☑ Lorentz
- ☑ Luan He
- ☑ Maritsa
- ☑ Mekong
- ☑ Narmada
- ☑ Salado
- ☑ Salween
- ☑ Thames
- ☑ Tugela
- ☑ Uruguay
- ☑ Dalalven
- ☑ Dalinghe
- ☑ Dead Sea
- ☑ Dramselv
- ☑ Eastmain
- ☑ Kelantan
- ☑ Kemijoki
- ☑ Kymijoki
- ☑ Medjerda
- ☑ Nottaway
- ☑ Van Golu
- ☑ Veleka
- ☑ Amu Darya
- ☑ Corantijn
- ☑ Eyre Lake

- ☑ Groot-Kei
- ☑ Groot-Vis
- ☑ Han Jiang
- ☑ Irrawaddy
- ☑ Mae Klong
- ☑ San Pedro
- ☑ Santiago
- ☑ Syr Darya
- ☑ Conception
- ☑ Dong Jiang
- ☑ Papaloapan
- ☑ Rio Acarau
- ☑ Rio Grande
- ☑ Rio Gurupi
- ☑ Rio Mearim
- ☑ Tocantins
- ☑ Yalu Jiang
- ☑ Alsek River
- ☑ Batang Hari
- ☑ Chao Phraya
- ☑ Rio Pindare
- ☑ Rogue River
- ☑ Roper River
- ☑ Yongding He
- ☑ Yukon River
- ☑ Fuchun Jiang
- ☑ George River
- ☑ Guadalquivir
- ☑ Horton River
- ☑ Hudson River
- ☑ Mamberamo
- ☑ Min Jiang
- ☑ Rio Capim
- ☑ Rio Jacui
- ☑ Rio Prado
- ☑ Elbe River
- ☑ Kizilirmak
- ☑ Mahi River
- ☑ Nass River
- ☑ Oder River
- ☑ Rio Salado
- ☑ Santa Cruz
- ☑ Seal River
- ☑ Sembakung
- ☑ Taku River
- ☑ James River
- ☑ Kalixaelven
- ☑ Kobuk River
- ☑ Pearl River
- ☑ Rio Paraiba
- ☑ Albany River
- ☑ Brazos River
- ☑ Copper River
- ☑ Ellice River
- ☑ Fraser River
- ☑ Kinabatangan
- ☑ Kokemaenjoki
- ☑ Lagoon Mirim
- ☑ Lake Vattern
- ☑ Nelson River

- ☑ Noatak River
- ☑ Nueces River
- ☑ Penner River
- ☑ Quoich River
- ☑ Rio Araguari
- ☑ St. Lawrence
- ☑ Sungai Kajan
- ☑ Tapti River
- ☑ Winisk River
- ☑ Asi (Orontes)
- ☑ Gilbert River
- ☑ Jequitinhonha
- ☑ Klamath River
- ☑ Lake Titicaca
- ☑ Pee Dee River
- ☑ Rio Paraguacu
- ☑ Roanoke River
- ☑ Skeena River
- ☑ Stikine River
- ☑ Sungai Kapuas
- ☑ Anderson River
- ☑ Batang Kuantan
- ☑ Breede-Gouritz
- ☑ Columbia River
- ☑ Colville River
- ☑ Grande Riviere
- ☑ Hornaday River
- ☑ Nushagak River
- ☑ Paraiba Do Sul
- ☑ Savannah River
- ☑ Rio Parnaiba
- ☑ Rupert River
- ☑ Sabine River
- ☑ Santee River
- ☑ Southern Bug
- ☑ Berg-Olifants
- ☑ Cauvery River
- ☑ Damodar River
- ☑ De Grey River
- ☑ Fitzroy River
- ☑ Potomac River
- ☑ Rio De Contas
- ☑ Rio Itapecuru
- ☑ Rio Itapicuru
- ☑ Rio Jaguaribe
- ☑ Susitna River
- ☑ Tana (No; Fi)
- ☑ Vaenern-Goeta
- ☑ Vuoksi - Neva
- ☑ Altamaha River
- ☑ Delaware River
- ☑ Ferguson River
- ☑ Flinders River
- ☑ Gallegos-Chico
- ☑ Gascoyne River
- ☑ Sungai Mahakam
- ☑ Suwannee River
- ☑ Victoria River
- ☑ Ashburton River
- ☑ Blackwood River

☑ Cape Fear River
☑ Churchill River
☑ Fortescue River
☑ Great Salt Lake
☑ Inkomati-Usuthu
☑ Negro (Uruguay)
☑ Penobscot River
☑ Rio Vaza-Barris
☑ South Esk River
☑ St. Croix River
☑ Saint John River
☑ Thlewiaza River
☑ Connecticut River
☑ Lake Mar Chiquita
☑ Leichhardt Raiver
☑ Attawapiskat River
☑ Cuyuni - Essequibo
☑ Eel River (Calif.)
☑ Kura - Ozero Sevan
☑ Saguenay (Riviere)
☑ Mzimvubu-Tsitsikamma
☑ Natashquan (Riviere)
☑ Solo (Bengawan Solo)
☑ Xi Jiang - Bei Jiang
☑ Little Mecatina River
☑ Huang He (Yellow River)
☑ Brahmani River (Bhahmani)
☑ Caniapiscau - Aux Melezes
☑ Mahanadi River (Mahahadi)
☑ Alabama River & Tombigbee
☑ Kuskokwim River
☑ Macarthur River
☑ Mackenzie River
☑ Merrimack River
☑ Murchison River
☑ St. Johns River
☑ Coppermine River
☑ Hong (Red River)
☑ Murray - Darling
☑ Pongola-Uzimkulu
☑ Mississippi River
☑ Negro (Argentina)
☑ San Antonio River
☑ Susquehanna River
☑ Apalachicola River
☑ Tigris & Euphrates
☑ Tranh (Nr Thu Bon)
☑ Colorado (Argentina)
☑ Daryacheh-Ye Orumieh
☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra
☑ Manicouagan (Riviere)
☑ Rio Ribeira Do Iguape
☑ Feuilles (Riviere Aux)
☑ Mitchell River (N. Au)
☑ Trinity River (Texas)
☑ Churchill Fleuve (Labrador)
☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)
☑ Baleine Grande Riviere De La
☑ Grande Riviere De La Baleine
☑ Colorado River (Caribbean Sea)

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

☑ Hayes River (Trib. Hudson Bay)

☑ Moose River (Trib. Hudson Bay)

☑ Severn River (Trib. Hudson Bay)

☑ Sacramento River - San Joaquin River

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The effect of this opportunity are additional sales in clean tech market in many different sectors. For Safeguard Ecosystems and Ensure Health & Wellbeing the most relevant Clean Tech Opportunities are in i) sustainable water ii) pollution prevention iii) sustainable consumer goods vii) sustainable protein nutrition viii) advanced therapy) Our Next Generation Solutions (NGS) enable water and ecosystem preservation, reduced emission and leaching of persistent and disputed chemicals, reduced health-hazard exposure, the replacement of disputed chemicals and more effective pharma therapies and vaccinations. Our annual Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA) ensures that the positive impact of our NGS is substantive for our downstream value chain and that we do not compromise this by any other negative sustainability signal along the value chain in the specific Product-Application-Region-Combination (PARC). This opportunity is linked to the risk 4 market transition risks. We understand that system transformations in many sectors will affect the applications we sell our product to today. The focus of our capital investment and R&D resources on NGS allows us to generate sufficient opportunities to compensate future market transition risks. Our innovation growth areas "Advance Precision Biosolutions" will accelerate this opportunity space with additional sales from existing and new solutions in this space.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

In the reporting period the opportunity has multiple effects on several financial aspects: • Revenue of NGS related to this opportunity • Higher capacity utilization of technology platforms that supply products for this opportunity • R&D expenditures to support this opportunity • Capital expenditures for new or existing production capacity related to this opportunity • Capital expenditures for acquisitions related to this opportunity • Additional direct cost for circular raw materials or renewable energy for products related to this opportunity To give an estimate for the reporting year we take the revenue growth over last year for NGS related to this opportunity times previous year EBITDA margin.

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

For future time horizons the opportunity has multiple effects on several financial aspects: • Revenue of NGS related to this opportunity • Higher capacity utilization of technology platforms that supply products for this opportunity • R&D expenditures to support this opportunity • Capital expenditures for new or existing production capacity related to this opportunity • Capital expenditures for acquisitions related to this opportunity • Additional direct cost for circular raw materials or renewable energy for products related to this opportunity To give an estimate for "mid-term" horizons, we consider only revenue growth of NGS related to this opportunity times the target EBITDA margin. For "long-term" horizon, we estimate the min and max NGS revenue growth from scenario data. To calculate the EBITDA impact we work with the target EBITDA margin.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

7300000

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

27400000

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

50900000

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

187000000

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

196000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. These statements include, but are not limited to, projections of future financial performance, anticipated growth strategies, and anticipated trends in our business. Forward-looking statements are inherently subject to risks and uncertainties, many of which we cannot predict with accuracy and some of which we might not even anticipate. Actual results may differ materially from those expressed or implied in these forward-looking statements due to various factors, including but not limited to, changes in economic conditions, regulatory changes, technological advancements, and other risks detailed in our filings with the relevant regulatory authorities. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this plan or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as required by law. The reader is cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. Basis are the NGS sales reported from our businesses in the PSA process prior to the annual strategy process. Reporting year: 2024 reporting year expected: 1,932,000,000 Growth NGS over 2023: 67,000,000 EBITDA Margin Evonik 2023: 10.8% Reporting year opportunity: 7,300,000 Mid-term: 2025-2027 mid-term expected: 2,150,000,000 Growth NGS mid-term: 218,000,000 for 3 years EBITDA Margin Evonik: 18% Min: -30%: 27,400,000 Max: 30%: 50,900,000 Long-term: Baseline Growth 2028-2040: 0% p.a. Based on Scenario specific end-market growth rates for NGS sales in scope we estimated NET-ZERO: CAGR 2028-2040: 1.51% p.a. LOW-DEMAND: CAGR 2028-2040: 0.92% p.a. FRAGMENTED WORLD: CAGR 2028-2040: 1.53% p.a. CURRENT POLICIES: CAGR 2028-2040: 1.46% p.a. Long-term sales: 2040 long-term Baseline: 2,150,000,000 (on 2027 level residing) Delta 2040 long-term FRAGM. WORLD: 1,088,000,000 (max) Delta 2040 long-term LOW DEMAND: 1,041,000,000 (min) Long-term EBITDA opportunity: 2040 long-term Baseline: 0 2040 long-term FRAGM. WORLD: 196,000,000 2040 long-term LOW DEMAND: 187,000,000

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

611000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

This questionnaire contains forward-looking statements that are based on our current expectations, estimates, and projections. The cost number reflects our best estimate what would be necessary for our present portfolio to act on risks and opportunities for mid-range exposure in the broad scenario space. To quantify the cost *in a cumulative manner - to be consistent with the cumulative opportunity exposure - we quantified the intangible and tangible assets we need to supply via investments to support the additional sales to address this opportunity. We are aware, that there is additional cost in R&D, marketing, and sales, but we are unable to disintegrate them. For consistency reasons, we only quantified additional assets to support additional revenue streams.*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We will focus our growth investments on Next generation Solutions (NGS) to achieve our portfolio targets, which are anchored in our 2030 Sustainability Targets (50% NGS in our portfolio) and in our Long-term Incentive Plan. We will prioritize our innovation in specific Innovation Growth Areas: “Accelerate Energy Transition” is focused on solutions for the hydrogen economy, renewable natural gas, e-Mobility, carbon capture, wind and solar power and insulation materials for building energy efficiency to enable growth of the Clean Tech market, which by far show the highest growth rates in all scenarios. “Enable Circular Economy” will focus on attractive niches in the challenging environment of materials circularity including solutions for chemical recycling as well as the use of renewable or recycled raw materials. “Advance Precision Biosolutions” includes solutions that enable new pharmaceutical therapies, with a focus on nucleic acid based medicines, like used as Covid vaccines,and solutions for bio-based and bio-degradable specialty chemicals for cosmetic or cleaning applications
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

1961000000

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

Select from:
☑ 11-20%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

As part of the portfolio sustainability assessment (PSA) we have structured and asessed the complete portfolio of chemical products in Product-Application-Region-Combinations (PARCs). We track the Next Generation Solutions (NGS) revenue, with sustantive positive effects as opportunities. This data is the basis for opp6 quantification.

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

244000000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

As part of the portfolio sustainability assessment (PSA) we have structured and asessed the complete portfolio of chemical products in Product-Application-Region-Combinations (PARCs). We track the Next Generation Solutions (NGS) revenue, with sustantive positive effects as opportunities. This data is the basis for opp5 quantification.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

1932000000

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

As part of the portfolio sustainability assessment (PSA) we have structured and asessed the complete portfolio of chemical products in Product-Application-Region-Combinations (PARCs). We track the Next Generation Solutions (NGS) revenue, with sustantive positive effects as opportunities. This data is the basis for opp7 quantification.

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all climate-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. Among other things, in the reporting period, both the sustainability council and the sustainability circle considered the results of the EAGER project to reduce greenhouse gas emissions at our sites, and the establishment of sustainability data management. CONTRIBUTION OF GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS TO BOARD OVERSIGHT: The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all forests-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. CONTRIBUTION OF GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS TO BOARD OVERSIGHT: The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all water-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. CONTRIBUTION OF GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS TO BOARD OVERSIGHT: The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all biodiversity-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by

the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. CONTRIBUTION OF GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS TO BOARD OVERSIGHT: The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

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

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all climate-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all forests-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

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

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all water-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The executive board bears overall responsibility for sustainability and all biodiversity-related aspects at Evonik. Direct responsibility is assigned to the chief human resources officer. Responsibility for sustainability management is defined in a corporate policy. In view of the increasing relevance of sustainability for the management of the Evonik Group, we integrated further ESG aspects into our governance framework in the reporting period. Since September 2022, our sustainability council has met at the executive board level, chaired by the chairman of the executive board. To strengthen the alignment with our businesses, alongside the executive board, members include the heads of the divisions. The sustainability council is responsible for the management of climate- and sustainability-related aspects and the associated decisions. Following approval by the executive board, the measures are implemented by the operational units in close consultation with the relevant functions, for example, Strategy, Sustainability, Research, Development & Innovation, and Procurement. The decisions taken by

the sustainability council are prepared by the sustainability circle, which comprises representatives of the functions and departments of relevance for sustainability. The sustainability circle is chaired by the chief human resources officer, who is the executive board member responsible for sustainability. The governance mechanisms selected ensure that the Board has a comprehensive view on climate-related issues and can ensure a coherent and Group-wide response, if needed.
[Add row]

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

	Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue	% of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue	Please explain
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*8*	*Based on Evoniks SBTi-Committment*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years	*`Numeric input [must be between [0 - 100]*	*no focus area for LTIs*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years	*`Numeric input [must be between [0 - 100]*	*no focus area for LTIs*

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Board/Executive board

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus – set figure

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

40% of 20% ESG Bonus

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

Direct reduction of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

All environmental issues adressed in our corporate environmental policy have to be applied within the boundaries of Evonik Industries activities under operational control.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

☑ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation

☑ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

CDP_2024_Evonik ESHQE-Policy.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

In July 2021, Evonik published its commitment on responsible supply chains of palm oil Evonik intends to apply the following criteria for the use of palm oil, palm kernel oil, and their derivatives:1. Traceability, 2. Compliance with legal requirements, 3. Conservation of the environment, 4. Local compliance and consent, 5.

Compliance with standardized procurement criteria, 6. RSPO-certified supply chains for raw materials and products, 7. Responsible supply chains to protect and conserve valuable forest areas

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat

Social commitments

☑ Other social commitment, please specify :Commitment to resolving both social and environmental issues in own operations and supply chain Commitment to protect rights and livelihoods of local communities

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Other additional reference/description, please specify :Commitment to eliminate conversion of natural ecosystems Commitment to eliminate deforestation Commitment to take action beyond own supply chain to tackle environmental issue Commitment to transparency Recognition of the overall importance of forests

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Evonik recommendations for responsible use of palm oil 2021_EN.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

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

Member of SBTi "well below 2 target We are an active member of WBCSD, strongly involved in workstreams or projects especially in WBCSD’s pathway “Products and Materials”. We were an early adopter of the Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA) framework by WBCSD and are actively involved in its continuous updating. Evonik’s PSA method and the use of its outcomes is integral part of our strategic management process and our sustainability reporting.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

(4.11.3) Global environmental treaties or policy goals in line with public commitment or position statement

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

Evonik Climate Policy 2024_EN.pdf

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on

Select all that apply
☑ Mandatory government register

(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization

EU-Transparency register REG-No: 5958991861-30 / active / 2008 / updated 04-2024

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

Evonik is involved in many national and international competency networks in the area of sustainability- These include econsense, Together for Sustainability, Chemistry4Climate or VCI (Verband chemischer Industrien). Evonik is also a member of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and is committed to its vision 2050. For all different networks several working groups have been established in order to contribute to the respective objectives. All of these memberships and activities are steered and decided by a cross functional high level committee (so called sustainability council).

[Fixed row]

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Row 1

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

The holistic closing of material cycles is a central key to sustainable management and thus also to achieving climate targets. Due to its high level of technological competence, Germany as an industrial location has enormous potential to become the leading provider of new technologies that enable the economically sensible recycling of raw materials used and at the same time reduce dependence on raw material imports.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Low-impact production and innovation

☑ Circular economy

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ National

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☑ EU27

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

Select from:

☑ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

10000

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

The holistic closing of material cycles is a central key to sustainable management and thus also to achieving climate targets. Due to its high level of technological competence, Germany as an industrial location has enormous potential to become the leading provider of new technologies that enable the economically sensible recycling of raw materials used and at the same time reduce dependence on raw material imports.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe
☑ German Chemical Industry Association (VCI)

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

The aim of this dialogue platforms is to come up with practical ideas on how the chemical industry and other sectors can move towards defossilization by 2045. Chemistry4Climate supports Germany as an industrial base and promote a fairer world, where value chains are viewed globally and partner regions are given a fairer share as advocated by the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

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

3000000

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

The aim of this dialogue platforms is to come up with practical ideas on how the chemical industry and other sectors can move towards defossilization by 2045. Chemistry4Climate supports Germany as an industrial base and promote a fairer world, where value chains are viewed globally and partner regions are given a fairer share as advocated by the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☑ Trust or foundation

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

WBCSD

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

The market signal identified as being significant for Evonik from the heart of the sustainability analysis. These include, for example, anticipated regulatory trends, environmental and social performance compared to alternative, and major sustainability ambitions in Evonik markets. The evaluation is based on the framework for Portfolio Sustainability Assessments (PSA) developed by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. This enables Evonik to take account of different market signals in the various end-markets for our business. Furthermore, Evonik plays an active role within the WBCSD in the ongoing development of a circularity-related sustainability analysis (e.g. standardization and evaluation of circularity). The WBCSD's CFO Network brings together 50 CFOs from across all sectors and geographies. Members of the CFO Network are collaborating to raise the bar on the "S" in ESG through open discussion and giving input into the global standard-setting processes.

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

106000

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

The market signal identified as being significant for Evonik from the heart of the sustainability analysis. These include, for example, anticipated regulatory trends, environmental and social performance compared to alternative, and major sustainability ambitions in Evonik markets. The evaluation is based on the framework for Portfolio Sustainability Assessments (PSA) developed by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. This enables Evonik to take account of different market signals in the various end-markets for our business. Furthermore, Evonik plays an active role within the WBCSD in the ongoing development of a circularity-related sustainability analysis (e.g. standardization and evaluation of circularity). The WBCSD's CFO Network brings together 50 CFOs from across all sectors and geographies. Members of the CFO Network are collaborating to raise the bar on the "S" in ESG through open discussion and giving input into the global standard-setting processes.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

[Add row]

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization’s response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization’s response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication.

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests
☑ Water
☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Content of environmental policies
☑ Governance

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

p46ff / The environment

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Sustainability Report 2023.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

No further comment
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :Net-Zero

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

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

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :1) Customers SBTi scope 3 commitments 2) Investment into new technology is high for all sectors to prevent climate change and other societal issues. More focus on prevention than on remediation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :Chemical Safety Regulation, Regulations related to circular economy, policies and regulations are more focussed on prevention than on remediation of problems

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Climate Change NET ZERO (NGS and other data sources) NGFS NET ZERO limits physical risks to 1.4C global warming end of the century. The policy reaction is immediate, technology changes fast and carbon dioxide removal is a at medium-high level. Regional policy shows a medium variation. The NGFS NET ZERO scenario confronts companies with low physical risks of climate change but with significant transition risks, driven by the very high carbon prices in an orderly transition toward Net-Zero by 2050. Consumer sentiments and customer's SBTi targets contribute to a transition of all sectors towards net-zero emissions, circularity and nature positive solutions. Global climate targets are aligned, and global trade and cooperation facilitate a fast technology change. A significant reduction of chemicals and micro/nano plastic accumulation in nature is supported by environmental policies. High granularity and availability of sustainability data on product level across value chains support fast transformation. Capital markets are very sensitive to climate and nature impacts and enable lower cost of capital for sustainable investments. The scenario analysis is performed for the entire organization. All risks and opportunities are quantified as future EBITDA impact to assess the relevance of the specific risk and opportunity category, the development over time, and the scenario dependency. To quantify long-term risk and opportunity exposure we have calculated CAGRs for relevant markets in the time intervals i) leading up to 2030, ii) 2031-40, iii) 2041-50: 1. Clean Tech Opportunities in NET-ZERO: i) 29%, ii) 13%, iii) 4% 2. Steel, cement, chemical production in NET-ZERO: i) 0.6%, ii) 0.2%, iii) 1.6% 3. Timber produced in NET-ZERO: i) 1.4%, ii) 1.4% iii) 1.1% 4. Pulp wood in NET-ZERO: i) 1.5%, ii) 1.4%, iii) 1.2% 5. Caloric Food Demand in NET-ZERO: i) 0.97%, ii) 0.67%, iii) 0.84% 6. Pork, poultry, egg production in NET-ZERO: i) 2.1%, ii) 0.85%, iii) 0.49% 7. Oil crop production in NET-ZERO: i) 0.41%, ii) 0.56%, iii) 0.50% 8. Ceral and sugar production in NET-ZERO: i) 0.39%, ii) 0.39%, iii) 0.34% 9. Non-communicable disease counts in NET-ZERO: i) 1.3%, ii) 0.48%, iii) 0.48% 10. Long-term global annual GDP growth in NET-ZERO: i) 1.7%, ii) 1.7%, iii) 1.4% Uncertainties arise from scenario granularity and assumptions i) data flaws in our LCA data, and the poor data availability on acute and chronic physical risks of climate change.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Climate Change NGFS NET-ZERO As a specialty chemical company, we will be exposed to supply-side transformations of energy sources, raw materials and manufacturing technologies. The NET-ZERO scenario describes a very strong and globally coordinated policy reaction resulting in high carbon prices and high investment level into non-fossil energy and new technology. It presents the highest level of supply-side transformation for our industry. Thus, it allows us to identify *the risk exposure of this transformation on the competitiveness of our production processes, and of our energy and raw material supply. The NET-ZERO scenario results in the highest exposure to policy risks from carbon pricing and in the highest exposure to technology transition risks by integration and electrification of process heat, access to competitive non-fossil raw materials and renewable electricity, and alternative manufacturing process like large scale fermentation of agriculture commodities with biotechnology or green hydrogen-based manufacturing of olefines and other chemicals. NET-ZERO is aligned with SSP1 but comprises different integrated assessment models that address specific technology options to achieve Net-Zero. For quantification of risks and opportunities we use the REMIND-MAgPIE model, which assumes a high level of bioenergy with carbon sequestration to stay within the NET-ZERO emission budget until 2050. This results in more than twice the carbon sequestration of the IEA scenarios and more than 10% of arable land used for energy crops by 2050. Thus, this scenario has a strong link between energy and material production and the productivity and land availability in agriculture.*

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Forests scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available forests scenario, please specify **:**WBCSD McKinsey Food System Scenario Tool with data for FAO Agriculture Commodity Categories: >3° Historic Trend Scenario

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :Investment into new technology is high for all sectors to cope with climate change impacts

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :Policies and regulations are focussed on dealing with the consequences of climate change and mobilizing private sector investments as public budgets will be very constraint

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Forests WBCSD/ McKinsey 3 HISTORIC TREND scenario (complements NGFS CURRENT POLICIES and FRAGMENTED WORLD data) HISTORIC TREND represents a scenario in which climate action remains stable at current levels creating limited transition risks, but the world fails to limit global warming to manageable levels, resulting in substantial future physical risks. This scenario has low levels of transition risk. In this scenario Carbon Prices stay at 4/t by 2050, bioenergy generation remains limited to first generation as low levels of 9 EJ/year in 2050. No diet shift away from meat leads to 18% higher demand for livestock products in 2050 compared to 2020 levels. Nitrogen Use Efficiency remains below 60% by 2050 with crop yield growth below 1% p.a. and food waste remaining at present levels of 33% by 2050. The demand for timber in construction of new buildings remains low at 0.5%.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Forests WBCSD/ McKinsey 3 HISTORIC TREND Scenario We use HISTORC TREND scenario to complement NGFS data in the field of agriculture and livestock-based products for the CURRENT POLICIES and FRAGMENTED WORLD scenarios.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

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

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Relevant technology and science
☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Water WWF Water Risk Filter PESSIMISTIC (complements NGFS Fragmented World) The PESSIMISTIC scenarios represent a world with unequal and unstable socio-economic development (SSP3) and high GHG emission levels (RCP6.0 /RCP8.5), leading to an increase of global mean surface temperature of approximately 3.5C by the end of the 21st century. Business-as-usual so that GHG emissions continue to rise throughout the 21st century. Increase of global mean surface temperature is as likely as not to exceed 4ºC by the end of the 21st century. Emphasis on national issues due to regional conflicts and nationalism. Societies are becoming more skeptical about globalization. Global governance, institutions and leadership are relatively weak. Low investment in technology development. Increase in resource use intensity. Environmental policies have very little importance. Serious degradation of environmental systems in some regions. Growing population and limited access to safe water and improved sanitation challenge human and natural system.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Water WWF Water Risk Filter PESSIMISTIC The WWF Water Risk Filter we use to assess the vulnerability of our manufacturing sites and supply chains against water related risks. The PESSIMISTIC scenario is aligned with SSP3 and we use it to make our manufacturing organization and our procurement aware of the risks related to water. We take a risk-based approach as we focus first on assets and raw materials with a high watershed risk and a high operational risk.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify **:**Low Demand

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- ☑ Policy
- ☑ Market
- ☑ Liability
- ☑ Reputation
- ☑ Technology
- ☑ Acute physical
- ☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☑ 2030
- ☑ 2040
- ☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

- ☑ Consumer sentiment
- ☑ Consumer attention to impact
- ☑ Impact of nature service delivery on consumer
- ☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :Low consumption in all sectors leads to lower investment, but also to lower adverse health impacts and lower environmental impacts

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :polcy makers and regulators are less focused on prevention as low growth releases environmental and societal pressures

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Climate Change LOW DEMAND (NGFS and other data sources) The NGFS LOW DEMAND assumes a significant reduction of material and energy consumption with app. 60% of the renewable energy investment level of the NET ZERO scenario. This scenario also limits physical risks to 1.4C global warming end of the century. The policy reaction is immediate, technology changes fast and carbon dioxide removal is at medium level. Regional policy shows a medium variation. Even though this scenario has a much slower transition towards a decarbonized energy system, it confronts manufacturing companies with the highest transition risks, as consumer attention to impact and circular business models significantly reduce the demand for manufactured goods. A significant reduction of chemicals and micro/nano plastic accumulation in nature is supported by environmental policies. The scenario analysis is performed for the entire organization. All risks and opportunities are quantified as future EBITDA impact to assess the relevance of the specific risk and opportunity category, the development over time, and the scenario dependency. To quantify long-term risk and opportunity exposure we have calculated CAGRs for relevant markets in the time intervals i) leading up to 2030, ii) 2031-40, iii) 2041-50: 1. Clean Tech Opportunities in LOW DEMAND: i) 16%, ii) 9.0%, iii) 3.8% 2. Steel, cement, chemical production in LOW DEMAND: i) -4.3%, ii) -1.5%, iii) 1.6% 3. Timber produced in LOW DEMAND: i) 0.69%, ii) 0.68% iii) 0.72% 4. Pulp wood in LOW DEMAND: i) 0.81%, ii) 0.72%, iii) 0.56% 5. Caloric Food Demand in LOW DEMAND: i) 0.56%, ii) 0.19%, iii) 0.25% 6. Pork, poultry, egg production in LOW DEMAND: i) 1.7%, ii) 0.40%, iii) 0.04% 7. Oil crop production in LOW DEMAND: i) 0.62%, ii) 0.61%, iii) 0.52% 8. Ceral and sugar production in LOW DEMAND: i) 0.29%, ii) 0.15%, iii) -0.02% 9. Non-communicable disease counts in LOW DEMAND: i) 2.3%, ii) 1.1%, iii) 1.1% 10. Long-term global annual GDP growth in LOW DEMAND: i) 1.2%, ii) 1.2%, iii) 0.93% Uncertainties arise from scenario granularity and assumptions i) data flaws in our LCA data, and the poor data availability on acute and chronic physical risks of climate change.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Climate Change NGFS Low Demand As a specialty chemical company, we will be exposed to supply-side transformations of energy sources, raw materials and manufacturing technologies, as well as to demand-side transformation via different solutions for the food system, built environment, manufactured goods, transport & mobility and health & care. A high level of circularity in all those sectors will lead to a reduced demand for manufacturing and chemicals. The LOW DEMAND scenario describes a very strong change in consumer behavior and best captured the sufficiency related risks. It presents the highest level of demand-side transformation for our industry. Thus, it allows us to identify the risk exposure of this transformation for our existing product portfolio. The LOW DEMAND scenario results in the highest exposure to market transition risks by much lower material intensity in all sectors in addition to considerable policy & regulation risk and technology transformation risk exposure. LOW DEMAND is aligned with SSP1 but assumes a much lower consumption level und thus a much lower investment in new technology and non-fossil energy. As this scenario relieves the transformation pressure on the energy sector, it is the most challenging scenario for the manufacturing sector. In the chemical industry and other manufacturing sectors we need to transform in stagnating or shrinking markets, which es a challenge for financing the transition. For quantification of risks and opportunities we work with the REMIND-MAgPIE model data. The model assumes for LOW DEMAND the lowest electricity cost and lowest level of hydrogen demand of all scenarios, but still assumes a high level of bioenergy with CCS - but at much lower level than in the NET-ZERO scenario - to achieve net-zero by 2050. Therefore, the link to agriculture productivity and land availability remains important also for this scenario.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :Fragmented World

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5°C - 2.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify : fragemented local and national regulations to deal with the negative impacts of climate change avoid further increase of global warming and ecosystm damage.

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Climate Change FRAGMENTED WORLD (NGS and other data sources) The NGFS FRAGMENTED WORLD assumes a high variation of carbon prices between different regions and different sectors setting in after 2030, confronting companies with both: transition risks and physical risks of climate change. This scenario limits physical risks to 2.9C global warming by the end of the century. The policy reaction is delayed and fragmented, technology changes slow and fragmented and carbon dioxide removal is a at low-medium level. Regional policy shows a high variation "too little too late". Societies become more skeptic about globalization, which negatively impacts technology change. Global governance, institutions and leadership are relatively weak. Low investment in technology development. Increase in resource use intensity. Environmental policies have little importance. Serious degradation of environmental systems in some regions. Growing population and limited access to safe water and improved sanitation challenge human and natural systems. Capital markets and insurances are very sensitive to climate change related risks. The scenario analysis is performed for the entire organization. Risks and opportunities are quantified as future EBITDA impact to assess the relevance of the specific risk and opportunity category, the development over time, and the scenario dependency. To quantify long-term risk and opportunity exposure we have calculated CAGRs for relevant markets in the time intervals i) leading up to 2030, ii) 2031-40, iii) 2041-50: 1. Clean Tech Opportunities in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 12%, ii) 11%, iii) 6.5% 2. Steel, cement, chemical production in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 1.0%, ii) 0.19%, iii) 0.47% 3. Timber produced in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 0.49%, ii) 0.48% iii) 0.53% 4. Pulp wood in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 0.56%, ii) 0.56%, iii) 0.58% 5. Caloric Food Demand in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 0.97%, ii) 0.67%, iii) 0.84% 6. Pork, poultry, egg production in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 1.8%, ii) 1.4%, iii) 1.2% 7. Oil crop production in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 1.6%, ii) 1.0%, iii) 0.70% 8. Ceral and sugar production in FRAGM: WORLD: i) 1.2%, ii) 1.3%, iii) 1.1% 9. Non-communicable disease counts in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 2.5%, ii) 3.3%, iii) 3.3% 10. Long-term global annual GDP growth in FRAGM. WORLD: i) 1.7%, ii) 1.5%, iii) 1.3% Uncertainties arise from scenario granularity and assumptions i) data flaws in our LCA data, and the poor data availability on acute and chronic physical risks of climate change.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Climate Change NGFS Fragmented World As a specialty chemical company, we will be exposed to supply-side and demand-side transformations. However, our large manufacturing asset footprint - with over 120 manufacturing sites globally – and the high dependency of these sites on energy and freshwater intake for cooling, as well as complex supply chains for difficult to substitute products and a high importance of supply security for our customers, all results in a high exposure to acute and chronic physical risks of climate change. The FRAGMENTED WORLD scenario describes a fragmented - but still significant - climate change mitigation response of policy makers in a "too little too late" fashion. This leaves business with a combination of transition risks and significant physical risks. This scenario allows us to describe our risk exposure in a challenging combination of transition and physical risks. The FRAGMENTED WORLD scenario results in moderate exposure to policy risks from carbon pricing and in the moderate exposure to technology transition and market transition risks combined with a moderate exposure to acute physical risks for our manufacturing assets and supply chains and moderate chronic physical risks that also affect GDP growth and thus the demand for our products. Overall, the level of transition risk exposure and physical risk exposure is in the same magnitude for this scenario. FRAGMENTED WORLD is aligned with SSP3 and for quantification of risks and opportunities we work with REMIND-MAgPIE model data. Until 2030 this scenario is identical with the CURRENT POLICIES scenario. After 2030 policy reaction will result in a sector specific carbon price increase. The industry and supply a much carbon price escalation is calculated than for transport and building. This, in the period between 2040 we some minor growth of green hydrogen, bioenergy combined with CCS, but all too little to make a difference.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :Current Policies

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 3.5ºC - 3.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Climate Change CURRENT POLICIES (NGFS and other data sources) The NGFS CURRENT POLICIES scenario limits physical risks to 2.9C global warming by the end of the century. No policy reaction beyond current policies, technology changes slow and carbon dioxide removal is a at low level. Regional policy shows a low variation. This scenario confronts companies mainly with acute and chronic physical risks of climate change in a hot house world. The scenario analysis is performed for the entire organization. Risks and opportunities are quantified as future EBITDA impact to assess the relevance of the specific risk and opportunity category, the development over time, and the scenario dependency. To quantify long-term risk and opportunity exposure we have calculated CAGRs for relevant markets in the time intervals i) leading up to 2030, ii) 2031-40, iii) 2041-50: 1. Clean Tech Opportunities in CURR. POLICIES: i) 12%, ii) 6.2%, iii) 4.3% 2. Steel, cement, chemical production in CURR. POLICIES: i) 1.0%, ii) 0.66%, iii) 0.87% 3. Timber produced in CURR. POLICIES: i) 0.49%, ii) 0.48% iii) 0.53% 4. Pulp wood in CURR. POLICIES: i) 0.56%, ii) 0.56%, iii) 0.58% 5. Caloric Food Demand in CURR. POLICIES: i) 0.97%, ii) 0.67%, iii) 0.84% 6. Pork, poultry, egg production in CURR. POLICIES: i) 1.8%, ii) 1.4%, iii) 1.2% 7. Oil crop production in CURR. POLICIES: i) 1.6%, ii) 1.0%, iii) 0.70% 8. Ceral and sugar production in

CURR. POLICIES: i) 1.2%, ii) 1.3%, iii) 1.1% 9. Non-communicable disease counts in CURR. POLICIES: i) 2.5%, ii) 3.0%, iii) 3.0% 10. Long-term global annual GDP growth in CURR. POLICIES: i) 1.7%, ii) 1.5%, iii) 1.3% Uncertainties arise from scenario granularity and assumptions i) data flaws in our LCA data, and the poor data availability on acute and chronic physical risks of climate change.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Climate Change NGFS Current Policies As a specialty chemical company, we will be exposed to significant physical risks of climate change. Our large manufacturing asset footprint - with over 120 manufacturing sites globally, the high dependency of these sites on energy and freshwater intake for cooling, as well as complex supply chains for difficult to substitute products and a high importance of supply security for our customers, all results in a high exposure to acute and chronic physical risks of climate change. The CURRENT POLICIES scenario describes a failing climate change mitigation response of policy makers. This leaves business with low level of transition risks but with the highest of physical risks. This scenario allows us to describe our risk exposure to physical risks. The CURRENT POLICIES scenario results in high exposure to acute physical risks for our manufacturing assets, supply chains and GDP growth and high chronic physical risks (heat stress, water stress, sea level rise & coastal erosion) that again affect our supply chains, our manufacturing base and GDP growth and thus the demand for our products. Asia, an important region for manufacturing and for market demand, will be exposed very high to physical risks of climate change. CURRENT POLICIES is aligned with SSP5 and for quantification of risks and opportunities we work with REMIND-MAgPIE model data but consider also other publicly available estimations on physical risks. The quantification of physical risks in the necessary granularity is far less advanced than the quantification o transition risks. Damage functions are emerging and in the scientific literature there is discussions that existing models underestimate the risk exposure. Additionally, all climate models do not yet consider properly the effect of environmental tipping points. Some of these tipping points are beginning to tip, thus we expect that climate models and damage functions will undergo a lot of changes in the coming years.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Forests scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available forests scenario, please specify :WBCSD McKinsey Food System Scenarios: 1.5° Innovation Scenario

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Consumer attention to impact
☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :1) Customers SBTi scope 3 commitments 2) Investment into new technology is high for all sectors to prevent climate change and other societal issues. More focus on prevention than on remediation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Political impact of science (from galvanizing to paralyzing)

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :policies and regulations are more focussed on prevention than remediation

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Forest WBCSD / McKinsey 1.5 INNOVATION scenario (complements NGFS NET-ZERO) Under 1.5C INNOVATION Scenario, large demands from the energy system for BECCS, coupled with greater than-historic yield growth in agriculture and government support for R&D, enables early decarbonization and limited physical impacts of climate change. This scenario has high levels of transition risk but may be muted by technological progress. In this scenario carbon prices increase to 153/ by 2050, 2nd generation bioenergy generation is at 112 EJ/year (out of total 130 EJ/yr bioenergy) in 2050. The diet shift away from meat is medium with -2% demand for livestock products between 2020 and 2050. Nitrogen Use Efficiency increases to 70% by 2050 with crop yields improving 1% p.a. and food waste reduced to 20% by 2050. The demand for timber in construction of new buildings grows to 50% (vs. 0.5% today). For Biobased, non-deforestation consumer goods ingredients via biotechnology, a growth focus in our portfolio, we have not found any scenario data to address the high growth rates expected for these products. For a reasonable assessment of the opportunity space we have anticipated a 10% p.a. long-term CAGR in our consideration for NET-ZERO in an innovation scenario.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We use this 1.5 INNOVATION scenario to complement NGFS data in the field of agriculture and livestock-based products for the NET-ZERO scenario.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :1) Customers SBTi scope 3 commitments 2) Investment into new technology is high for all sectors to prevent climate change and other societal issues. More focus on prevention than on remediation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :policies and regulations are more focussed on prevention than on remediation

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Water WWF Water Risk Filter OPTIMISTIC (complements NGFS NET-ZERO) The OPTIMISTIC scenarios represent a world with sustainable socio-economic development (SSP1) and ambitious reduction of GHG emissions (RCP2.6 /RCP4.5), leading to an increase of global mean surface temperature of approximately 1.5C by the end of the 21st century. Aggressive mitigation measures so that GHG emissions are halved by 2050. Increase of global mean surface temperature is not likely to exceed 2ºC by the end of the 21st century. Emphasis on human and nature well-being. Effective and persistent cooperation and collaboration across the *local, national, regional international scales and between public organizations, private sector and civil society within and across all scales of governance. Rapid technological change. Improved resource efficiency. Sustainability concerns; more stringent environmental regulation implemented. Research and technology development reduce the challenges of access to safe water and improved sanitation.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The WWF Water Risk Filter we use to assess the vulnerability of our manufacturing sites and supply chains against water related risks. The OPTIMISITCP scenario is aligned with SSP1 shows the projection of the nowadays risk exposure.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :WBCSD / McKinsey AGriculture Climate Scenario Tool: 1.5° Societal Transformation Scenario

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :Low consumption in all sectors leads to lower investment, but also to lower adverse health impacts and lower environmental impacts

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :policy makers are less focused on prevention becasue low demands put less pressure on societal and environmental issues

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

1.5C Societal Transformation Scenario represents strong, coordinated and prompt global policy action, as well as market responses (e.g. diet shifts and lower food waste) that result in widespread carbon pricing and land protection to enable decarbonization and limited physical impacts of climate change. This scenario has high levels of transition risk. In this scenario carbon prices increase to 153/ by 2050, 2nd generation bioenergy generation is at 82 EJ/year (out of 100 EJ/yr total bioenergy) in 2050. The diet shift away from meat is medium with -12% demand for livestock products between 2020 and 2050. Nitrogen Use Efficiency increases to 65% by 2050 with crop yields improving 1% p.a. and food waste reduced to 16.5% by 2050. The demand for timber in construction of new buildings grows to 10% (vs. 0.5% today).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We use this 1.5 SOCIETAL TRANSFORMATION scenario to complement NGFS data in the field of agriculture and livestock-based products for the LOW DEMAND scenario.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :GLOBAL BURDEN OF DISEASE COMBINED INTERVENTION scenario from: The Lancet. 16 May 2024. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00685-8

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :Shift of global burden of disease

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Political impact of science (from galvanizing to paralyzing)

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :public health and healthcare providor reaction to shift of global burden of disease

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify :ability of governments to to finance health care cost with a shift from premature deaths to morbitiy, longer life expctancy and a higher burden of non-communicable diseases

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Climate Change GLOBAL BURDEN OF DISEASE COMBINED INTERVENTION scenario (complements NGFS NET-ZERO) From the most recent publication of Global Burden of disease forecast (GBD 2021 Forecasting Collaborators. Burden of disease scenarios for 204 countries and territories, 2022–2050: a forecasting analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. The Lancet. 16 May 2024. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00685-8) we took major non-communicable disease count development of the COMBINED INTERVENTION scenario to describe the growth on non-communicable disease which present a relevant market for Evonik's pharma business: - Cardiovascular diseases - Diabetis and kidney diseases - Neoplasm (malignent and non-malignent) - Chronic respiratory diseases - Neurological disorders - Musculoskeletal disorders The interventions are a safer environment with regards to water and sanitation, improved childhood nutrition and vaccination, and improved behavioral and metabolic risks. This scenario shows a weighted average growth rate until 2030 of 1.3% and a weighted average growth rate from 2031 to 2050 of 0.5%.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Climate change GBD COMBINED INTERVENTION scenario We use the global burden of disease COMBINED INTERVENTION scenario to complement NGFS data in the field of non-communicable disease counts for the NET-ZERO scenario.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate physical scenario, please specify :GLOBAL BURDEN OF DISEASE REFERENCE scenario from: The Lancet. 16 May 2024. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00685-8

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

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

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify :shift of global burden of disease from premature deaths to morbidity and a strong rise in non-communicable diseases

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Political impact of science (from galvanizing to paralyzing)
☑ Level of action (from local to global)
☑ Global targets
☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :health and consumer protection policies to deal with high cost and to support preventive measures

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify :ability of public and private healthcare providors to deal with mounting cost

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Climate Change GLOBAL BURDEN OF DISEASE REFERENCE scenario (complements NGFS LOW DEMAND) From the most recent publication of Global Burden of disease forecast (GBD 2021 Forecasting Collaborators. Burden of disease scenarios for 204 countries and territories, 2022–2050: a forecasting analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. The Lancet. 16 May 2024. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00685-8) we took major non-communicable disease count development of the REFERENCE scenario to describe the growth on non-communicable disease which present a relevant market for Evonik's pharma business: - Cardiovascular diseases - Diabetis and kidney diseases - Neoplasm (malignent and non-malignent) - Chronic respiratory diseases - Neurological disorders - Musculoskeletal disorders This scenario shows a weighted average growth rate until 2030 of 2.3% and a weighted average growth rate from 2031 to 2050 of 1.1%.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Climate change GBD REFERENCE scenario We use the global burden of disease REFERENCE scenario to complement NGFS data in the field of non-communicable disease counts for the LOW DEMAND scenario.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :Modell Deutschland Circular Economy, WWF Deutschland 2023

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

A circular economy study from WWF Deutschland 2023, based on Prakash, S.; Löw, C.; Loibl, A.; Sievers, L.; Antony, F.; Besler, M.; Dehoust, G.; Doll, C.; Eberling, E.; Fiala, V.; Gascon Castillero, L.; Herbst, A.; Jakob, K.; Köhler, A.; Langkau, S.; Liu, R.; Lopez Hernandez, V.; Lotz, M. T.; Schicho, M.; Schön-Blume, N.; Stuber-Rousselle, K.; Tercero Espinoza, L. (2023): Modell Deutschland Circular Economy, Modellierung und Folgeabschätzung einer Circular Economy in Deutschland. Öko-Institut e.V; in Zusammenarbeit mit Fraunhofer ISI und FU Berlin; im Auftrag vom WWF Deutschland. Öko-Institut e. V (Hg.), 2023 The study applies a holistic approach to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, material and food consumption, and thus effects on land use and biodiversity and water. It also describes the social and economic implications. Impacts on the construction, automotive and batteries, household appliances and consumer electronics, food, textiles, packaging, furniture, and lighting are quantified with a reference to measures that reduce the linear material consumptions and recommendations for policy makers.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The study applies a holistic approach to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, material and food consumption, and thus effects on land use and biodiversity and water. It also describes the social and economic implications. Impacts on the construction, automotive and batteries, household appliances and consumer electronics, food, textiles, packaging, furniture, and lighting are quantified with a reference to measures that reduce the linear material consumptions and recommendations for policy makers. Thus, this scenario complements NGFS and IEA scenarios with a too narrow focus on energy system transformation and allow us to understand the sufficiency levers on manufactured goods in many different sectors. Even though the study is focused on Germany, we applied those sufficiency effects for the quantification of risk 4 on Evonik's global sales.
[Add row]

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

• Tectonic economic shifts driven by demographics, geopolitical conflicts, loss of social cohesion, physical impacts of climate change and nature loss, consumer spending shift from consumption to essentials, public dept crisis, higher inflation, represent special challenges for capital intensive industries with a large asset footprint. • An overall disorderly transition, even in the LOW DEMAND scenario holds major transition risks for industry and financial sector. •Least cost access and supply reliability for renewable electricity secures competitiveness for front loaded investments in more capital-intensive manufacturing industry. • Agriculture and forestry as well as health and care sectors contribute important shaping factors for Evonik's portfolio. Therefore, we have assessed 4 NGFS scenarios and complemented them with additional data to represent the full range of possible transition and physical risks and opportunities Evonik will be exposed to for the time horizon 2030, 2040, and 2050 Key insight gained from the scenario analysis are: o understanding which scenario shaping factors need quantification o appropriate

granularity and value chain location of risks and opportunities for value chains and production platforms Quantification of risks and opportunities for scenarios o Cost-related and revenue-related risks/opp. described as gross EBITDA impacts o Risks/opp. quantified against a baseline of Evonik's present portfolio o Risks/opp. of transition plan options in the scenario space to formulate key findings Key trends and critical uncertainties on our strategy, business model and value chain o A broad range of transition and physical risks and opportunities have a substantive effect on Evonik o Transition risks dominate in the NET-ZERO and LOW DEMAND scenario. Physical risks dominate in the CURRENT POLICIES scenario. In the FRAGMENTED WORLD scenario, transition and physical risks are of a similar magnitude. o Transition and physical risks grow exponentially over time, with a significant share of 2040 and 2050 EBITDA exposed if no measures are taken. o Critical uncertainties are i) policy reaction and future carbon prices, ii) circularity and the future demand for chemicals iii) future chemical safety requirements iv) physical risks of climate change specific for regions and value chains Evonik's response to ensure the resilience of our business strategy o Evonik's regional asset set-up allows us to cope well with regionally different policy measures. o Investment in Scope 1&2 emission reduction, reduced water dependency and higher energy efficiency has a very positive impact on our resilience. o Securing renewable electricity PPAs reduces exposure to higher energy prices. o Giving businesses or site into a different ownership if Evonik is not the best owner for the transition to climate neutrality. o Reducing overhead costs to maintain our ability to grow and innovate. o Focusing our innovation in specific Innovation Growth Areas: "Accelerate Energy Transition" contribute to critical material properties and energy efficiency in manufacturing to enable growth of the Clean Tech market, which by far show the highest growth rates in all scenarios. "Enable Circular Economy" will focus on attractive niches in the challenging environment of materials circularity. In LOW DEMAND and in CURRENT POLICIES established materials growth is negative or remains far below GDP growth. For NET ZERO timber and pulpwood are predicted gain market share in applications that have been traditionally dominated by chemicals, steel and cement. "Advance Precision Biosolutions" include solutions that enable new pharma therapies and solutions for bio-based and bio-degradable specialty chemicals. It will see resilient growth in all scenarios. Pharma markets will benefit from the global burden of disease shift from premature death to higher morbidity and from communicable, maternal, neonatal, and nutritional diseases (CMNN) to non-communicable diseases (NCD). o Securing access to circular, low carbon footprint raw materials to maintain the license to operate with our customers. o Support our customers to adopted to climate change in our product applications. Evonik's future cash flow and financing capabilities are sufficient to finance NGS growth, footprint reduction, innovation, and portfolio transition to address risks and take advantage of opportunities. However, we carefully need to steer our portfolio for scenario resilience. In the past we have upgraded, repurposed, redeployed or sold existing assets in a socially responsible manner and will continue to do so. Focusing 3 b CapEx investment until 2030 and 50% of our R&D project resources in our 3 innovation growth areas will help our customers in the transformation. Additionally, we have committed to 700 m CapEx until 2030 for Scope 1&2 reduction, water and energy efficiency.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

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

For our portfolio we cannot derive meaningful conclusions out of the scenario analysis by separating out the findings for climate, water, forests, as they are interlinked and interact with further shaping factors. The WBCSD / McKinsey Agriculture Scenarios HISTORIC TREND, INNOVATION, and SOCIETAL TRANSFORMATION we used to complement the NGFS scenarios for agriculture and forestry data, so we can better characterize risks and opportunities for our animal nutrition business and for specialty chemical inputs into the food system. The outcomes of the forest scenario analysis are included in the Climate Scenario description

Water

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

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

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

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

For our portfolio we cannot derive meaningful conclusions out of the scenario analysis by separating out the findings for climate, water, forests, as they are interlinked and interact with further shaping factors. The WWF Water Risk Filter PESSIMISTIC and OPTIMISTIC scenarios we used to better identify specific water risks at our sites, as these risks can only be properly assessed bottom up. We have modified the questionnaire to assess the site-specific operational risks. We then had all our manufacturing sites fill out the questionnaire and then identified the focus sites with high operational risks and high watershed risk. We are in the process of conducting workshops with focus sites to validate our proxis for water related risks. The outcomes of the water scenario analysis are included in the Climate Scenario description.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ No, but we have a climate transition plan with a different temperature alignment

(5.2.2) Temperature alignment of transition plan

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Being a Specialty Chemicals Company, Evonik has a high energy demand and many production processes rely on fossil raw materials. Non-fossil energy supply of our operations is not feasible with current capacities and prices and non-fossil raw materials are not yet available in sufficient amounts and at competitive prices, nor are the production technologies able to process non-fossil raw materials. However, the anticipated volume growth of our business, including the use of fossil resources, is included in our targets on carbon emission reduction. The increase in emissions from fossil sources will be overcompensated by our energy and emission savings as described in our targets.

(5.2.7) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

Evonik is in regular exchange with shareholders on sustainability topics and answers any questions shareholders may have. Additionally, Evonik participates in ESG-investor conferences multiple times per year.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ More frequently than annually

(5.2.10) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

The transition plan describes the portfolio of Evonik in the reporting year. It is based on scenarios as described by NGFS, IEA and IPCC. Implementation of the transition plan will resourced out of our Free Cash Flow as well as Green Financing instruments as described in our Green Finance Framework.

(5.2.11) Description of progress against transition plan disclosed in current or previous reporting period

On progress against targets, please refer to our Sustainability report 2023, p.7 Progress in implementing the transition plan is being made. However, the respective major activities do not show immediate effects. Examples are the exit of coal-fired power plants in Marl, which took place in April 2024, so after the reporting year, the signing of Power Purchase Agreements that come into effect only 2025 onwards, and the starting of projects that will only have an effect after their completion. The same is true for Scope 3 activities, where our value chain collaboration was intense (e.g., through working in TfS and WBCSD) but did not yield any substantial immediate effect on our Scope 3 emissions.

(5.2.12) Attach any relevant documents which detail your climate transition plan (optional)

Evonik Sustainability Report 2023.pdf

(5.2.13) Other environmental issues that your climate transition plan considers

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Plastics

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(5.2.14) Explain how the other environmental issues are considered in your climate transition plan

Other environmantel issues are covered by plans to reduce specific water consumption (water), reduce the use of non-RSPO-certified palm oil (forests and biodiversity) or value chain cooperation with partners to allow for recycling of PU matraces (plastics). Please refer to our Sustainability report 2023 for more details.

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Decision to define a WB2° target as a first step.

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

As B2B company we face supply side transformation relevant for our manufacturing assets and supply chains, as well as demand side transformations in the many value chains we are a part of. These high uncertainties force us to work with scenarios extensively to come up with transition plan which is resilient in this scenario space and serves as a guidance for strategic decision making. This is why Evonik decided to go for a WB2 target first, with the option to tighten to a 1.5 target in a second step.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Risk 4 (market transition), risk 6 (heat stress), risk 9 (SVHC exposure), opp 6 (energy efficiency and energy system transformation) resemble the range of risk and opportunity exposure for Evonik's products and services related to Climate Change. To ensure that we understand the market transition risks in time, we perform our annual Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA). In the process products and applications with negative sustainability signals are classified as TRANSITIONER or CHALLENGED and products with positive signals – in the absence of any negative signals – are classified as Next GENERATION SOLUTIONS (NGS). The decision was taken to focus our growth CapEx on NGS products in strategic business units that have been identified as "growth" in the strategy process. This is an important lever to achieve our 2030 target of 50% sales with NGS. Further on, the decision was taken that we need to focus our innovation resources to exploit new market opportunities with 3 new Innovation Growth Areas Accelerate Energy Transition, Enable Circular Economy, and Advance Precision Biosolutions. We have made partnerships with our customers and other businesses along value chains a strategic priority as in many cases risk mitigation and new opportunities will need several companies bringing in their expertise for long-term commitments. Forest and water, risk and opportunity: Risk 2 (EU deforestation regulation), risk 4 (market transition risks with reference to non-biodegradable PARCs), risk 6 (heat stress), opp 5 (Biobased and deforestation-free NGS), opp 7 (NGS with water impacts) resemble the range of risk and opportunity exposure for Evonik's products and services related to Forests and Water. Strategic decisions are not specific for Climate Change, Forest and Water and are identical to the ones mentioned under Climate Change.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Risk 4 (market transition), risk 5 (renewable raw materials), risk 6 (heat stress) describe the range value chain impacts of climate transitional risks and the physical risks of climate change on our markets. Regionally, we have the strongest exposure in Asia, as it is an important market but carries the highest transition risks and the highest physical risks, which are especially relevant for economies where GDP is dependent on labor which is exposed to high temperatures and humidities (like in agriculture or construction). We have started to investigate these risks more carefully with our Asia region. We are intensively in discussions with suppliers and customers on scope 3 transparency, carbon footprint calculations, mass balance. We have several thousand suppliers and customers globally, however the majority consists of companies with less than 1000 employees, thus resource limitations on both sides force us to focus the interaction on value chains with the highest momentum, for example cosmetics, automotive materials, tires. Project management according to CDP standard KPI granularity is supposed to be reached within the next ten years.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Risk 4 (market transition), Risk 5 (transition to renewable raw materials), opp 6 (NGS with impact on energy efficiency and energy system transformation) resemble the range of risk and opportunity exposure for Evonik’s R&D investment related to Climate Change. Evonik has no lack of opportunity in any of the future scenario, *but the very broad scenario space in a mostly disorderly transition will force us to balance our innovation portfolio for scenario resilience. We develop new solutions, improve existing products and manufacturing processes, and support product portfolio transition to address market and technology transition risks with new revenue sources. Market transitions can put existing R&D investments in risks, if the application of our products is not aligned with climate change mitigation efforts of our downstream or upstream value chain. To avoid this, we track the PSA classification for R&D Projects supporting existing products and we assess R&D projects for new products or new application with our Portfolio Sustainability Assessment criteria. To explore opportunities that fit to Evonik's technology expertise and market access, we focus our innovation efforts on 3 innovation growth areas: "Accelerate Energy Transition, "Enable Circular Economy", "Advance Precision Biosolutions". Projects in these programs are assessed annually in our PSA process to ensure a positive sustainability contribution.*

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Risk 1 (carbon pricing), risk 3 (water pricing), risk 5 (transition to renewables), risk 7 (flooding), risk 8 (water stress), opp 1 (resource efficiency), opp 3 (resilience to regulatory changes), opp 4 (lower exposure to physical risks) resemble the range of risk and opportunity exposure for Evonik's operations related to climate change and water. To focus our organization on the execution of footprint reduction measures, we have decided to run the EAGER program to achieve our 2030 climate targets for scope 1&2 emissions, but also improve our energy efficiency and our freshwater consumption, supported by a water intensity target. As the biggest lever for emission reduction lies in process integration and the electrification of low temperature process heat, these measures will improve energy intensity by utilizing waste heat and at the same time reduce the demand for cooling water and fuel. This will also make our operations more resilient to climate change, as increasing frequency and severity of weather events will put energy and water supply for operations at risk. We have decided to initiate workshops with high water risk sites to better understand risks from a local perspective (for example regulatory changes and future operating permit requirements) and to identify measures that have a business case by addressing climate change mitigation, adaptation, and improve resource efficiency. Our PPAs secure access and price of renewable electricity, which will become more important with falling fuel intensity and rising electricity intensity of our total energy demand.

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Risk 2 (EU deforestation regulation), risk 4 (market transition risks with reference to non-biodegradable PARCs), risk 6 (heat stress), opp 2 (products complying to EU DR), opp 5 (Biobased and deforestation-free NGS), opp 7 (NGS with water impacts) resemble the range of risk and opportunity exposure for Evonik's products and services related to Forests and Water. Strategic decisions are not specific for Climate Change, Forest and Water and are identical to the ones mentioned under Climate Change.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Risk 5 (transition to renewable content), risk 6 (heat stress), risk 9 (SVHC exposure) describe our growing exposure to forest and water risks driven by the transition to a non-fossil raw material base. Bio-based or recycling based raw material have a high freshwater consumption and bio-based raw materials can exercise additional direct or indirect pressure on forests, depending on their sourcing region. Additionally, we need we will see risks from widening the hazard classes for chemicals considered as SVHC for endocrine disrupting and persistent-mobile-toxic chemicals. We have decided to engage in the cross-sector material pathway of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development to better understand the criteria for sustainable grown and sourced biobased raw materials and to achieve alignment on these criteria along value chains. We also have started innovation activities to explore the potential of CO2-based chemicals in the Rheticus Project together with Siemens. With our Rhamnolipids we also have developed a new class of biosurfactants from carbohydrates instead of oleochemicals to have a solution that is not linked to deforestation concerns. We also have reached out into our value chains to better capture the risk exposure to SVHC chemicals by aligning on the definition of consumer use, widespread commercial use and contained industrial use and implement this in our Portfolio Sustainability Assessment.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Risk 4 (market transition), risk 5 (transition to renewables), risk 9 (SVHC exposure), opp 5 (biobased and deforestation-free), opp 7 (existing NGS with water impacts) resemble the range of risk and opportunity exposure for Evonik's products and services related to forests and water. Market transitions can put existing R&D investments in risks, if the application of our products is not aligned with water management and nature related efforts of our downstream or upstream value chain. To avoid this, we track the PSA classification for R&D Projects supporting existing products and we assess R&D projects for new products or new application with our Portfolio Sustainability Assessment criteria. In our innovation growth areas "Enable Circular Economy", "Advance Precision Biosolutions" we have placed projects that help to substitute non-biodegradable chemicals, save water, and establish alternatives to chemicals that are linked to deforestation concerns.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Climate change, risk and opportunity affecting CapEx for new revenue streams: Risk 4 (market transition), risk 5 (transition to renewables), risk 6 (heat stress), opp 5 (biobased, deforestation-free) opp 6 (existingwith impacts on energy efficiency and energy system transformation), opp 7 (NGS with water impacts) resemble the range of risk and opportunity related to climate change and require additional revenue streams to address risks and to seize opportunities. We placed a guidance to focus 80% of our growth CapEx in NGS in growth businesses into financial planning process and resource allocation for mid-term and long-term financial planning of CapEx. We have communicated an anticipated 3 bn CapEx investment until 2030 for this purpose. The funding and financing of the CapEx will come out of our cash flow and out of green bonds. Climate change and water, risk and opportunities affecting CapEx to address environmental risks for our asset footprint: Risk 1 (carbon pricing), risk 3 (water pricing), risk 7 (flooding), risk 8 (water stress), opp 1 (ressourc e fficiency), opp 3 (resilience to regulatory changes), opp 4 (resilience to physical risks) resemble the range of risk and opportunity related to climate change considered in our capital expenditure planning. We placed a guidance to invest 700 M CapEx until 2030 for Scope 1&2 reduction into financial planning process and resource allocation for mid-term and long-term financial planning of CapEx. We manage this investment on a project basis. All projects receive an EAGER tag in our capital project management systems. The funding and financing of the CapEx will come out of our cash flow and out of green bonds.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Risk 4 (market transition), risk 5 (transition to renewables), risk 6 (heat stress), opp 5 (biobased and deforestation-free) opp 6 (energy efficiency and energy system transformation) resemble the range of risk and opportunity related to climate change and considered in long-term revenue planning. Risk 5 (transition to renewable content), risk 6 (heat stress), describe our growing exposure to climate change impacts and to the transition to a non-fossil raw materials an energy. This will lead to a structural increase of raw material and energy prices, we will be passing on to our customers. This is considered in our long-term revenue planning. Potentially negative revenue development from exposure to future market transition or chronic physical risks are assessed for the scenario space and are considered in the assessment of market attractiveness, which is an important dimension (next to competitive position) for definition of the strategic role of each Strategic Business Unit (SBU). On a more detailed assessment level these negative developments are assessed in the PSA for a Product-Application-Region-Combination (PARC) to allow business to identify negative signals in time as an input into R&D and CapEx resource steering. Opportunities for additional revenues are assed for the scenario space and are as well considered in the market attractiveness rating for each SBU. To have sufficient capital allocated to ensure growth of these opportunities we have allocated 80 of our Value generation" CapEx on these NGS opportunities in our strategic financial planning. Additionally, we have set revenue targets for our 3 innovation growth areas to deliver 1.5 bn additional revenue by 2032 and we have ensured that this commitment is backed up by sufficient R&D resources and CapEx allocations.

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Risk 1 (carbon pricing), risk 3 (water pricing), risk 7 (flooding), risk 8 (water stress), opp 1 (resource efficiency), opp 3 (resilience to regulatory changes), opp 4 (resilience to physical risks) resemble the range of risk and opportunity related to climate change and considered our cost planning for our direct operation. We consider the cost impacts related to Evonik operation to assess how the internalization of environmental externalities will affect the future competitiveness of our sites Risk 5 (transition to renewable content), risk 6 (heat stress), describe our growing exposure to by climate change impacts and to the transition to a non-fossil raw materials an energy. This will lead to a structural increase of raw material and energy prices, which we consider in our long-term cost planning.

Row 5

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Access to capital

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Opportunity Climate, Water, Forests: Risk 1 (exposure to carbon pricing), opp 6 (NGS with impacts on energy efficiency and energy system transformation) resemble risks and opportunities that can be financed with lower cost of capital via green finance, as the methodology to achieve impacts is well described and impacts can be verified in the annual impact report. Evonik's Green Finance Framework and the EIB loan for Innovation are to examples how to finance growth opportunities to transform the company.

Row 6

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Climate change and water, risk and opportunities affecting "Value Preservation" CapEX: Risk 1 (carbon pricing), risk 3 (water pricing), risk 7 (flooding), risk 8 (water stress), opp 1 (renewable electricity access), opp 3 (resilience to regulatory changes), opp 4 (cost savings via resource efficiency) resemble the range of risk and opportunity related to climate change and considered in "value preservation" capital expenditure planning. We placed a guidance to invest 700 M CapEx until 2030 for Scope 1&2 reduction into financial planning process and resource allocation for mid-term and long-term financial planning of CapEx. We manage this in vestment on a project basis. All projects receive an EAGER tag in our capital project management systems. The funding and financing of the CapEx will come out of our cash flow and out of green bonds.

Row 7

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Risk 2 (EU DR compliance), risk 4 (market transition including stakeholder ambition on bio-degradable chemical additives and ingredient), risk 5 (transition to renewable content), risk 6 (heat stress), opp 2 (additional sales from EUDR compliant products), opp 5 (biobaed, deforestation-free), opp 7 (NGS with water impacts) resemble the range of risk and opportunity affecting Evonik's future revenues related to Forests and Water. Potentially negative revenue development from exposure to future market transition or chronic physical risks are assessed for the scenario space and are considered in the assessment of market attractiveness, which is an *important dimension (next to competitive position) for definition of the strategic role of each Strategic Business Unit (SBU). On a more detailed assessment level these negative developments are assessed in the PSA for a Product-Application-Region-Combination (PARC) to allow business to identify negative signals in time as an input into R&D and CapEx resource steering. Opportunities for additional revenues are assed for the scenario space and are as well considered in the market attractiveness rating for each SBU. To have sufficient capital allocated to ensure growth of these opportunities we have allocated 80 of our Value generation" CapEx on these NGS opportunities in our strategic financial planning. Even though the growth drivers often arise from healthcare needs the NGS PARCs allocated to Safeguard Ecosystems and new PARCs arising from Advance Precision Biosolutions have often positive impacts on water by reducing the release of chemicals into the environment along the value chain and from offering alternatives to chemicals that are connected to biodiversity and deforestation concerns.*

Row 8

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Risk 2 (EU deforestation directive compliance), risk 4 (market transition including stakeholder ambition on bio-degradable chemical additives and ingredient), risk 5 (transition to renewable content), risk 6 (heat stress), opp 2 (additional sales from EUDR compliant products), opp 5 (biobased and deforestation-free), opp 7 (NGS with water impacts) resemble the range of risk and opportunity affecting Evonik's future direct cost related to forests and water. Some of this cost increases we merely pass on to our customers, other cost increases present an opportunity because the underlying efforts present additional customer value and allow us to differentiate from competitors to secure additional growth and/or margin.

[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization’s climate transition	Indicate the level at which you identify the alignment of your spending/revenue with a sustainable finance taxonomy
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy	*Select from:* ☑ At both the organization and activity level

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Climate change mitigation

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue/Turnover

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

79000000

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

1

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

1

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

1

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

17

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

83

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

See the description in the row for the objective "Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation"

Row 2

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Climate change mitigation

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

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

2000000

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

12

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

88

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

See the description in the row for the objective "Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation"

Row 3

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Climate change mitigation

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

2000000

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

14

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

86

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

See the description in the row for the objective "Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation"

Row 4

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Climate change adaptation

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue/Turnover

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

0

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

100

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

None of Evonik's activities are taxonomy-eligible with regard to the climate change adaptation objective. Consequently, none can be aligned.

Row 5

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:
☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:
☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:
☑ Climate change adaptation

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ CAPEX

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

0

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

100

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

None of Evonik's activities are taxonomy-eligible with regard to the climate change adaptation objective. Consequently, none can be aligned.

Row 6

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:
☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:
☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:
☑ Climate change adaptation

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

0

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

100

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

None of Evonik's activities are taxonomy-eligible with regard to the climate change adaptation objective. Consequently, none can be aligned.

Row 7

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:
☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue/Turnover

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

79000000

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

1

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

1

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

1

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

17

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

83

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

AVOIDING DOUBLE COUNTING: None of Evonik's activities are taxonomy-eligible regarding the climate change adaptation objective. Thus, the total numbers across both climate-change-related objectives equal the numbers for the climate change mitigation objective. LITTLE FOCUS OF EU TAXONOMY ON SPECIALTY CHEMICALS: The main focus of the current delegated acts of the climate taxonomy is on economic activities that result in high carbon dioxide emissions, where a reduction in emissions would make the biggest contribution to achieving the EU’s climate targets. Consequently, the chemical products mainly affected by the delegated acts issued so far for the two climate-related environmental objectives are commodity chemicals. Evonik’s portfolio of specialty chemicals is therefore only covered to a small extent by the EU taxonomy’s climate change mitigation objective at present. In other words, only a few of our economic activities are taxonomy-eligible for the climate-related objectives. In 2023, these taxonomy-eligible activities accounted for just 17 percent of turnover, 12 percent of CapEx, and 14 percent of OpEx. Consequently, taxonomy-alignment can only be assessed for this share of our portfolio. (Please note: Since some of our economic activities are eligible under the other four, not-climate-related objectives of the EU taxonomy, our total eligibility across all six objectives of the EU taxonomy was 17 percent of turnover, 13 percent of CapEx, and 15 percent of OpEx.) REASONS FOR CURRENT ALIGNMENT AND NON-ALIGNMENT: Evonik's taxonomy-eligible products include butadiene, products classified as plastics by the EU taxonomy, precursors for energy efficiency equipment for buildings and steam and electricity from our gas and steam turbine power plants. For 2023, the taxonomy-alignment of these activities was 1 percent of turnover and less of CapEx and OpEx. One major reason for these low ratios is that for the climate change mitigation objective for chemical products, the EU taxonomy mainly addresses the cradle-to-gate carbon footprint of the products and especially their raw materials. In contrast, it disregards the positive impacts (handprint) of many chemical products along the value chain. The enabling role of chemical products both as necessary precursor for low-carbon technologies (such as renewable energy production or e-mobility) and as mitigation enablers via their effects in customers' applications (such as resource savings, energy savings, durability) are neglected in the current scope of the EU taxonomy. Furthermore, external verification is required for several aspects such as the cradle-to-gate footprint of the eligible products. This increases the effort and costs for proving alignment. (For further details see also VCI's position paper) OUTLOOK FOR TAXONOMY-ALIGNMENT: While we support the vision and ambition of the EU taxonomy, its current implementation hinders taxonomy-alignment of specialty chemicals due to inconsistencies, high costs for proving of alignment and incomplete coverage of specialty chemicals and their enabling effects. However, the intended updates and extensions of the EU taxonomy might reduce these hindrances in the future. When considering just the current state of the taxonomy legislation and only the two climate-related environmental goals, we assume that Evonik's percentage of taxonomy-alignment will increase due to the rising use of non-fossil raw materials with third party sustainability certification. After all, we are endeavouring to increase the proportion of renewable raw materials and already reached 12.0 percent of production inputs in 2023, as compared to 11.1 percent in 2022 (see p.37 of our sustainability report 2023). However, due to the uncertainties of both the legal development and the increase of our external LCA verifications, we applied a conservative approach and stated out future taxonomy-alignment without any changes from the current level.

Row 8

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

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

2000000

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

12

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

88

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

The methodology and context of identifying aligned CapEx is similar to the description for aligned turnover (see above). While turnover is determined and consolidated at product level using a system-supported process, direct assignment of the CapEx and OpEx KPIs to taxonomy-eligible economic activities is not always possible. In these cases, we used appropriate coding to the next highest level where an indicator was available. The next highest level is either a product line or a business line. Our system compiles and consolidates the CapEx and OpEx KPI indicators at least at the level of business lines. This method prevents double-counting of turnover, CapEx, and OpEx.

Row 9

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:
☑ Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ OPEX

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

2000000

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

14

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

86

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

The methodology and context of identifying aligned OpEx is similar to the description for aligned turnover (see above). While turnover is determined and consolidated at product level using a system-supported process, direct assignment of the CapEx and OpEx KPIs to taxonomy-eligible economic activities is not always possible. In these cases, we used appropriate coding to the next highest level where an indicator was available. The next highest level is either a product line or a business line. Our system compiles and consolidates the CapEx and OpEx KPI indicators at least at the level of business lines. This method prevents double-counting of turnover, CapEx, and OpEx.
[Add row]

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

(5.4.3.1) Details of minimum safeguards analysis

Minimum safeguard analysis was only performned for the little bit of slaes that fall under scope of the EU taxonomy.

(5.4.3.2) Additional contextual information relevant to your taxonomy accounting

As described in detail in question 5.4.1, specialty chemicals are not in the focus of the EU taxonomy. As a result, Evonik could only assess 17 percent of turnover, 13 percent of CapEx, and 15 percent of OpEx against the EU taxonomy's regulations regarding the climate-related environmental goals. The rest of our portfolio is currently not in the scope of the EU taxonomy's climate-related goals (not eligible). This includes most of our Next Generation Solutions: Products with a strong sustainability profile that is above or well above the market reference level. Selected examples for Next Generation Solutions which benefit climate change mitigation are published annually and include for example products and services which enable higher fuel-efficiency of tires, lower GHG-intensity of animal feed, energy-saving hydraulic fluids or reusing of spent catalysts (see our Next Generation Solutions brochure 2023, https://files.evonik.com/shared-files/p230509-en-broschu-re-next-generation-solutions-ngs-supplement-2023-nr-in-bearbeitung-9349.pdf). Next Generation Solutions are determined via the annual sustainability analysis of our business, which is based on the Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA) methodology of the World Business Council for Sustainability Development (WBCSD) and undergoes an annual limited assurance review. In contrast to the EU taxonomy, the sustainability analysis of our business covers our whole chemicals business. Also, it covers not just climate-related ecological aspects, but a multitude of ecological and social aspects. Furthermore, unlike the EU taxonomy, the sustainability analysis of our business covers the footprint, handprint, and further signals and market requirements. Many Evonik products are differentiated from competing products principally through their handprint. Our sustainability analysis with its holistic approach therefore remains the key tool for the strategic management and ongoing development of our portfolio.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

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

(5.5.1) Investment in low-carbon R&D

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.5.2) Comment

As a leading specialty company we have a broad range of R&D activities that would qualify as low-carbon R&D as defined in this questionaire. In the following section we have detailed only the most prominent activities.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.5.3.1) Technology area

Select from:
☑ Unable to disaggregate by technology area

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

90

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

443000000

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

90

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

Evonik has a large range of R&D and technology competences with a 2023 R&D expenditure of 443 million with approximately 2,700 R&D staff at more than 40 locations around the world, 23,000 patents and pending patents, 7,350 trademarks either registered or applied for. The R&D competences are applied in R&D projects managed through a stage gate process, in the support of production sites, and for application technology. Research for low carbon R&D efforts comprise biotechnology, carbon capture, utilization and storage, chemical production using renewables with enzymatic or fermentation processes, advance process control systems, electrochemistry, product redesign and radical process redesign. The individual areas are unable to disintegrate, because we often use several competences to develop or improve manufacturing processes or to develop new products and services. As the definition of low-carbon R&D is very broad in the questionnaire, we estimate that at least 90% of our R&D expenditures fall under these definitions.

Row 4

(5.5.3.1) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Waste heat recovery

(5.5.3.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Large scale commercial deployment

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

2

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

443000000

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

5

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

We approximately spend 8 m in 2024 on Waste Heat Recovery R&D. This comprises the efforts for conceptual engineering, but not the efforts for basic engineering and construction, as they are part of the investment project engineering effort and will be activated. The number is a very rough estimate and will rise in the coming years, as we will focus on the many small investment projects that contribute to Watse Heat Recovery.
[Add row]

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

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

280

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

28

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

we take a holistic approach to sustainability. Investments have an impact on several areas of sustainability. The stated changes to the CAPEX refer to the EAGER project without differentiation with regard to the different sustainability areas. We will invest app. 10% of or annual CapEx Volume for the footprint reduction of our existing assets (700 M for EAGER). Not all of this is related to water, but as much of this CapEx is related for energy efficiency via heat integration, if will have a positive effect on cooling water intake. We anticipate that for our journey towards Net-Zero we will continue to see investments in heat integration and closed water cycles. We estimate that water related measures have not a significant effect on OpEx.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:
☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply
☑ Conduct cost-benefit analysis

☑ Drive energy efficiency

☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment with the price of a carbon tax

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

☑ Benchmarking against peers

☑ Existing or pending legislation

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

Evonik defines its internal carbon on the basis of external surveys and forecasts globally.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Differentiated

(5.10.1.7) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

As reduction of scope 1 emissions are much more influenced by capex availability and reduction of scope 2 emissions do much more impact operational expenditures we do take different approaches.

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Evolutionary

(5.10.1.9) Indicate how you expect the price to change over time

Currently Evonik plans with a carbon price about 100/tCO2eq on the global scale. within the next 10years

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

5

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

100

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

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Operations

☑ Procurement

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for all decision-making processes

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

25

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

Pricing approach is being monitored based on a selection of sensitivity analysis to be compared with a bas-case scenario
[Add row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Forests ☑ Water ☑ Plastics
Smallholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply*
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Forests ☑ Water ☑ Plastics
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Forests ☑ Water ☑ Plastics

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Forests ☑ Water ☑ Plastics

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

We prioritize suppliers for engagement on environmental issues by assessing their contribution to our Scope 3 emissions. By focusing on these suppliers with the highest contribution to our Scope 3 emissions, we work collboratively to identify and implement best practices for reductions, set and monitor emisison reduction targets and develop innovative solutions. The prioritization of supplier engagement is often associated with specific business activities.

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

150

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

We prioritize all suppliers in scope of EUDR and palm oil activities.

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

Water

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Dependence on water
☑ Impact on water availability

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

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

We prioritize engaging with suppliers based on their water usage and impact on water availability, especially those with high-volume or water-intensive processes, or those located in water-stressed regions. By targeting these suppliers, we aim to collaboratively identify real data and first mitigation measures to minimize water-related risks. This approach is aligned with specific business activities that are water-dependent.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

50

Plastics

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

We prioritize suppliers for engagement on environmental issues by assessing their contribution to our Scope 3 emissions. By focusing on these suppliers with the highest contribution to our Scope 3 emissions, we work collboratively to identify and implement best practices for reductions, set and monitor emisison reduction targets and develop innovative solutions. The prioritization of supplier engagement is often associated with specific business activities.

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

150
[Fixed row]

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Product lifecycle

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We prioritize supplier engagement on environmental issues based on their Scope 3 emissions impact, focusing on those contributing most to our footprint. Collaboratively, we target reductions through best practices, set and monitor goals, and innovate. Key factors include the volume and environmental footprint of *supplied materials, strategic importance, and risk management. Suppliers crucial to our supply chain and those posing compliance or reputational risks receive heightened attention to uphold sustainability and meet regulatory standards.*

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Suppliers are prioritized by regulatory and strategic compliance

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We prioritize engaging with suppliers based on their water usage and impact on water availability, especially those with high-volume or water-intensive processes, or those located in water-stressed regions. By targeting these suppliers, we aim to collaboratively identify real data and first mitigation measures to minimize water-related risks. This approach is aligned with specific business activities that are water-dependent.

Plastics

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Product lifecycle

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Suppliers with the most significant environmental impact are prioritized. This can be determined by the volume (and spend) of materials supplied, the environmental footprint of the materials, or the processes used by the supplier. • Strategic Importance: Key suppliers that are critical to the business are engaged preferentially to ensure that the sustainability standards are met across the most crucial parts of the supply chain. • Risk Management: Suppliers that pose a potential risk to Evonik in terms of environmental compliance or reputation are engaged more closely to mitigate these risks. Regulatory Compliance: Suppliers are also prioritized based on the need to comply with environmental regulations in the regions they operate in or supply to
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Evonik places a strong emphasis on sustainability and responsible sourcing, which includes setting environmental requirements for suppliers. As part of the organization's purchasing process, suppliers are often required to comply with certain environmental standards and practices. This can include the management of their environmental impact, adherence to environmental regulations, and the implementation of sustainable practices. Evonik's commitment to environmental stewardship is reflected in its procurement policies, which aim to minimize the environmental footprint of its operations and products. By requiring suppliers to meet these environmental standards, Evonik promotes a culture of sustainability not only within its own operations but also across its supply chain.The company's approach to sustainable procurement involves a comprehensive evaluation of suppliers' environmental performance and the integration of environmental criteria into supplier selection and evaluation processes. This ensures that the company's environmental values are upheld throughout its supply chain and contributes to the broader goal of sustainable development.

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Evonik's targetis to purchase 100% RSPO-certified palm (kernel) oil derivatives to minimize risk of deforestation. In July 2021, Evonik published its commitment on responsible supply chains of palm oil (found on the Evonik website). one criteria for the use of palm oil, palm kernel oil, and their derivatives is: Direct suppliers of palm-based raw materials need to be members of the RSPO or organizations with equivalent, validated principles and obligations. supplier qualification is part of RSPO audit prozess. Supplier certifications are monitored on monthly basis.

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Evonik has initiated supplier engagement with preliminary pilot programs, primarily concentrating on carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions. While these efforts have laid the groundwork for collaborative environmental stewardship, the focus on water-related issues has not been fully developed yet. Recognizing the critical importance of sustainable water management, Evonik plans to expand its environmental requirements to include specific water-related criteria within the next two years.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Measuring product-level emissions

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

no comment

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :RSPO compliance

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ Suspend and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

for palm oil: Evonik's target is to purchase 100% RSPO-certified palm (kernel) oil derivatives to minimize risk of deforestation, Evonik is a founding member of the Action for Sustainable Derivatives (ASD) initiative. The goal of the ASD initiative is to ensure the traceability of palm oil derivatives to mills and plantations. Its risk analysis methods and joint action plans aim to help counter progressive deforestation. As a result of the annual supply chain mapping, ongoing grievances linked to associated mills in Evonik's supply chain are identified by consultancy "transitions". The progress of grievances are monitored by ASD. Identified grievances linked to Evonik's supply chain (Level 1 mills - high probability of physical link to supply chain) are passed for comments and action plans to direct suppliers. Responses are shared with requesting supply chain partners. The Deforestation and Conversion-free (DCF) volumes were calculated by an external party (consultancy "transitions").

Water

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:
☑ 26-50%
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to make credible renewable energy usage claims

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

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

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to set science-based targets

Financial incentives

☑ Provide financial incentives for environmental performance

☑ Provide financial incentives for suppliers increasing renewable energy use

Information collection

☑ Collect climate transition plan information at least annually from suppliers

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

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Collaborate with suppliers to develop reuse infrastructure and reuse models

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

10

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

Evonik expanded its supplier engagement activities to encompass not just raw material providers but also those in logistics and packaging. This strategic move was driven by the understanding that a significant portion of Evonik's environmental footprint lies within its supply chain. The rationale for this broadened engagement was twofold: to reduce Evonik's overall environmental impact and to support suppliers, especially those vulnerable, in improving their environmental practices. By focusing on logistics and packaging, areas with immediate substantial potential for carbon footprint reduction, Evonik aimed to foster a collaborative environment where both *the company and its suppliers could thrive sustainably. Evonik initiated the collection of primary data from its logistic and packaging suppliers, which was a critical first step in identifying areas for reduction. The company received initial data sets, which were analyzed. Follow-up discussions with internal stakeholders and suppliers were then conducted to explore opportunities for more sustainable practices, such as changing specific transportation modes and switching to rebottled packaging. In the area of raw materials, Evonik took a proactive stance by issuing a Carbon Data Ambition letter to all significant suppliers, specifically targeting those with annual emissions exceeding 10,000 tonnes of CO2 equivalent. This letter was not merely a request for information but a clear expression of Evonik's ambition to obtain primary data from all significant suppliers by the end of 2025. This cooperative approach was met with positive feedback, as all lead buyers actively disseminated the ambition. The engagement activities have led to several positive outcomes: Enhanced understanding of the environmental impact across the supply chain with real data. Improved supplier practices through the adoption of more sustainable transportation methods and packaging solutions. Strengthened relationships with suppliers, fostering a culture of cooperation and mutual growth in sustainability. Success was measured using specific metrics that reflected the effectiveness of the engagement activities: Reduction in CO2 emissions from logistics and packaging changes. Percentage of suppliers providing primary data and number of suppliers switching to sustainable practices, such as rebottled IBCs.*

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Palm oil

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

Plastics

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

[Add row]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Palm oil

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building

☑ Organize capacity building events

☑ Support smallholders to clarify and secure land tenure rights

☑ Other capacity building approach, please specify :Investing in pilot projects

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

300

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Evonik supports the " Living Landscape Sabah /Tabin" jurisdictional approach since 2020 together with partners. The program combines conservation & sustainable development by integrating protection of forests, wildlife and rivers, with RSPO certified production of oil palm, restoration of ecological corridors, and riparian reserves. Objectives: 1. PROTECT: Landscape Planning & Policy By 2026, an integrated land-use plan for the Tabin landscape supports protection of forests and certification of RSPO/NDPE palm oil at landscape level. By 2026, an effective policy framework at jurisdictional level supports the sustainable landscape approach across Sabah's landscapes. 2. PRODUCE: Sustainable Palm Oil By 2026, oil palm growers covering 15,000 ha in Tabin are RSPO certified (and NDPE compliant) through landscape approaches. 3. PROTECT: Wildlife Protection By 2026, populations of rare, threatened and endangered terrestrial mammals are stabilized in Tabin Wildlife Reserve. 4. PROTECT: Human-Elephant Conflict By 2026, human-elephant conflicts in Tabin and its surrounding areas are substantially reduced, preventing retaliatory killings. 5. RESTORE: Ecological Corridors By 2026, at least one ecological corridor is established and restored, allowing for wildlife migration and habitat connectivity. 6. Landscape Assessments and Methodologies By 2026, the cooperation has contributed to develop landscape assessments and methodologies supporting sustainable development in the Sabah-Tabin landscape and deforestation-free supply chains. Together with partners, Evonik has been supporting an additional landscape project in West Kalimantan, Indonesia, since 2022. Objectives: 1. By June 2026, farmer association AMB has
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing
☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

We want a better understanding of our downstream scope 3 emissions in categories 9, 11, 12. Additionally, we help our customers to reduce their carbon footprint or to achieve “avoided emissions” (or “scope 4” emission reduction) along the value chain. As most of our products are additives going into customer products and processes in the low percentage range, we often find that our customers do not have an interest in the product carbon footprint of our products and how much this contributes to their carbon footprint. Our customers are much more interested in how the use of our products can improve energy efficiency, extend product lifetime, allow a higher value product reuse or recycling, or enable certain physical or metabolic effects in the application that contribute to avoided emissions in customer’s operation or along the value chain.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

With our efforts in the customer dialogues, we contribute to a more efficient use of our products and to a more circular approach along the value chain. Thus, the success of this engagement can be measures in the downstream scope 3 intensity of our portfolio and of the avoided emissions we can calculate based on more profound understanding of the downstream value chain. This understanding also allows us to better formulate the customer value for our solutions and evolve our business model.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

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

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

☑ Encourage collaborative work in multi-stakeholder landscape towards initiatives for sustainable land-use goals

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

We want to have a better understanding about the forest and biodiversity related topics we need to control to fulfill customer requirements with a strong sustainability agenda. Even though most of our products are additives going into customer products and processes in the low percentage range, we do have customers with a strong sustainability agenda that want us to ensure the absence of deforestation in our supply chain. Now, the EU Deforestation Regulation forces us to validate the absence of deforestation in for products and supply chains in scope and we interact with our customers how we can ensure that we support them with credible prove of EU DR compliant products. We also want to understand how our products and services can enable our customers or our downstream value chain to improve its sustainability performance in the field of forests and biodiversity. One example if the monogastric animal feed area, where our amino acids allow customers a lower protein content feed. As protein sources in feed like soybean meal can directly or indirectly contribute to land use change and additional pressure on biodiversity and forests in some regions, we support our customers with feed formulations that meet the nutritional needs of he animals and minimize the environmental footprint.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

With our efforts in the customer dialogues, we contribute to a more efficient use of our products and to less pressure on forest and biodiversity along the value chain. Thus, the success of this engagement can be measures on more profound understanding of the downstream value chain expressed in our handprint calculation. The metrics for forests and biodiversity are not as advance as for climate change and there are controversies around direct and indirect land use change calculations that make it difficult to use “avoided emissions” as a proxy for positive impact on forests. However, we continue work with customers and other stakeholders along the value chain to evolve a better understanding. This understanding also allows us to better formulate the customer value for our solutions and evolve our business model.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

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

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

☑ Encourage collaborative work in multi-stakeholder landscape towards initiatives for sustainable land-use goals

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

We want to have a better understanding about the water related topics we need to control to fulfill customer requirements with a strong sustainability agenda. Even though most of our products are additives going into customer products and processes in the low percentage range, we do have customers with a strong sustainability agenda that want us to ensure the absence of water related issues in our supply chain. We also want to understand how our products and services can enable our customers or our downstream value chain to improve its sustainability performance in the fields of water. One example is the use of biodegradable additives in applications that release chemicals into the water system or soil. In most cases it is not about substituting one chemical in another one, but in developing an entire new formulation, which needs to meet a specific performance in the application and will need new internal and external approvals. Another example is in the field of feed formulation, as every percentage of crude protein reduction in monogastric feed reduces water consumption in farming and nitrogen emissions by 10%.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

With our efforts in the customer dialogues, we contribute to a more efficient use of our products and to less pressure the water cycle along the value chain. Thus, the success of this engagement can be measures on more profound understanding of the downstream value chain expressed in our handprint calculation. This understanding also allows us to better formulate the customer value for our solutions and evolve our business model.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

We want to understand investor and shareholder perspective on our transparency of climate related risks and opportunities and our governance processes and decisions to manage these. Because of the complexity of our product portfolio, asset landscape and supply chains, it is important that our shareholders have a good understanding of our risk and opportunity exposure and how our decisions respond to this exposure. The interaction allows us to better understand how we hold up n our peer group and allows us to continuously improve our reporting.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

The success of this interaction we see in our climate related scoring in ratings in rankings like CDP, Sustainalytics, MSCI, ISS, Ecovadis. Another measure of success is our ability to place green bonds or secure other green finance options.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

We want to understand investor and shareholder perspective on our transparency of forest and biodiversity related risks and opportunities and our governance processes and decisions to manage these. Because of the complexity of our product portfolio, asset landscape and supply chains, it is important that our shareholders have a good understanding of our risk and opportunity exposure and how our decisions respond to this exposure. The interaction allows us to better understand how we hold up in our peer group and allows us to continuously improve our reporting. We also educate our investors and shareholders, which at of the many forst and biodiversity related aspects are material for our downstream and upstream value chain and for our operations.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

The success of this interaction we see in our forest and biodiversity related scoring in ratings in rankings like CDP, Sustainalytics, MSCI, ISS, Ecovadis. Another measure of success is our ability to place green bonds or secure other green finance options.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

We want to understand investor and shareholder perspective on our transparency of water related risks and opportunities and our governance processes and decisions to manage these. Because of the complexity of our product portfolio, asset landscape and supply chains, it is important that our shareholders have a good understanding of our risk and opportunity exposure and how our decisions respond to this exposure. The interaction allows us to better understand how we hold up in our peer group and allows us to continuously improve our reporting. We also educate our investors and shareholders, which at of the many water-related aspects are material for our downstream and upstream value chain and for our operations.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We evaluate the success of this interaction via our water-related scoring in ratings and rankings like CDP, Sustainalytics, MSCI, ISS, Ecovadis. Another measure of success is our ability to place green bonds or secure other green finance options.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :WBCSD members and value chain shaping companies with global reach

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

The categories 1,2,3,4,12 comprise more than 80% of scope 3 emissions and more than 60% of our total GHG emissions. Most of those emissions can not be controlled by our direct suppliers and direct customers. Therefore, we have a high motivation to engage across the value chain to look for ways to reduce these emissions. As policy frameworks for carbon prices are not sufficiently aligned in the global economy to drive the decarbonization along value chain in an economically feasible way, the challenge is to find opportunities for action that can be scaled by bringing together several partners along the value chain with competencies and market access. Examples for these opportunities are i) heat as a service arrangements and other forms of collaborations to tackle waste heat recovery, as our upstream and downstream industry has a large potential to reduce fuel use for low temperature heat and thus save energy and emissions. ii) understand how renewable agriculture practices contribute to lower the carbon footprint for bio-based raw materials for alternative manufacturing processes compete with fossil-based manufacturing. iii) how different ways of natural gas extraction can reduce methane leakages iv) understand the opportunities of sector coupling between urban mobility, housing and infrastructure and how the material challenge of a high voltage infrastructure can be met with new solutions. v) how long-term supply agreement *between different players can bring new low-carbon solutions to scale with feasible economics. Another motivation for engagement is that very often accounting methods and parameters for sustainable solutions on a product level are not aligned along the value chain. That makes it very difficult for B2B companies to compete on a set of agreed environmental or social performance indicators, even more if there are trade-offs between different environmental and social performance indicators, as it is the case between fossil-based and bio-based carbon sources. The engagement helps us to understand different perspectives along the value chain to develop solutions that will receive a broad market acceptance.*

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

WBCSD assessment of membership criteria is important feedback on our engagement. Also, our partnerships with value chain shaping companies with a global reach to scale low-carbon solution or to access raw materials with a lower carbon footprint are a measure of success.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :WBCSD members and value chain shaping companies with global each

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Encourage collaborative work in multi-stakeholder landscape towards initiatives for sustainable land-use goals

☑ Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

As the chemical industry and its downstream value chain will move away from fossil-based carbon source, a significant share will come out of renewable based carbon sources. Therefore, the pressure on land and forests to supply nutrition, energy, and materials will increase. This demands for a certain productivity per area to reduce the pressure on land-based habitats and it is yet not clear, how sustainability for a biobased raw material is defined. Terms line "sustainable sourced" and "do no harm" do not really help. We engage in WBCSD to better understand the perspectives of renewable agriculture and to assess a nature-positive roadmap for the chemical industry. Evonik is actively engaged in promoting sustainable palm oil production through its involvement with the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). Evonik has been a member of the RSPO since 20101. Several of Evonik's production sites, including those in Essen, Steinau, Shanghai, and Americana, have received RSPO certification. Evonik aims to use the largest possible share of RSPO-certified fatty acids and fatty alcohols derived from palm oil in their products for cosmetics, detergents, and cleaning agents. Evonik collaborates with organizations like the WWF and companies such as Beiersdorf to support sustainable palm oil production and conservation efforts in regions like Tabin, Malaysia. Evonik is also a founding member of the Action for Sustainable Derivatives (ASD) initiative, which was established in 2019. The ASD aims to enhance the sustainability of palm oil and palm kernel oil derivatives used in various industries, including cosmetics and personal care. Evonik works to ensure the traceability of palm oil derivatives back to mills and plantations. The initiative employs risk analysis methods and joint action plans to address issues such as deforestation and social impacts. By collaborating with other companies and stakeholders, Evonik aims to transform the palm derivatives sector through increased transparency and on-the-ground impacts. The initiative also focuses on supporting the livelihoods of independent smallholder farmers by including them in the global derivatives supply chain.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

WBCSD assessment of membership criteria is important feedback on our engagement. Also, our partnerships with value chain shaping companies with a global reach to scale solution with a lower pressure on forests and biodiversity or to access more sustainable bio-based raw materials are a measure of success.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :WBCSD members and value chain shaping companies with global reach

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

As the chemical industry and its downstream value chain will move away from fossil-based carbon source, a significant share of our raw material will come out of renewable based carbon sources or recycling or green hydrogen-based carbon sources, all with a significant blue water footprint and water pollution topics (as renewable raw materials have a high water intensity and might come from regions facing water stress). Therefore, the pressure on the water cycle will increase. As it is currently not clear how it is possible to stay within planetary boundaries while increasing the share of biobased and recycled feedstock, we engage with the WBCSD to better understand the perspectives of water use and pollution along value chains and to assess a nature-positive roadmap for the chemical industry.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

WBCSD assessment of membership criteria is important feedback on our engagement. Also, our partnerships with value chain shaping companies with a global reach to scale solution with a lower pressure on water cycle or to access more sustainable circular raw materials are a measure of success.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**NGOs and scientific community, either directly or through industry associations like CEFIC or WBCSD

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

Even though the GHG protocol and SBTi provide a fairly well-established accounting methods on corporate level, many open questions remain, especially if data has to be presented on a more granular level (sites, raw-materials, etc.) or at a product level. So far there is no alignment on the biogenic carbon accounting between SBTi and GHG protocol. The link between scope 3 emissions and circularity metrics is not established, there is a heated discussion about chain of custody approaches and product claims, acceptable mass balance accounting being part of it. NGOs and science represent an important opinion and play a crucial role in coming to an agreement that spans across different industry sectors and that is rooted in science and not in a particular stakeholder interest. As we and our customers need to make decisions today and can not wait on the lengthy alignment process, we interact with these stakeholders directly or through industry associations to understand the different perspectives and make the best decisions for us and for our stakeholders. Example of the interaction are i) SBTi chemical sector guidance via CEFIC ii) the Circular Transition Indicator Development in WBCSD iii) the global circularity protocol efforts of WBCSD and UNEP. Another motivation of NGO interaction is to give visibility to new low carbon solutions to promote acceptance in the market.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our engagement should contribute to further alignment of accounting frameworks and the collaborations with NGOs to promote sustainable solutions is our measure of success.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**NGOs and scientific community, either directly or through industry associations or WBCSD

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions

☑ Encourage collaborative work in multi-stakeholder landscape towards initiatives for sustainable land-use goals

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Accounting for forests and biodiversity on corporation level and on product level is still very vague and the alignment on the right parameters, companies can compete on, are held up by strongly diverging perspectives on the right way to conduct agriculture and forestry, the consideration of specific environmental and social aspects, and acceptance of new technologies like GMO crops. We try to interact with NGO and science to improve the data quality of parameters we can retrieve from our LCA data, as this is the for the time being the best basis for decision making in our industry. Another motivation of NGO interaction is to give visibility to new solutions protecting biodiversity to promote acceptance in the market. One notable collaboration is with The Nature Conservancy and other leading NGOs in the USA. This partnership aims to accelerate the commercial-scale adoption of alternative feed ingredients, reducing reliance on wild-caught fish. Evonik has partnered with the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) to promote sustainable palm oil production and conservation efforts in Borneo. This collaboration focuses on two main projects: 1. Tabin Wildlife Reserve in Sabah, Malaysia: This project aims to make palm oil production more sustainable and halt deforestation. It involves certifying 20,000 hectares of palm oil plantations by 2025 under the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) standards. The initiative also includes creating ecological corridors to allow wildlife to move freely and stabilizing populations of endangered species like orangutans and Borneo elephants. 2. West Kalimantan, Indonesia: Here, the focus is on working with smallholder farmers to promote sustainable palm oil cultivation and improve their livelihoods. These efforts are part of Evonik's broader commitment to sustainability and reducing the ecological footprint of its supply chain.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our engagement should contribute to further alignment of accounting frameworks and the collaborations with NGOs to promote sustainable solutions is our measure of success.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**NGOs or scientifc community, eiher directly or through industry associations or WBCSD

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Proper accounting rules for water on corporation level and on product level much is still under development. We try to interact with NGO and science to improve the data quality of parameters we can retrieve from our LCA data, as this is the for the time being the best basis for decision making in our industry. Another motivation of NGO interaction is to give visibility to new solutions protecting the water cycle to promote acceptance in the market. Another motivation is to define criteria for safe and sustainable use of chemicals along the value chain, to addresses the issue of chemical pollution and novel entities transgressing planetary boundaries.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our engagement should contribute to further alignment of accounting and sustainable use of chemicals frameworks and the collaborations with NGOs to promote sustainable solutions is our measure of success.
[Add row]

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

(5.13.1) Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement

Select from:

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

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.13.3) Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives

5.13 focuses on CDP Supply Chain member engagement - Evonik Industries has more than 3000 suppliers.; less than 2% are members of the CDP supply chain programm. Whereever being initiated, either by Evonik or by a supplier, Evonik is cordially willing to develope mutually collaborative environmental actions through the implementation of initiatives. Many initiatives have been deployed in recent years. However due to economic reasons standardized procedures have been proven not to be target-oriented. Level of monitoring and disclosing of details according to CDP understanding does contradict efficient project management.

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Evonik understands operational control approach need to be in place in order for the business' assets to be properly safeguarded and for the financial statements to be accurate, reliable and trustworthy. Thus operational control approach is used for our financial reporting. Furthermore we assume following advantages • Ensuring that the business runs smoothly. • Ensuring client satisfaction. • Ensuring timely and quality service delivery. • Ensuring that stock is readily available to clients • Ensuring appropriate environmental reporting

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Evonik understands operational control approach need to be in place in order for the business' assets to be properly safeguarded and for the financial statements to be accurate, reliable and trustworthy. Thus operational control approach is used for our financial reporting. Furthermore we assume following advantages • Ensuring that the business runs smoothly. • Ensuring client satisfaction. • Ensuring timely and quality service delivery. • Ensuring that stock is readily available to clients • Ensuring appropriate environmental reportingEvonik understands operational control approach need to be in place in order for the business' assets to be properly safeguarded and for the financial statements to be accurate, reliable and trustworthy. Thus operational control approach is used for our financial reporting. Furthermore we assume following advantages • Ensuring that the business runs smoothly. • Ensuring client satisfaction. • Ensuring timely and quality service delivery. • Ensuring that stock is readily available to clients • Ensuring appropriate environmental reporting

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Evonik understands operational control approach need to be in place in order for the business' assets to be properly safeguarded and for the financial statements to be accurate, reliable and trustworthy. Thus operational control approach is used for our financial reporting. Furthermore we assume following advantages • Ensuring that the business runs smoothly. • Ensuring client satisfaction. • Ensuring timely and quality service delivery. • Ensuring that stock is readily available to clients • Ensuring appropriate environmental reporting

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Evonik understands operational control approach need to be in place in order for the business' assets to be properly safeguarded and for the financial statements to be accurate, reliable and trustworthy. Thus operational control approach is used for our financial reporting. Furthermore we assume following advantages • Ensuring that the business runs smoothly. • Ensuring client satisfaction. • Ensuring timely and quality service delivery. • Ensuring that stock is readily available to clients • Ensuring appropriate environmental reporting

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Evonik understands operational control approach need to be in place in order for the business' assets to be properly safeguarded and for the financial statements to be accurate, reliable and trustworthy. Thus operational control approach is used for our financial reporting. Furthermore we assume following advantages • Ensuring that the business runs smoothly. • Ensuring client satisfaction. • Ensuring timely and quality service delivery. • Ensuring that stock is readily available to clients • Ensuring appropriate environmental reporting

[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, other structural change, please specify :Acquisition and Divestments

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

Rheinfelden - RheinPerChemie, Luelsdorf, Wesseling - CC-Betrieb, Liaoyang

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

Divested Rheinfelden - RheinPerChemie, 01.11.2022, Divested Luelsdorf, 30.06.2023, Divested Wesseling - CC-Betrieb, 30.06.2023, Divested, Liaoyang, 31.12.2022
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, a change in methodology

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

In order to reflect the latest climate science in the calculation of emissions from 2023 onwards, IPCC AR6 is used (to the extent possible, depending on the used database per category) also for the calculation of scope 3 emissions instead of the previously used impact assessment method CML2001. The change did not have a significant impact on the GHG inventory.
[Fixed row]

(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ No, because the impact does not meet our significance threshold

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

With respect to base year emissions recalculation, Evonik follows the guidance provided by the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard Chapter 5 and the 5% SBTi threshold for significance in accordance with Evonik's current target validation (SBTi criteria 4.2). According to criteria 4.2 and supporting documents (e.g, TWG-FOR-001 Version 5.1 December 2021) SBTi defines the threshold of significance as a cumulative change of five percent or larger in an organization's total base year emissions (tCO2e).

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

☑ Other, please specify :WBCSD Chemicals (2013) Guidance for Accounting & Reporting Corporate GHG Emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.3) Comment

We calculated our market-based scope 2-emissions in 2015 for the first time based on information of our suppliers. The supplier based information covers 95 % of our electricity related scope 2-emissions.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4381100.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 excluding Biogenic CO2e Emissions

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2067966.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

location-based country factors used-

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1915900.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

market based 95 % of supplier information for market based emissions

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12980800

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The calculation of the CO2e “backpack” of chemical raw materials is mainly based on data provided by Evonik’s procurement department. All those raw materials and associated amounts for which carbon footprint (CF) values were available at the time of calculation were considered. By this approach, a considerably higher coverage than 90 % of the total purchasing volume with CF was reached. An extrapolation of GHG emissions was carried out for the remaining purchased quantities. Supplier-specific CF are preferred and increasingly used to calculate emissions. Otherwise, data from recognized database providers such as Sphera Solutions GmbH, ecoinvent or CarbonMinds was used. Where available, geographically representative CF are used; otherwise, averages from multiple countries (e.g., global, EU) are used whenever possible, with country-specific data as proxy for the same raw material but from another country used last. This approach is chosen to minimize potential uncertainties related to regional differences in manufacturing processes and energy generation. If an appropriate substance-specific emission factor cannot be determined, average emission factors are used or estimates are made based on similar products. Accounting emissions for production and provision of packaging materials as well as purchased goods (except for chemical raw materials) and services starts from a compilation of all positions with purchase values by the procurement department. All positions are assigned to the categories 1 and 2 (capital goods) with the help of industry codes (“Standard Industrial Classification” (SIC)). For instance, packaging materials, IT hardware as well as technical services are accounted for in category 1. The emissions are then calculated by using spend-based CF for the respective codes. Those emission factors were extracted from a guidance document provided by the UK Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA; 2012 Guidelines to DEFRA/DECC’s GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Annex 13 (Indirect emissions from the supply chain) (2012)). To ensure that the CF remain as representative as possible, they are adjusted in accordance with inflation trends. Compared to the emissions caused by the purchased raw materials, the emissions of the purchase of other goods, services and packaging is negligible (

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

310000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Accounting emissions for production and provision of purchased services and goods (except for chemical raw materials) starts from a compilation of all positions with purchase values by the procurement department. All positions are assigned to the categories 1 (purchased goods and services including packaging) and 2 (capital goods) with the help of industry codes ("Standard Industrial Classification" (SIC)). For instance, machines and technical devices are accounted for in category 2. Calculating emissions is based on multiplying purchase values with respective spend-based emission factors according to the industrial classification as listed in the guidance document by the UK Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA; 2012 Guidelines to DEFRA/DECC's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Annex 13 (Indirect emissions from the supply chain) (2012)). To ensure that the emission factors remain as representative as possible, they are adjusted in accordance with inflation trends. Since category 2 is a category of low relevance for Evonik (1 % of the base year's GHG inventory) the use of the spend-based method is considered sufficiently accurate.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1737700

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Greenhouse gas emissions from the production of the quantities recorded for solid, liquid and gaseous energy sources that are utilized in Evonik's power plants and processes were determined by the use of representative region-specific emission factors from Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH). Depicting upstream emissions for externally purchased energy amounts of steam and electricity occurred via adequate assumptions concerning the mix of energy carriers and associated emission factors. In addition, emissions resulting from electricity purchased and traded to customers were covered in category 3. Calculations *were performed via quantities and CO2 emission factors based on supplier information, and adding corresponding upstream CO2e-emissions for the respective energy source mix. Again, region-specific upstream emission factors for energy carriers were used and obtained from Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH). The emission factors were utilized to calculate the emissions as representatively as possible. They reflect, to the best of our ability, the most current state of information available to us at the time of the calculation.*

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1061700

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Upstream transportation and distribution comprise of inbound transports from direct suppliers to Evonik as well as product transportation services purchased by Evonik between Evonik sites and those from the company to customers. The base year CO2e emissions of transportation activities of (intermediate) products were calculated by using transport mode-specific emission factors. Those emission factors were extracted from a guideline jointly published by Cefic and the Smart Freight Centre in 2021 (Calculating GHG transport and logistics emissions for the European Chemical Industry (2021) (https://cefic.org/app/uploads/2021/09/Calculating-GHG-transport-and-logistics-emissions-for-the-European-Chemical-Industry-Guidance.pdf). Calculations were based on the data on goods quantities, the corresponding transport distances to direct customers and other sites estimated by means of the Haversine formula, as well as specific modes of transport. Since Evonik does not have full knowledge of the transport distances and means of transport for incoming raw materials, an average emission factor per metric ton of shipped product was calculated by using the data for outbound transports. The use of this average emission factor is based on the assumption that the average means of transport and distance can be transferred to inbound transportation. Associated emissions were then calculated for the overall quantity of purchased raw materials in the base year (see category 1).

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

302900

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emissions resulting from the disposal of waste generated in operations were calculated based on the waste quantities for each type of disposal as recorded in an internal database. Externally treated amounts of wastewater as well as solid production, construction and demolition waste were included in the calculation. The average data method was applied. Representative and partially region-specific emission factors per type of disposal were determined with the help of Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH) and adequate assumptions (concerning the C-content).

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7200

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The CO2e emissions generated by business travel activities were calculated based on the travel distances per mode of transportation provided by Evonik Travel Management and using corresponding emission factors of the means of transport used. Emission factors take fuel supply into account and were adopted from publications of the UK Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, now Department for Energy Security & Net Zero. (“Greenhouse gas reporting: Conversion factors 2021”; https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2021). In cases where the travel data for individual regions was not fully available, greenhouse gas emissions per means of transport were extrapolated to the total number of employees. As category 6 is of very low relevance for Evonik (

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55400

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions caused by employee commuting were estimated based on representative statistics on the means of transportation used, commuting distances and working days in combination with average emission factors. Regional differences were considered and adopted for the corresponding number of employees. The overview of the number of employees per region is provided by the HR department. Emission factors per passenger kilometer for car and public transportation take fuel supply into account and were adopted from publications of the UK Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, now Department for Energy Security & Net Zero. ("Greenhouse gas reporting: Conversion factors 2021"; https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2021). Since category 7 is a category of very low relevance for Evonik (

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3800

(7.5.3) Methodological details

CO2e emissions caused by power and heating requirements of administrative buildings are already covered in scope 1 and scope 2 emissions, provided that a production plant subject to official CO2e reporting is located at the site. For those buildings and offices that are not already covered, the respective headcounts were determined. The overview of the number of employees per region was provided by the HR department. The calculation of greenhouse gas emissions was then performed by means of average statistical data for electricity and heating requirements per employee and region as well as region-specific emission factors obtained from Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH). Since category 8 is a category of very low relevance for Evonik (

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

51300

(7.5.3) Methodological details

CO2e emissions of downstream goods transports from Evonik to direct customers (except for those activities already covered in category 4) were calculated analogous to category 4 by using transport mode-specific emission factors. Those emission factors were extracted from a guideline jointly published by Cefic and the Smart Freight Centre in 2021 (Calculating GHG transport and logistics emissions for the European Chemical Industry (2021) (https://cefic.org/app/uploads/2021/09/Calculating-GHG-transport-and-logistics-emissions-for-the-European-Chemical-Industry-Guidance.pdf). Calculations were based on the goods issue quantities, estimated transportation distances to the direct customers as well as the specific modes of transport.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4163600

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Due to the large number of Evonik solutions for diverse applications, accounting for category 11 focuses only on direct CO2 emissions that are formed from the carbon content of the sold products and assumed to be released fully due to metabolization or decomposition during the use phase in the downstream value chain. The product amounts considered here do not require any explicit waste treatment. Calculations considered the quantities sold in the base year 2021, the carbon content of the products and the stoichiometric conversion to CO2. For some product lines, only the main products (by amount sold) were regarded specifically, and derived assumptions were transferred to the remaining amounts or averaging occurred. In some cases, the products' carbon contents were estimated via the respective raw materials applied.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2769000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Since Evonik is often unaware of the end uses of its own products – especially intermediates – the emissions resulting from their disposal were not calculated for the applications themselves, but only for the Evonik products contained therein. Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the disposal of the product amounts sold in base year – except for those quantity shares directly emitted during use and already accounted for in category 11 – were calculated by considering products' carbon contents and representative emission factors from the Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH) for the respective type of disposal (landfilling, incineration with or without energy recovery, recycling and wastewater treatment). In case of incineration, wastewater treatment and landfilling of degradable products, emissions were calculated based on the stoichiometric conversion to CO2. For landfilling and wastewater treatment of inert products that do not decompose within a period of 100 years (see WBCSD Scope 3 Chemical Sector Guidance), only the processing effort was depicted. Recycling was assigned an emission factor of zero. In cases where a relevant magnitude of energy recovery during treatment can be expected, adequate emission factors were applied. Statistics providing shares of the different disposal types for specific (end) product groups were consulted. For some lines, only the main products (by amount sold) were regarded specifically, and derived assumptions were transferred to the remaining amounts or averaging occurred. If applications and the disposal route(s) were unknown, a treatment split between incineration and landfilling was assumed. Average shares per disposal type were determined beforehand via regional statistical data (e.g. OECDstat) and Evonik's sold volumes per continent.

[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Reporting year	*3845958*	*Date input [must be between [10/01/2015 - 10/01/2023]*	*Scope 1 excluding Biogenic Emissions.*
Past year 1	*4141141*	*12/30/2022*	*Scope 1 excluding Biogenic Emissions.*
Past year 2	*4381000*	*12/30/2021*	*Scope 1 excluding Biogenic Emissions.*

[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

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

1848027

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

1498096

(7.7.4) Methodological details

market based 95 % of supplier information for market based emissions

Past year 1

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

1980304

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

1800068

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

market based 95 % of supplier information for market based emissions

Past year 2

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

2067966

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

1916000

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

market based 95 % of supplier information for market based emissions
[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

10084700

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Supplier-specific method
☑ Average data method
☑ Spend-based method

☑ Average spend-based method

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

17

(7.8.5) Please explain

The calculation of the CO2e "backpack" of chemical raw materials is mainly based on data provided by Evonik's procurement department. All those raw materials and associated amounts for which carbon footprint (CF) values were available at the time of calculation were considered. By this approach, a considerably higher coverage than 90 % of the total purchasing volume with CF was reached. An extrapolation of GHG emissions was carried out for the remaining purchased quantities. Supplier-specific CF are preferred and increasingly used to calculate emissions. Otherwise, data from recognized database providers such as Sphera Solutions GmbH, ecoinvent or CarbonMinds was used. Where available, geographically representative CF are used; otherwise, averages from multiple countries (e.g., global, EU) are used whenever possible, with country-specific data as proxy for the same raw material but from another country used last. This approach is chosen to minimize potential uncertainties related to regional differences in manufacturing processes and energy generation. If an appropriate substance-specific emission factor cannot be determined, average emission factors are used or estimates are made based on similar products.. Accounting emissions for production and provision of packaging materials as well as purchased goods (except for chemical raw materials) and services starts from a compilation of all positions with purchase values by the procurement department. All positions are assigned to the categories 1 and 2 with the help of industry codes ("Standard Industrial Classification" (SIC)). For instance, packaging materials, IT hardware as well as technical services are accounted for in category 1. The emissions are then calculated by using spend-based CF for the respective codes. Those CF were extracted from a guidance document provided by the UK DEFRA (2012 Guidelines to DEFRA/DECC's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Annex 13 (Indirect emissions from the supply chain) (2012)). To ensure that the CF remain as representative as possible, they are adjusted in accordance with inflation trends. Compared to the emissions caused by the raw materials, the emissions of the purchase of other goods, services and packaging is negligible (

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

321000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Average spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Accounting emissions for production and provision of purchased services and goods (except for chemical raw materials) starts from a compilation of all positions with purchase values by the procurement department. All positions are assigned to the categories 1 (purchased goods and services including packaging) and 2 (capital goods) with the help of industry codes (“Standard Industrial Classification” (SIC)). For instance, machines and technical devices are accounted for in category 2. Calculating emissions is based on multiplying purchase values with respective spend-based emission factors (GWP100, IPCC AR2) according to the industrial classification as listed in the guidance document by the UK Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA; 2012 Guidelines to DEFRA/DECC’s GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Annex 13 (Indirect emissions from the supply chain) (2012)). To ensure that the emission factors remain as representative as possible, they are adjusted in accordance with inflation trends. Since category 2 is a category of low relevance for Evonik (1 % of Evonik’s total GHG inventory in the reporting year) the use of the spend-based method is considered sufficiently accurate. To enable a simultaneous financial and environmental reporting, Evonik uses for the calculation of most of the reported scope 3 categories the “Fast Close” process by the time of the external verification. In the “Fast Close“ process, the data of the reporting year is compiled on September 30 (the Q3 closing date) and for the remainder of the year, i.e. the fourth quarter, the emission amounts are estimated. The calculation of the “fast close” Scope 3 GHG inventory is externally verified with “limited assurance”. In the first half of the following year, calculations with actual full year activity data are performed and results are compared with the calculated data for the fast close report. Any discrepancies are analyzed and measures to continuously improve the calculation methodology will be introduced as necessary. The emissions disclosed here display the results based on actual full year data. The same “Fast Close” approach applies to most of the other scope 3 categories like e.g., categories 1, 4 and 12.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1025300

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Average data method

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

22

(7.8.5) Please explain

Greenhouse gas emissions from the production of the quantities recorded for solid, liquid and gaseous energy sources that are utilized in Evonik's power plants and processes were determined as a product of the energy quantities and the representative region-specific emission factors (GWP 100, IPCC AR6) from Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH, as of 2023). The global energy data were obtained from the internal ESHQ software ESTER (Evonik Standard Tool ESHQ and Reporting), maintained by the Environment, Safety, Health and Quality Department. Depicting upstream emissions for externally purchased energy amounts of steam and electricity occurred via adequate assumptions concerning the mix of energy carriers and associated emission factors. In addition, emissions resulting from electricity purchased and traded to customers were covered in category 3. Calculations were performed via quantities and CO2 emission factors based on supplier information, and adding corresponding upstream CO2e emissions for the respective energy source mix. Here again, region-specific upstream emission factors (GWP 100, IPCC AR6) for energy carriers were used and obtained from Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH, as of 2023). The emission factors were utilized to calculate the emissions as representatively as possible. They reflect, to the best of our ability, the most current state of information available to us at the time of the calculation. To enable a simultaneous financial and environmental reporting, Evonik uses for the calculation of most of the reported scope 3 categories the "Fast Close" process by the time of the external verification. In the "Fast Close" process, the data of the reporting year is usually compiled on September 30 (the Q3 closing date) and for the remainder of the year, i.e. the fourth quarter, the emission amounts are estimated. Category 3 was already mostly calculated on data of the full year 2023; only for the traded electricity preliminary data was used. The calculation of the "fast close" Scope 3 GHG inventory is externally verified with "limited assurance". In the first half of the following year, calculations with complete full year activity data were performed. The emissions disclosed here display the results based on actual full year data.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

947300

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Upstream transportation and distribution comprise of inbound transports from direct suppliers to Evonik as well as product transportation services purchased by Evonik between Evonik sites and the outbound transport from the company to customers. The data for the internal and outbound transport activities are provided by the IT Development Analytics Department. The CO2e emissions of the internal and outbound transportation activities of (intermediate) products were calculated by using transport mode-specific emission factors (well to wheel). Those emission factors were extracted from a guideline jointly published by Cefic and the Smart Freight Centre in 2021 (Calculating GHG transport and logistics emissions for the European Chemical Industry (2021) (https://cefic.org/app/uploads/2021/09/Calculating-GHG-transport-and-logistics-emissions-for-the-European-Chemical-Industry-Guidance.pdf). Calculations were based on the data on goods quantities, the corresponding transport distances to direct customers and other sites estimated by means of the Haversine formula, as well as specific modes of transport. Since Evonik does not have full knowledge of the transport distances and means of transport for incoming raw materials, an average emission factor per metric ton of shipped product was calculated by using the data for outbound transports. The use of this average emission factor is based on the assumption that the average means of transport and distance can be transferred to inbound transportation. Associated emissions were then calculated for the overall quantity of purchased raw materials in the reporting year. (see category 1). The life cycle emissions associated with manufacturing vehicles, facilities or infrastructure were not taken into account. For information about the extent to which the data is verified, see description of scope 3, category 2.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

286800

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions resulting from the disposal of waste generated in operations were calculated based on the waste quantities for each type of disposal as recorded in the internal ESHQ software ESTER (Evonik Standard Tool ESHQ and Reporting), maintained by the Environment, Safety, Health and Quality Department. Externally treated amounts of wastewater as well as solid production, construction and demolition waste were included in the calculation. The average data method was applied. Representative and partially region-specific emission factors (GWP 100, IPCC AR6) per type of disposal were determined with the help of Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH, as of 2023) and adequate assumptions (concerning the C-content). The calculation method fulfills the minimum boundary defined in the GHG Protocol. To enable a simultaneous financial and environmental reporting, Evonik uses for the calculation of most of the reported scope 3 categories the "Fast Close" process by the time of the external verification. In the "Fast Close" process, the data of the reporting year is usually compiled on September 30 (the Q3 closing date) and for the remainder of the year, i.e. the fourth quarter, the emission amounts are estimated. Category 5 was already calculated based on the full year data 2023 and externally verified with "limited assurance".

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

19800

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The CO2e emissions generated by business travel activities were calculated based on the travel distances per mode of transportation provided by Evonik Travel Management and using corresponding emission factors of the means of transport used. Emission factors take fuel supply into account and were adopted from publications of the UK Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, formerly published by the UK BEIS (2023 Government Greenhouse Gas Conversion Factors for Company Reporting; https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2023). The selected emission factors consider the AR5 GWP100 values, cover all emissions from well-to-wheel and, in the case of emissions from aviation, include both direct (CO2, CH4, N2O) and indirect (non-CO2 emissions e.g. water vapour) climate change effects. In cases where the travel data for individual regions was not or not fully available, greenhouse gas emissions per means of transport were extrapolated to the total number of employees. Life cycle emissions associated with manufacturing vehicles or infrastructure are not considered. As category 6 is of very low relevance for Evonik (

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

44500

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions caused by employee commuting were estimated based on representative statistics on the means of transportation used, commuting distances and working days in combination with average emission factors. Regional differences were considered and adopted for the corresponding number of employees. In addition, the impact of the opportunity to work a defined part of the time from home, offered in the context of #Smartwork, was taken into account. The overview of the number of employees per region is provided by the HR department. Emission factors per passenger kilometer for car and public transportation take fuel supply into account and were adopted from the latest publications in 2023 of the UK Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, formerly published by the UK BEIS (2023 Government Greenhouse Gas Conversion Factors for Company Reporting; https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2023). The selected emission factors consider the AR5 GWP100 values and cover all emissions from well-to-wheel. As in previous years, emissions from employee teleworking have not been estimated. Since category 7 is a category of very low relevance for Evonik (

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

3800

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

CO2e emissions caused by power and heating requirements of administrative buildings are already covered in scope 1 and scope 2 emissions, provided that a production plant subject to official CO2e reporting is located at the site. For those buildings and offices that are not already covered, the respective headcounts were determined. The overview of the number of employees per region was provided by the HR department. The calculation of greenhouse gas emissions was then performed by means of average statistical data for electricity and heating requirements per employee and region as well as region-specific emission factors (GWP 100, IPCC AR6) obtained from Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH, as of 2023). Optional life cycle emissions associated with manufacturing or constructing leased assets are not considered. Since category 8 is a category of very low relevance for Evonik (

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

36700

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

CO2e emissions of downstream goods transports from Evonik to direct customers (except for those activities already covered in category 4) were calculated analogous to category 4 by using transport mode-specific emission factors (well to wheel). Those emission factors were extracted from a guideline jointly published by Cefic and the Smart Freight Centre in 2021 (Calculating GHG transport and logistics emissions for the European Chemical Industry (2021) (https://cefic.org/app/uploads/2021/09/Calculating-GHG-transport-and-logistics-emissions-for-the-European-Chemical-Industry-Guidance.pdf). Calculations were based on the data on goods quantities, the corresponding transport distances to direct customers and other sites estimated by means of the Haversine formula, as well as specific modes of transport. The transport activity data is provided by the IT Development Analytics Department. The life cycle emissions associated with manufacturing vehicles, facilities, or infrastructure are not considered. To enable a simultaneous financial and environmental reporting, Evonik uses for the calculation of most of the reported scope 3 categories the "Fast Close" process by the time of the external verification. In the "Fast Close" process, the data of the reporting year is compiled on September 30 (the Q3 closing date) and for the remainder of the year, i.e. the fourth quarter, the emission amounts are estimated. The calculation of the "fast close" Scope 3 GHG inventory is externally verified with "limited assurance". In the first half of the following year, calculations with actual full year activity data are performed and results are compared with the calculated data for the fast close report. Any discrepancies are analyzed and measures to continuously improve the calculation methodology will be introduced as necessary. The emissions disclosed here display the results based on actual full year data.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The portfolio of Evonik covers some 4,000 products and serves manifold end applications in different end-customer markets. The high number of end markets and immense number of resulting applications as well as Evonik's position rather upstream most value chains it is involved in lead to a non-manageable complexity of assessing any plausible result for scope 3 category 10 as scope 1 & 2 emissions of the manifold further processing steps for diverse end applications for all Evonik products would have to be quantified. Evonik is not able to track (the shares of) all end uses of each sold product and depict associated efforts in the processing steps. A reliable calculation of emissions is not possible. Following the requirements of the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Standard, we reviewed the principles and concluded that decision-making needs of users are still met.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3138600

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average product method

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Calculation method for direct use-phase emissions from GHG and products that contain or form GHG that are emitted during use (Product quantity sold multiplied with products' (average) c-content and its stoichiometric conversion to CO2 (*44/12))

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Due to the large number of Evonik solutions for diverse applications, accounting for category 11 focuses only on direct CO2 emissions that are formed from the carbon content of the sold products and assumed to be released fully due to metabolization or decomposition during the use phase in the downstream value chain. The product amounts considered here do not require any explicit waste treatment. Emissions were calculated using the quantities sold in 2023, the carbon content of the products and the stoichiometric conversion to CO2. For some product lines, only the main products (by amount sold) were regarded specifically, and derived assumptions were transferred to the remaining amounts or averaging occurred. In some cases, the products' carbon contents were estimated via the respective raw materials applied. To enable a simultaneous financial and environmental reporting, Evonik uses for the calculation of most of the reported scope 3 categories the "Fast Close" process by the time of the external verification. In the "Fast Close" process, the data of the reporting year is compiled on September 30 (the Q3 closing date) and for the remainder of the year, i.e. the fourth quarter, the emission amounts are estimated. The calculation of the "fast close" Scope 3 GHG inventory is externally verified with "limited assurance". In the first half of the following year, calculations with actual full year activity data are performed and results are compared with the calculated data for the fast close report. Any discrepancies are analyzed and measures to continuously improve the calculation methodology will be introduced as necessary. The emissions disclosed here display the results based on actual full year data.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2653100

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Average product method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Since Evonik is often unaware of the end uses of its own products – especially intermediates – the emissions resulting from their disposal were not calculated for the applications themselves, but only for the Evonik products contained therein. Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the disposal of the product amounts sold in the reporting year – except for those quantity shares directly emitted during use and already accounted for in category 11 – were calculated by considering products' carbon contents and representative emission factors (GWP100, IPCC AR6) from the Managed LCA Content (GaBi database, Sphera Solutions GmbH) for the respective type of disposal (landfilling, incineration with or without energy recovery, recycling and wastewater treatment). In case of incineration, wastewater treatment and landfilling of degradable products, emissions were calculated based on the stoichiometric conversion to CO2. For landfilling and wastewater treatment of inert products that do not decompose within a period of 100 years (see WBCSD Scope 3 Chemical Sector Guidance), only the processing effort was depicted. Recycling was assigned an emission factor of zero. In cases where a relevant magnitude of energy recovery during treatment can be expected, adequate emission factors were applied. Statistics providing shares of the different disposal types for specific (end) product groups were consulted. For some lines, only the main products (by amount sold) were regarded specifically, and derived assumptions were transferred to the remaining amounts or averaging occurred. If applications and the disposal route(s) were unknown, a treatment split between incineration and landfilling was assumed (36% incineration and 64% landfill). Average shares per disposal type were determined beforehand via regional statistical data (e.g. OECDstat) and Evonik's sold volumes per continent. For information about the extent to which the data is verified, see description of scope 3, category 2.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 emissions resulting from downstream leased assets are not reported because this category is not relevant for Evonik Industries which is supported by the WBCSD Guidance for Accounting & Reporting Corporate GHG emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain. Estimations revealed a

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 emissions resulting from franchises are not reported because this category is not applicable to Evonik Industries. Evonik does not own or operate franchises. Also, the WBCSD Chemicals (2013) Guidance for Accounting & Reporting Corporate GHG emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain states that this category is not relevant for the chemical sector.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

A screening for Scope 3 category 15 was performed, taking into account the subsidiaries / joint ventures / joint operations Evonik has no operational control over. Our most recent screening of Scope 3 category 15 resulted in a share of less than 1 % of Scope 3 emissions when all relevant activities were included. This category is therefore not considered material for Evonik and thus currently not disclosed.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

not relevant

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

not relevant
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2022

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

11216500

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

322400

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

1521300

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

970300

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

348200

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

26300

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

54100

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

4000

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

44500

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

3092300

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

2951200

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Emissions of all categories except for categories 3 and 8 identical with those reported to CDP last year. Slight deviations in reported emissions of categories 3 and 8 due to error corrections and/or updated information. Reporting of emissions from previous years to enable tracking over time.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2021

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

12980800

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

310000

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

1737700

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

1061700

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

302900

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

7200

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

55400

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

3800

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

51300

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

4163600

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

2769000

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Emissions of our base year 2021. No changes compared to last year's CDP reporting. Reporting of emissions from previous years to enable tracking over time.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Sustainability Report 2023.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

164-165

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Sustainability Report 2023.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

164-165

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

95

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Sustainability Report 2023.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

164-165

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

95
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

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

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

EN_ECF-Broschuì̂ re-2023_final.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

Limited Assurance Report of the Independent Assurance Practitioner Regarding Greenhouse Gas Emission Data To the Executive Board of Evonik Industries AG, Essen; to be found on pg. 16, 17

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

97969

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.6

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Green energy is one of Evonik's three most important material topics. In the reporting period, we made good progress with the strategic transformation of Evonik in this area. The focus at our sites is clearly defined: In the long term, supply will be switched to energy from renewable resources. More than 50 sites in Europe, Asia, and North and South America currently source or generate sustainable energy. Calculation: Our total Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions in the previous year were 5941209 t CO2: - 97969 *100/5941209 1.6*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

64000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2023, we successfully had further sites in Europe, North America, Brazil, and China certified as conforming with ISO 50001. Our certified energy management system now includes 57 sites, and ISO 50001 certification is planned for further sites in the coming years. Our aim is for certification to cover more than 90 percent of Evonik's global energy consumption by 2026. In 2023, successfully implemented energy efficiency measures as part of the implementation of ISO 50001 led to a reduction in CO2 emissions of 64000 metric tons CO2. Calculation: Our total Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions in the previous year were 5941209 t CO2: - 64000 *100/5941209 1.1*

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

85039

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.4

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Significant divestments in 2023: Divested Rheinfelden - RheinPerChemie, 01.11.2022, Divested Luelsdorf, 30.06.2023, Divested Wesseling - CC-Betrieb, 30.06.2023, Divested, Liaoyang, 31.12.2022 Calculation: Our total Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions in the previous year were 5941209 t CO2: - 85039 *100/5941209 1.4*

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material Acquisitions in 2023

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material Mergers in 2023

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

350146

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

5.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Global demand remained weak overall in 2023 in challenging economic conditions, and production contracted by 10 percent year-on-year to 7.5 million metric tons (2022 8.38 million metric tons). That was also one of the main reasons for the sharp drop in scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions, which also fell by 10 percent in the reporting period (2023 5.34 million metric tons CO2e). Other reasons for the reduction were increased purchasing of electricity from renewable resources and the mode of operation of the power plants in Marl (Germany). Significantly less coal was used at the coal-fired power plant as block 4 was taken out of service in April 2023, and there was a long maintenance shutdown at block 5 in the second half of the year. The requirement to extend the operation of the coal-fired power plant at this site, which was imposed to safeguard general supply as a result of the geopolitical situation, expires at the end of March 2024. Worldwide, Evonik will then no longer generate any electricity from coal. Calculation: Our total Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions in the previous year were 5941209 t CO2: - 350146 *100/5941209 5.9*

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material change in methodology in 2023

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material change in boundary in 2023

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material change in physical operating conditions in 2023

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material change in 2013
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Market-based

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.

(7.12.1.1) CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)

133440

(7.12.1.2) Comment

Amount entered reflects the direct biogenic CO2 emissions from fermentation processes which use bio-based input materials. Further explanations: Biomass – and related CO2 removals and biogenic CO2 emissions – for material and energy use are treated equally by Evonik as both are assumed to be re-released into the atmosphere again during use or at the end of their lifetime. CO2 removals and biogenic CO2 emissions alongside Scope 3 category 3 and (related to) Scope 2 for bioenergy use were not calculated due to complexity and limited data availability (on each energy supplier’s market-based CO2 factor and energy source mix). The share of bioenergy use and associated biogenic CO2 emissions is up to now limited. Taking into account CO2 removals (and biogenic CO2 emissions) relevant to some purchased raw materials, a net total of (-)1,249,000 t of CO2 removals through biological carbon sequestration and biogenic CO2 emissions during upstream processing was quantified for Scope 3 category 1. In addition, a small amount (13,000 t biogenic CO2) emerged alongside Scope 3 category 5. Biogenic CO2 emissions in the downstream chain amounted to 796,000 t of CO2, i.e. for Scope 3 categories 11 & 12. For category 12, partly not the full (biogenic) carbon content is considered to be converted to CO2 and emitted during 100 years (cf. WBCSD Chemicals (2013), p.33) and not all biogenic C streams are completely traceable in complex operation processes (e.g. in waste streams), so that the biogenic C inventory is not fully balanced for now and some biogenic carbon counted as fossil carbon. Further data granularity and other improvements in this context are pursued.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

3791333

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

22290

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ HFCs

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

15413

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ N2O

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

18181

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 5

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ PFCs

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

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 6

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ SF6

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

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 7

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ NF3

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

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

146.869

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

19636.269

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

20400.524

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42783

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

4941.545

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

370.428

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

164999

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

263489

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

240861.261

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54147

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

16991

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

171.292

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20686.734

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

16809.509

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

7859.263

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

141145.102

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

160304.665

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

103803.259

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8319.225

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

1129.297

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

0

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3996.036

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

7097.51

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

6579.578

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2176076

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

477983.074

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

377171.677

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21389.539

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

13339.144

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

11234.042

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17282.176

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

14490.073

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

1966.5

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

912.792

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

525.65

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

525.65

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11983.193

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

28162.73

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

24884.565

Luxembourg

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2227.064

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

403.105

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

544.237

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26253.329

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

15940.925

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

5502.595

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10247.526

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

920.747

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

0

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

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

3.061

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

0

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

43066.552

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

39446.694

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

233294.363

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

111771.828

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

114531.712

Slovakia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10194.862

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

2625.71

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

0

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7778.041

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

14549.388

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

15842.817

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

40351.507

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

20328.883

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

14125.683

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21333.916

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

12672.945

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

12110.788

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16815.102

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

3721.214

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

3581.167

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27757

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

51378.41

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

44050.465

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1759.383

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

708.379

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

652.159

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

784071.526

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

545036.437

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

451880.497
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Smart Materials*	*817949.247*
Row 2	*Speciality Additves*	*157456.643*
Row 3	*Technology & Infrastructure*	*1516219*
Row 4	*Performance Materials*	*527398.072*
Row 5	*Nutrition & Care*	*826935.293*

[Add row]

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

	Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e	Comment
Chemicals production activities	*3845958.543*	*Evonik is one of the world's leading specialty chemicals companies*

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Smart Materials*	*601388.227*	*370768.741*
Row 2	*Specialty Additives*	*116937.101*	*98719.233*
Row 3	*Nutrition & Care*	*464871.837*	*402084.812*
Row 5	*Technology & Infrastructure*	*409603.325*	*383012.426*
Row 6	*Performance Materials*	*255227.43*	*243511.639*

[Add row]

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

	Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e	Comment
Chemicals production activities	*1848027.919*	*1498096.852*	*Evonik is one of the world's leading specialty chemicals companies*

[Fixed row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3845958.543

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

1848027.919

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

1498096.852

(7.22.4) Please explain

All locations which are under Evonik's operational control are consolidated subsidiaries.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

n/a
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Row 1

(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock

Select from:
☑ Other (please specify) **:**Base Chemicals

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

40

(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology

Percentages reveal the shares of the Scope 3 category 1 emission amount by using the raw material categories "Base Chemicals", "Specialty Chemicals", and "Inorganics" and the list of chemical raw materials purchased as basis. Chemical raw materials that are not categorized and indirect spend are remaining and not assigned into one of the categories. Background for Scope 3 category 1: The methodology of GHG emission calculations for Scope 3 category 1 closely follows the relevant Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Standard documents (by the WBCSD and WRI) as well as the "Guidance for Accounting & Reporting Corporate GHG Emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain" published by WBCSD Chemicals in 2013. The CO2e "backpack" calculation is based on a list of all purchased chemical raw materials. All those raw materials and associated amounts for which carbon footprint values were available at the time of calculation were taken into account. By this approach, a considerably higher coverage than 90 percent of the total purchasing volume was reached. An extrapolation of greenhouse gas emissions was carried out for the remaining quantities. Supplier-specific emission factors are preferred and increasingly used to calculate emissions. Otherwise, data from recognized database providers such as Sphera Solutions GmbH (Managed LCA Content, as of 2023), ecoinvent or CarbonMinds are used. Where available, geographically representative datasets were used to determine emission factors, otherwise averages from several countries (e.g. global, EU) were used, and only in the last possible case country-specific individual datasets were applied.

Row 2

(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock

Select from:
☑ Other (please specify) **:**Inorganics

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

21

(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology

Percentages reveal the shares of the Scope 3 category 1 emission amount by using the raw material categories “Base Chemicals”, “Specialty Chemicals”, and “Inorganics” and the list of chemical raw materials purchased as basis. Chemical raw materials that are not categorized and indirect spend are remaining and not assigned into one of the categories. Background for Scope 3 category 1: The methodology of GHG emission calculations for Scope 3 category 1 closely follows the relevant Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Standard documents (by the WBCSD and WRI) as well as the "Guidance for Accounting & Reporting Corporate GHG Emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain" published by WBCSD Chemicals in 2013. The CO2e “backpack” calculation is based on a list of all purchased chemical raw materials. All those raw materials and associated amounts for which carbon footprint values were available at the time of calculation were taken into account. By this approach, a considerably higher coverage than 90 percent of the total purchasing volume was reached. An extrapolation of greenhouse gas emissions was carried out for the remaining quantities. Supplier-specific emission factors are preferred and increasingly used to calculate emissions. Otherwise, data from recognized database providers such as Sphera Solutions GmbH (Managed LCA Content, as of 2023), ecoinvent or CarbonMinds are used. Where available, geographically representative datasets were used to determine emission factors, otherwise averages from several countries (e.g. global, EU) were used, and only in the last possible case country-specific individual datasets were applied.

Row 3

(7.25.1) Purchased feedstock

Select from:

☑ Specialty chemicals

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

29

(7.25.3) Explain calculation methodology

Percentages reveal the shares of the Scope 3 category 1 emission amount by using the raw material categories “Base Chemicals”, “Specialty Chemicals”, and “Inorganics” and the list of chemical raw materials purchased as basis. Chemical raw materials that are not categorized and indirect spend are remaining and not assigned into one of the categories. Background for Scope 3 category 1: The methodology of GHG emission calculations for Scope 3 category 1 closely follows the relevant Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Standard documents (by the WBCSD and WRI) as well as the "Guidance for Accounting & Reporting Corporate GHG Emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain" published by WBCSD Chemicals in 2013. The CO2e “backpack” calculation is based on a list of all purchased chemical raw materials. All those raw materials and associated amounts for which carbon footprint values were available at the time of calculation were taken into

account. By this approach, a considerably higher coverage than 90 percent of the total purchasing volume was reached. An extrapolation of greenhouse gas emissions was carried out for the remaining quantities. Supplier-specific emission factors are preferred and increasingly used to calculate emissions. Otherwise, data from recognized database providers such as Sphera Solutions GmbH (Managed LCA Content, as of 2023), ecoinvent or CarbonMinds are used. Where available, geographically representative datasets were used to determine emission factors, otherwise averages from several countries (e.g. global, EU) were used, and only in the last possible case country-specific individual datasets were applied.
[Add row]

(7.25.1) Disclose sales of products that are greenhouse gases.

Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons

0

(7.25.1.2) Comment

Evonik does not sell carbon dioxide

Methane (CH4)

(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons

156000

(7.25.1.2) Comment

of which 40 % is for energy use.

Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons

0

(7.25.1.2) Comment

Evonik does not sell nitrous oxide

Hydrofluorocarbons (HFC)

(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons

0

(7.25.1.2) Comment

Evonik does not sell hydrofluorocarbons

Perfluorocarbons (PFC)

(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons

0

(7.25.1.2) Comment

Evonik does not sell Perfluorocarbons

Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons

0

(7.25.1.2) Comment

Evonik does not sell sulphur hexafluoride

Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.25.1.1) Sales, metric tons

0

(7.25.1.2) Comment

Evonik does not sell trifluoride
[Fixed row]

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1458

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

511

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6385

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2382

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of

Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

835

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10432

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1310

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

459

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5737

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

7786

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2730

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply
☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

34099

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2966

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1040

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 15

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

12990

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 16

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

23627

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 17

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8283

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 18

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

103470

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 19

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 20

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 21

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 22

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

36896

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 23

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

12935

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 24

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- ☑ Category 2: Capital goods
- ☑ Category 6: Business travel
- ☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
- ☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
- ☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
- ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- ☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- ☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

- ☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- ☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- ☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

161581

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 25

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

26359

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 26

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9241

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 27

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

115436

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 28

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

11339

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 29

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3975

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 30

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

49659

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 31

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

435

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 32

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

152

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 33

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1905

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 34

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

215

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 35

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

76

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 36

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

944

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 37

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

462

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 38

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

162

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 39

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2022

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 40

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

215

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 41

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

75

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 42

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- ☑ Category 2: Capital goods
- ☑ Category 6: Business travel
- ☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
- ☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
- ☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
- ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- ☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- ☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

941

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 43

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

196

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 44

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

69

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 45

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

859

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 46

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

771

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 47

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

270

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 48

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3377

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 49

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2381

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 50

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

835

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 51

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10428

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 52

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

14732

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 53

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5165

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 54

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

64518

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 55

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8771

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 56

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3075

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 57

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

38413

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 58

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15466

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 59

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5422

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 60

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- ☑ Category 2: Capital goods
- ☑ Category 6: Business travel
- ☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
- ☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
- ☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
- ☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- ☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- ☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- ☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- ☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- ☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

67731

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 61

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

451

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 62

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

158

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 63

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1974

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 65

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

959

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 66

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

336

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 67

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4202

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 68

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6096

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 69

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2137

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 70

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

26697

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 71

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4714

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 72

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1653

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 73

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20645

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 74

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 75

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 76

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 77

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 78

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 79

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 80

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1479

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 81

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO_2e

518

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 82

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6476

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 83

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

537

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 84

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

188

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 85

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2353

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 86

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

27765

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 87

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9734

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 88

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

121593

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 89

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4536

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 90

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1590

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 91

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

19866

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 92

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1411

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 93

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

495

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 94

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6179

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 95

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8722

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 96

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3058

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 97

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

38196

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 98

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 99

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 100

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Based on the analysis and reporting of the Evonik Carbon Footprint allocation of Scope 1 Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions and its sources is quite easy. Especially Scope 3 emissions upstream show the outstanding position of Category 1 relevance i.e. purchased goods and services as well as Category 12 Scope 3 emissions (end of life treatment) (publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 101

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

11348

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

(publication Evonik Carbon Footprint available on www.Evonik.com)

Row 102

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3978

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 103

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

49696

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 104

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

13

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 105

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

Row 106

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

55

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

Row 107

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1865

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 108

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

654

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 109

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8169

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 110

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

Row 111

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

Row 112

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply
☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 113

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2003

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 114

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

702

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

Row 115

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8773

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 116

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 117

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 118

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

Row 119

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

938

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 120

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

329

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 121

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4106

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 122

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

653

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 123

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

229

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

Row 124

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply
☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2861

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 125

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5510

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

electricity and steam production; chemical reactions

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 126

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1932

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

purchase of electricity and steam

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

Row 127

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

24129

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

scope 3 emissions are mainly (86%) due to cat 1, cat 11 and cat 12

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Doing so would require we disclose business sensitive/proprietary information

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

individual working Groups on Business line level

Row 2

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

focussing on main products of customers
[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

(7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☑ Capabilities to allocate emissions to customers already maximized

(7.28.4) Explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Evonik Industries has established a team of double digit people consisting of experts on this matter. As a matter of fact we are in close contact to all our customers and suppliers working intensively and collaboratively on improving our environmental performance along the value chain. However in accordance with our cooperative partners we decided to limit the granularity of information provided publicly.
[Fixed row]

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:

☑ More than 15% but less than or equal to 20%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:*

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
	☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

37965.87

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

13332971.65

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

13370937.52

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1260283.94

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1803665.87

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

3063949.81

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

7103.25

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

7103.25

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

3291435.02

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

3291435.02

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

92008.35

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

92008.35

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1390258.16

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

18435175.79

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

19825433.95
[Fixed row]

(7.30.3) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for chemical production activities in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)

(7.30.3.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary

37965.87

(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)

11976438.48

(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary

1356533.17

(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary

13370937.52

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.3.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary

1260283.94

(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)

1803665.87

(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary

0

(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary

3063949.81

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.3.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary

0

(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)

7103.25

(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary

0

(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary

7103.25

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.3.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary

0

(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)

3291435.02

(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary

0

(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary

3291435.02

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.3.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary

92008.35

(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary

92008.35

Total energy consumption

(7.30.3.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.3.2) MWh consumed from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary

1390258.16

(7.30.3.3) MWh consumed from non-renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (excluding recovered waste heat/gases)

17078642.62

(7.30.3.4) MWh consumed from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary

1356533.17

(7.30.3.5) Total MWh (renewable + non-renewable + MWh from recovered waste heat/gases) consumed inside chemical sector boundary

19825433.95
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

37965.87

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

37965.87

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

In addition to green electricity, biomethane is becoming increasingly important for Evonik as a substitute for fossil-based natural gas. Our production facilities in Schörfling am Attersee (Austria) already operate entirely with energy from renewable resources.These production facilities for SEPURAN membranes run exclusively off green electricity from wind, hydroelectric power, and biomass. Moreover, since the beginning of 2022, this site's gas requirements have been fully met by locally produced biomethane. By switching to environmentally friendly energy supply, Evonik has reduced direct CO2 emissions at this plant in Upper Austria by about 5,000 metric tons a year. Moreover, since 2021, the High Performance Polymers business line has used biomethane for the manufacture of certain products in Germany. Since May 2023, biomethane has been used to produce steam at the Health Care business line's site in Ham (France.)

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

2744987.78

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

312618.33

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

2432369.44

(7.30.7.8) Comment

The requirement to extend the operation of the coal-fired power plant at Marl site in Germany, which was imposed to safeguard general supply as a result of the geopolitical situation, expires at the end of March 2024. Worldwide, Evonik will then no longer generate any electricity from coal.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

21919.66

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

5293.55

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

16626.11

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Heating oil now only plays an insignificant role in the energy mix. It is only used for auxiliary firing systems in the coal-fired power plant I in Marl. Moreover, insignificant amounts are required for emergency generators at some sites.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

9208324.92

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

6656006.87

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

2552319.05

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Thanks to the coordinated operation of the power plants in Marl, there was a stronger shift in our energy mix towards natural gas in 2023. Increased use was made of the new, highly efficient gas and steam turbine power plants

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1357739.29

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

807912.01

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

549827.28

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Liquid or gaseous by-products, waste and sewage sludge that are thermally recycled as substitute fuels.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

13370937.52

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

5293.55

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

7814502.08

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

5551141.88

(7.30.7.8) Comment

.
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

1408844

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

739987

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

92008

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

92008

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

9437984

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

6757402

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

1075

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1075

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

360010

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

190019

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.11) Provide details on electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for chemical production activities.

Electricity

(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

739987

(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

739987

(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

92008

(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

73513

Heat

(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

0

(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

0

(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

0

(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

6757402

(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

6757402

(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

1075

(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

3491899

Cooling

(7.30.11.1) Total gross generation inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

190019

(7.30.11.2) Generation that is consumed inside chemicals sector boundary (MWh)

190019

(7.30.11.3) Generation from renewable sources inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

0

(7.30.11.4) Generation from waste heat/gases recovered from processes using fuel feedstocks inside chemical sector boundary (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Austria

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

30969.63

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

165276.58

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ I-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ India

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4022.85

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ India

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

259098.86

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ France

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

11795.61

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Finland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

9802.92

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

35270

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GEC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

16482.8

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

24996

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Norway

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

425.18

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Singapore

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4124.44

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Singapore

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Slovakia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

16576.46

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

24185.68

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The primary source of generation for GO is in Germany, with some additional GO also originating from Norway. The dates of initial commercial operation range from 1908 to 2021.

Row 16

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

15779.38

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

Row 17

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

393380.18

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

Row 18

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :The main source is hydropower, while solar and wind power contribute only a very small portion.

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

16627

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

-

[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10614.65

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

81996.64

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

92611.29

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

30969.63

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

14657

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1649.59

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

47276.22

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

251971.78

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

2439

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1124765.88

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

182240

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1561416.66

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

167413

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

57895.72

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

83562

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

308870.72

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

80096.75

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

28346.43

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

99693

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

208136.18

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

172950.43

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

168239.34

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

90075

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

431264.77

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9802.92

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

19129

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

28931.92

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19237.3

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

31438.2

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

50675.50

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

790503.35

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

698697

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

794417.99

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

3749933

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

6033551.34

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17814.03

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

7573

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

25387.03

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17382.27

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

25

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

5672.4

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

30690

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

53769.67

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1717.81

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1717.81

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

27629.59

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

46387.13

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

49119

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

123135.72

Luxembourg

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2604.04

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2604.04

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24996

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

30605.76

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

9937

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

65538.76

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8525

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

75

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

11580

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

20180.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

425.18

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

5

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

430.18

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

48515.2

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

91046.87

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

139562.07

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

271553.05

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

23053.99

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

656853

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

951460.04

Slovakia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16576.46

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

43977

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

60553.46

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11227.68

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

22053.19

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

33280.87

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29276.07

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

58983.91

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

46653

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

134912.98

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11472.6

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

21346.76

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

32819.36

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7771.96

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

20060

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

27831.96

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

15779.38

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

64951.5

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

80730.88

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3123.36

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3123.36

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1013999.69

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

24096

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

638583.71

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1839970

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3516649.40
[Fixed row]

(7.31) Does your organization consume fuels as feedstocks for chemical production activities?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.31.1) Disclose details on your organization's consumption of feedstocks for chemical production activities.

Row 1

(7.31.1.1) Fuels used as feedstocks

Select from:
☑ Natural gas

(7.31.1.2) Total consumption

241855

(7.31.1.3) Total consumption unit

Select from:

☑ metric tons

(7.31.1.4) Inherent carbon dioxide emission factor of feedstock, metric tons CO2 per consumption unit

2.58

(7.31.1.5) Heating value of feedstock, MWh per consumption unit

12.7

(7.31.1.6) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.31.1.7) Comment

Mainly for HCN, H2O2, H2 production
[Add row]

(7.31.2) State the percentage, by mass, of primary resource from which your chemical feedstocks derive.

	Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)	Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year
Biomass	*12.03*	*Select from:* ☑ Increased
Fossil fuel (where coal, gas, oil cannot be distinguished)	*54*	*Select from:* ☑ Increased
Unknown source or unable to disaggregate	*33.97*	*Select from:*

	Percentage of total chemical feedstock (%)	Direction of change in percentage of total chemical feedstock from previous year
		☑ Decreased

[Fixed row]

(7.39) Provide details on your organization's chemical products.

Row 1

(7.39.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Specialty chemicals

(7.39.2) Production (metric tons)

7508207

(7.39.3) Capacity (metric tons)

7508207

(7.39.4) Direct emissions intensity (metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product)

0.51

(7.39.5) Electricity intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)

0.51

(7.39.6) Steam intensity (MWh per metric ton of product)

1.34

(7.39.7) Steam/ heat recovered (MWh per metric ton of product)

0.46

(7.39.8) Comment

Compared to 2023, the aforementioned direct CO2 emissions and the quantities of electricity and steam consumed in relation to production deteriorated. This is mainly due to the sharp decline in production of 10 percent in 2023. The above-mentioned emissions and consumption did not decrease in the same order of magnitude because plants could not be operated at optimum and disproportionately large-volume production with lower energy consumption decreased.
[Add row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.00035004

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

5344055

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

15267000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

8.9

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

☑ Other, please specify :CO2 savings associated with the ISO 50001 process (see also 7.55.2)

(7.45.9) Please explain

Global demand remained weak overall in 2023 in challenging economic conditions, and total revenue contracted by 17 percent year-on-year to 15.3 billion euros. Comment on CO2 reduction see row 2

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.71176

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

5344055

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

7508207

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

5.5

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

☑ Other, please specify :CO2 savings associated with the ISO 50001 process (see also 7.55.2)

(7.45.9) Please explain

Global demand remained weak overall in 2023 in challenging economic conditions, and production contracted by 10 percent year-on-year to 7.5 million metric tons (2022 8.38 million metric tons). That was also one of the main reasons for the sharp drop in scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions, which also fell by 10 percent in the reporting period (2023 5.34 million metric tons CO2e). Other reasons for the reduction were increased purchasing of electricity from renewable resources and the mode of operation of the power plants in Marl (Germany). Significantly less coal was used at the coal-fired power plant as block 4 was taken out of service in April 2023, and there was a long maintenance shutdown at block 5 in the second half of the year.

Row 3

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

160

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

5344055

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**No. of employees as of December 31

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

33409

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

8.4

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply
☑ Change in renewable energy consumption
☑ Other emissions reduction activities
☑ Change in physical operating conditions
☑ Other, please specify **:**CO2 savings associated with the ISO 50001 process (see also 7.55.2)

(7.45.9) Please explain

Global demand remained weak overall in 2023 in challenging economic conditions, and the No. of employees as of December 31 contracted by 1.8 percent year-on-year to 33409. Comment on CO2 reduction see row 2
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

271000

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

metric tons

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

.

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

14

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Overall, production waste decreased by 14 percent to 271000 metric tons in 2023 compared to 2022. This is mainly due to lower production in the 2023 reporting year.
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

☑ Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EVON-GER-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/26/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

☑ Methane (CH_4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4381100

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1915900

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

6297000.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

4722750.000

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3846000

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1498100

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

5344100.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

60.53

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Evonik's ABS1 target is the overarching target combining the sub-targets ABS2 and INT1 and thus covering 100 % of Evonik's scope 1 and 2 emissions. The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks. As of now the use of bioenergy feedstock for energy use is negligible. Direct biogenic CO2 emissions are built during fermentation processes which use bio-based raw materials. The value chain emissions including LUC of these bio-based raw materials are included in Scope 3, category 1. Direct (scope 1) bio-based CO2 emissions are reported alongside.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

The target underscores Evonik's commitment to sustainable development. Evonik aims not only to contribute to global efforts to combat climate change but also to maintain its competitive edge in the marketplace. Furthermore, this target helps to reduce potential compliance costs such as costs of compliance with an emissions trading scheme.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Phasing out coal power at the Marl site; Investing in Next Generation Technologies like energy-efficient technologies and to enhance the efficiency of production processes; expanding the use of renewable energy sources. The first reduction measures of our global "Evonik Assessment of GHG Emission Reduction" (EAGER) project are currently being implemented. In the reporting year, Evonik invested around 81 million in EAGER projects.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EVON-GER-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/26/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3550400.0

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1915900.0

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

5466300.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

81.0

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100.0

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

87.0

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

23.5

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

4181719.500

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3249200

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1498100

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

4747300.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

55.97

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers all scope 1 & 2 emissions from Evonik's chemical production. The scope 1 emissions of own electricity generation are not part of this target, since they are already covered by intensity targets INT1 and INT2. The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks. As of now the use of bioenergy feedstock for energy use is negligible. Direct biogenic CO2 emissions are built during fermentation processes which use bio-based raw materials. The value chain emissions including LUC of these bio-based raw materials are included in Scope 3, category 1. Direct (scope 1) bio-based CO2 emissions are reported alongside.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

The target underscores Evonik's commitment to sustainable development. Evonik aims not only to contribute to global efforts to combat climate change but also to maintain its competitive edge in the marketplace. Furthermore, this target helps to reduce potential compliance costs such as costs of compliance with an emissions trading scheme.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Investing in Next Generation Technologies like energy-efficient technologies and to enhance the efficiency of production processes; expanding the use of renewable energy sources. The first reduction measures of our global "Evonik Assessment of GHG Emission Reduction" (EAGER) project are currently being implemented. In the reporting year, Evonik invested around 81 million in EAGER projects.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 3

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Abs 3

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EVON-GER-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:
☑ 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/26/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)
☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel

☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting

☑ Scope 3, Category 8 - Upstream leased assets

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

12980800.0

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

310000.0

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1069300.0

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1061700.0

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

302900.0

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7200.0

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

55400.0

(7.53.1.21) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3800.0

(7.53.1.22) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

51300.0

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15842400.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

15842400.000

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

62.0

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.42) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.43) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

68

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

68.0

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

11.07

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

14088646.320

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

10084700

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

321000

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

783600

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

947300

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

286800

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

19800

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

44500

(7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3800

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

36700

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

12528200.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

12528200.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

188.98

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers all upstream scope 3 categories and downstream transportation and distribution except for purchased and sold electricity (part of category 3), which is already covered by intensity target INT 2. Direct land use change (LUC)-related emissions are considered whenever emission factors from databases like LCA for Experts (Sphera) or ecoinvent are used. Thus, direct land use change emissions are included in the inventory boundary. This is currently only relevant for selected biobased raw material purchases in Scope 3 category 1; As of now the use of bioenergy feedstock for energy use is negligible.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Evonik is committed to acting in accordance with the Paris Climate Agreement and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The commitment to the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) underscores this endeavor.Evonik strives to enhance the sustainability of its value chain and to also reduce indirect emissions that fall outside the company's direct control.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Evonik aims to increase the use of alternative raw materials to reduce the consumption of finite resources and reduce Scope 3 emissions along the value chain. This includes bio-based, recycled, and CO2-based materials. The share of renewable raw materials rose to 12.0% of the raw material base in 2023 (previous year: 11.1%).

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 4

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 4

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EVON-GER-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/26/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

444300.0

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

444300.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

444300.000

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

10.7

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

1.9

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

1.9

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

333225.000

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

245700

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

245700.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

245700.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

178.80

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers direct emissions during use from fossil fuel sold and distributed (Share of scope 3 category 11). Thus land-related emissions are considered not relevant for this target. The emissions are calculated using the carbon content method, assuming a full conversion of C to CO2.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Evonik is committed to acting in accordance with the Paris Climate Agreement and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The commitment to the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) underscores this endeavor. This commitment is part of Evonik's strategic orientation, which aims to align the company's portfolio with sustainability and drive the transformation towards a climate-neutral economy.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Strategy under development / planned for end of 2024

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No
[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EVON-GER-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:
☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

07/26/2023

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons CO_2e per megawatt hour (MWh)

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO_2e per unit of activity)

0.5

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO_2e per unit of activity)

0.5000000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

19

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

19

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

44

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.2800000000

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

-3.7

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.42

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.4200000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

36.36

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers scope 1 emissions resulting from our own electricity generation. The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks, but as of now the use of bioenergy feedstock for energy use is negligible. In accordance with the common practice for calculating direct emission factors for power generation, only CO2 has been considered so far for the calculation of the emission factor of our main CHP plants at Marl site (90 % of Evonik's fossil electricity generation).

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

Evonik is committed to acting in accordance with the Paris Climate Agreement and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The commitment to the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) underscores this endeavor. This commitment is part of Evonik's strategic orientation, which aims to align the company's portfolio with sustainability and drive the transformation towards a climate-neutral economy. Furthermore, this target helps to reduce potential compliance costs such as costs of compliance with an emissions trading scheme.

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Phasing out coal power at the Marl site; expanding the use of renewable energy sources.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 3

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 2

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EVON-GER-001-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

07/26/2023

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:
☑ Metric tons CO2e per megawatt hour (MWh)

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.5

(7.53.2.17) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.6

(7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.6000000000

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

1.1000000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

19.0

(7.53.2.38) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) covered by this Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) intensity figure

38.5

(7.53.2.53) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this total Scope 3 intensity figure

2.9

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

5.4

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

44

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.6160000000

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

-3.7

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

-1.8

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.42

(7.53.2.64) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel- and energy-related activities (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.46

(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.4600000000

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.8800000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

45.45

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target covers direct emissions from own electricity generation (self consumed as well as sold; part of scope 1) and from purchased and sold electricity (part of scope 3 category 3). The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks, but as of now the use of bioenergy feedstock for energy use is negligible. In accordance with the common practice for calculating direct emission factors for power generation, only CO2 has been considered so far for the calculation of the emission factor of our main CHP plants at Marl site (90 % of Evonik's fossil electricity generation). Furthermore, uncertainty is left if all greenhouse gases or e.g. only CO2 is covered when using market-based factors or other thirdparty information. The CDP system's current intensity target calculation sums up Scope 1 and Scope 3 values, leading to wrong results when an intensity target covers 2 kind of direct emissions (Scope 1 emissions from own electricity generation, Scope 3 emissions from purchased and sold electricity). Calculating Evonik's INT2 target according to the SBTi Power Sector Guidance leads to the following actual intensity values: base year 0.54 tCO2/MWh, target year 0.30 tCO2/MWh, and reporting year 0.43 tCO2/MWh.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

Evonik is committed to acting in accordance with the Paris Climate Agreement and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The commitment to the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) underscores this endeavor. This commitment is part of Evonik's strategic orientation, which aims to align the company's portfolio with sustainability and drive the transformation towards a climate-neutral economy. Furthermore, this target helps to reduce potential compliance costs such as costs of compliance with an emissions trading scheme.

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Phasing out coal power at the Marl site; expanding the use of renewable energy sources.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*4*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*10*	*0*
Implementation commenced	*39*	*11000*

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Implemented	*90*	*53000*
Not to be implemented	*12*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Other, please specify :insulation, heating, air conditioning, lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

25000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

327000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

documented results are a combination of insulation, heating, air conditioning and lighting

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Other, please specify **:**process optimization, compressed air, reuse of water/steam, machine/equipment replacement, motors and drivers

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

52000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

5830000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

15580000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

the documented savings are results from energy efficiency measures: process optimization, compressed air, reuse of water/steam, machine/equipment replacement and a combination of motors and drivers

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

☑ Other, please specify :awareness about ISO 50001 requirements

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

0

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.9) Comment

An increase in awareness of the ISO 50001 requirements serves the improvement in both the energy efficiency measures documentation and the actual implementation of energy efficiency projects that bring significant energy savings

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

☑ Supplier engagement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

210910

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods & services

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

The CO2 savings relate to various measures in the area of raw materials, in which alternative raw materials with reduced CO2 emissions are used. The data and options result from the Supplier Engagement Program, which has been ongoing since 2019. All savings measures are tracked permanently.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

German laws (Energie-Effizienzgesetz/energy efficiency act; EnSimiMaV/Verordnung zur Sicherung der Energieversorgung über mittelfristig wirksame Maßnahmen/regulatory ordinance on Securing the Energy Supply through Medium-Term Effective Measures)

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The payback period is generally set at 1-10 years. Measures with longer payback periods are kept back and re-assessed at a later date.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

New Investments and aqusitions are calculated against a Price of carbon which depends on the global Region. Speaking generally Evonik expects a world-wide Price on carbon by about 100 within the next 10 years. Prior to this, price development may vary Region-/Country-wise and is taken into consideration.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Each year, Evonik Industries presents the Innovation Award, which recognizes the most successful researchers in the Company, either by recognizing the development of new products/systems or new and improved processes resulting in lowering emissions or reduced energy consumption. Recognition is an important driver of creativity. This is why working on new ideas at Evonik Industries is richly rewarded in such a variety of ways. To motivate our most creative minds in research and development, for example, we have an internal Innovation Award, which is presented annually to acknowledge outstanding research achievements worth 30.000. Evoniks Innovation award is part of the overall incentive system impacting climate change issues, either by recognizing the development of new products/systems or new and improved processes.

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

PPA/power purchase agreement
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 2

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)’s framework for Portfolio Sustainability Assessments (PSA)

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☑ Other, please specify :Specialty chemicals and services that are rated as A+ or A++, based on the taxonomy described above (Portfolio Sustainability Assessment)

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

The objective of the Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA) is to proactively steer Evonik‘s product portfolio towards improved sustainability performance and to identify strengths and weaknesses of Evonik businesses. The PSA of all Evonik’s chemicals products and solutions throughout their entire life cycle is performed at the level of PARCs (product-application-region-combinations; a PARC comprises a product or group of products used for a defined application in a specific region). Based on market signals (including chemical exposure along the life cycle, anticipated regulatory trends, sustainability ambitions of stakeholders, and comparative environmental and social performance), the portfolio is categorized into the performance categories Leader (A), Driver (A), Performer (B), Transitioner (C-), or Challenged (C--). The products and services with an A or A rating are called "Next Generation Solutions". In 2022, they represented 37% of Evonik sales. In 2030, Evonik strives for 50%. As part of the "Next Generation Solutions", low carbon products contribute to avoided emissions which were published and audited externally for four examples: 1) Additives for high-tech thermal insulation, 2) Silica and silanes for "green tires" with low rolling resistance, 3) Amino acids for efficient animal feed formulations, 4) Lubricant additives for energy-efficient manufacturing processes (e.g. hydraulic equipment).

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Addressing the Avoided Emissions Challenge- Chemicals sector

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Avoided emissions were published and audited externally for four selected products and applications so far:1) Thermal insulation: 1 metric ton of foam stabilizers in PU foam with a life expectancy of 12 years2) Tires: Driving with a compact car tire over 150000 km3) Animal feed formulations: 1 ton live weight or, in the case of feeding laying hens, 1 ton eggs4) Hydraulic equipment: Operation of a hydraulic construction machine moving 1 million metric tons of mass

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

1) Thermal insulation: Conventional, non-optimized foam stabilizers2) Tires: Carbon black as filler material and E-SBR as tread component3) Animal feed formulations: Feed mix with an amino acid supplementation customary in the regional market4) Hydraulic equipment: Conventional hydraulic oils without DYNAVIS technology (monograde)

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

1) Thermal insulation: For the use of foam stabilizers the insulation of refrigerators, foam stabilizers optimized by Evonik were compared with the effect of insulation materials manufactured with conventional foam stabilizers. Energy savings were determined on the basis of suitable assumptions and converted into the thus enabled greenhouse gas emission savings. For reasons of simplicity, identical emissions (for example, those associated with the manufacture and disposal of foam stabilizers) were not taken into account. This approach had no impact on the amount of savings.2) Tires: The "green tire" and the conventional carbon black tire were compared over their entire life cycle. To take the use phase into consideration, the required volume of tread components was included in the accounting for the distance of 150000 km, and the differences in fuel consumption and the associated greenhouse gas emissions were calculated for both systems. For reasons of simplicity, identical emissions (for example, those associated with the manufacture and disposal of the rest of the vehicle) were not taken into account. This approach had no impact on the amount of savings.3) Animal feed formulations: Feeding of pigs, broilers and laying hens was covered. The composition of the feed mixes, the animals' nutritional demand and the regional origin of feed materials was adapted to the different regions. The difference in greenhouse gas emissions over the whole life cycle represents the avoided emissions.4) Hydraulic equipment: Three different hydraulic oils based on Evonik DYNAVIS technology were compared across their entire life cycle with a conventional monograde hydraulic oil. To take the use phase into account, all hydraulic oils were used in field tests in a mid-sized excavator. While the oil drain interval of the monograde fluid is 2000 hours, the other three fluids need to be changed after 4500 hours. For reasons of simplicity, identical emissions (for example, those associated with the manufacture and disposal of the rest of the vehicle other than the hydraulic oil) were not taken into account. This approach had no impact on the amount of the savings determined. Reductions in greenhouse gas emissions were calculated on the basis of emissions in the life cycles of the hydraulic oils and the fuel savings determined for the hydraulic oils based on DYNAVIS technology.

[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Soy

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :no significant exposure in our portfolio

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

no significant exposure within the Evonik portfolio

(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :no significant exposure - downstream user

(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☑ No, other reason, please specify :use of non-traceable derivatives < 0,01 % from procurement basket

(8.1.1.10) Please explain

exposure

[Add row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Palm oil	*90000*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*90000*
Soy	*0*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*500*

[Fixed row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

various

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

50400

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Evonik Mill List 2023 ex.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

according to ASD investigation 2023 SCCT. Supply Chain mapping 2023 with external provider based on ASD community method. Resulting to the public list of mills connected for level 1

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Unknown origin

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

use of downstream derivatives not traceable, lower than 0,01 % from procurement spent

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

various

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

19200

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Evonik Mill List 2023 ex.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

according to ASD investigation 2023 SCCT. Supply Chain mapping 2023 with external provider based on ASD community method. Resulting to the public list of mills connected for level 1

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Unknown origin

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

20400

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

Evonik Mill List 2023 ex.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

mill list and origins available according to 2023 published mill list.
[Add row]

(8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel?

Select from:
☑ No

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Palm oil

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

Soy

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

(8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

non standardized procedure

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

(8.7.6) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.7.7) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year

no standardized procedure
[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Palm oil

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

Evonik has drawn up recommendations for sustainable procurement and use of palm oil, palm kernel oil, and their derivatives to raise the awareness of our employees on how to take a responsible approach to these substances. We have published these recommendations on our website. Specific strategies, targets, and measures are defined by the operational management teams in the Care Solutions and Oil Additives business lines. About 80 percent of the palm-based raw materials used by the Care Solutio

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2018

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Compliance with initiative, please specify :selected cut off date in line with RSPO P&C

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2025

[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Palm oil

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

☑ % of volume third-party certified

(8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RSPO - Mass Balance

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

11/30/2013

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

11/30/2013

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

11/30/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

82000

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

60000

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

73.17

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

target was set for 100 % RSPO MB certified raw materials.

(8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Possible raw material switch depends on availabilities, commercial feasibility and regulatory limitations, therefore the target was set to 2025.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

RSPO MB coverage of procurement spend 2022 was 57 %, 2023 reported on 73 %
[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Palm oil

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

☑ Value chain mapping

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

vonik is a founding member of the Action for Sustainable Derivatives (ASD) initiative. The goal of the ASD initiative is to ensure the traceability of palm oil derivatives to mills and plantations. Its risk analysis methods and joint action plans aim to help counter progressive deforestation. As one major pillar, Evonik annually investigates the regional origin of its palm (kernel) oil derivatives with the help of transitions. In 2023, the transparency level for the volumes in scope of the investigation could be significantly increased due to better feedback from supply chain partners: - 97,8 % traceable up to refineries vs 96,8% for 2021 - 97,2% traceable up to mills vs 96,2% for 2021 Method for supply chain investigation: 1. Data collection from direct & indirect suppliers 2. Supply chain mapping (list of refineries, crushers & mills in the chain, associated geographical maps) 3. Percentage of transparent derivatives to refineries, crushers, mills & plantations 4. Map of sourcing areas linked to the chain (proportion of sourcing per country/province considering volumes)*

Soy

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to establish one within the next two years

(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

no disclosure of soy due to low exposure and missing traceability
[Fixed row]

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

Palm oil

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

69.3

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

28.5

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

2.2

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00
[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Palm oil

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

58

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

58

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

58

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ No

Soy

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to do so within the next two years

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

no standardized procedure
[Fixed row]

(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.

Palm oil

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ RSPO supply chain certification – Segregated

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

58

(8.9.1.3) Comment

ASD method applied

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

ASD_Guidance Deforestation Free Reporting V1.0.pdf
[Add row]

(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Palm oil

(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area

58.00

(8.9.4.2) Monitoring approach used for determining that sourcing areas have no or negligible risk of deforestation or conversion

Select all that apply

☑ Collaborating with other organizations to develop and share risk profiles

☑ Information gathered through grievance mechanisms

☑ Landscape or jurisdictional approaches

☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial data

☑ Third-party assessment tool

(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment

Annual ASD Report on disclosed commodities. This methodology is based on the methodologies of the CDP, the AFI and the CGF-FPC to calculate DCF volumes; applied with the specificities of the palm sector. These methodologies propose a common framework to ensure deforestation and conversion free volumes: 1. Robust certification schemes (RSPO) 2. Traceable to an area where there is a negligible risk of deforestation (10 miles) 3. Monitoring at production level through field assessment or remotely assessed. RSPO model is currently recognized as the most robust certification in the palm oil sector, especially since the revision of its Principles and Criteria in 2018. The RSPO system adresses environmental and social rights, promotes HCV and HCS approaches, has a grievance mechanism in place, and ensures transparency in the data it displays publicly. Other certifications like MSPO or ISPO have not yet been recognized as robust enough by the sector to fully adress DCF challenges, although it is important to recognize their contribution and potential future engagement. The only RSPO certifications that ensures fully physically certified volumes are IP and SG. The RSPO Mass Balanced system mixes certified volumes with conventional volumes. Therefore, this model allows for DCF claims only if it is backed up by other DCF verification measures such as field project assessment and satellite monitoring.Within a 10 km buffer around the mills, identification from satellite images of deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems due to palm oil cultivation. • Consideration of deforestation and conversion by industrial players and smallholders. • Mills are considered non DCF as soon as deforestation or conversion is detected

(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin

Select all that apply

☑ Indonesia

☑ Malaysia

(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas

all identified sourcing areas in scope

(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.4.7) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ Third party

(8.9.4.8) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through sourcing area monitoring and is verified as DF/DCF

58

(8.9.4.9) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

Annual ASD Report on disclosed commodities. This methodology is based on the methodologies of the CDP, the AFI and the CGF-FPC to calculate DCF volumes; applied with the specificities of the palm sector. These methodologies propose a common framework to ensure deforestation and conversion free volumes: 1. Robust certification schemes (RSPO) 2. Traceable to an area where there is a negligible risk of deforestation (10 miles) 3. Monitoring at production level through field assessment or remotely assessed. RSPO model is currently recognized as the most robust certification in the palm oil sector, especially since the revision of its Principles and Criteria in 2018. The RSPO system adresses environmental and social rights, promotes HCV and HCS approaches, has a grievance mechanism in place, and ensures transparency in the data it displays publicly. Other certifications like MSPO or ISPO have not yet been recognized as robust enough by the sector to fully adress DCF challenges, although it is important to recognize their contribution and potential future engagement. The only RSPO certifications that ensures fully physically certified volumes are IP and SG. The RSPO Mass Balanced system mixes certified volumes with conventional volumes. Therefore, this model allows for DCF claims only if it is backed up by other DCF verification measures such as field project assessment and satellite monitoring.Within a 10 km buffer around the mills, identification from satellite images of deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems due to palm oil cultivation. • Consideration of deforestation and conversion by industrial players and smallholders. • Mills are considered non DCF as soon as deforestation or conversion is detected

(8.9.4.10) Attachment of verification (optional)

ASD_Guidance Deforestation Free Reporting V1.0.pdf

(8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

combination of RSPO certification, available field assesment, statelite monitoring
[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint	Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint	Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :NDPE compliance according to EUDR in progress	*NDPE monitoring according to EUDR in progress*
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*no standardized procedure*

[Fixed row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.

	Third-party certification scheme adopted	Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted	Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*no standardized procedure*
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*no standardized procedure*

[Fixed row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

	GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated	Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change	Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, and willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]*
Soy	*Select from:* ☑ No, and do not plan to do so in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*no standardized procedure*

[Fixed row]

(8.13.1) Provide details on the actions your organization has taken in its direct operations and/or upstream value chain that have resulted in reduced GHG emissions and/or enhanced removals.

Row 1

(8.13.1.1) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Palm oil

(8.13.1.2) Description of actions

RSPO certification and GHG impacts

(8.13.1.3) CO2e reductions and removals achieved from base year (metric tons CO2e)

104000

(8.13.1.4) Base year

2018

(8.13.1.5) Emissions accounting boundary

Select from:

☑ Included in the corporate GHG inventory boundary

(8.13.1.6) Scope

Select from:

☑ Scope 1+2 (location-based) +3 (upstream)

(8.13.1.7) Emissions accounting methodology and standards

Select all that apply

☑ ISO 14064-1:2018

(8.13.1.8) Explain calculation

comparative Life Cycle Assessment of RSPO -certified and non-certified palm oil, target 100 % MB raw material basket of Evonik (CS OA)
[Add row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

☑ Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

☑ Labor rights

☑ Land use rights
☑ Third parties' rights
☑ Environmental protection
☑ Human rights protected under international law
☑ Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations
☑ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting
☑ The principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), including as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply
☑ Second party audits
☑ Supplier self-declaration

(8.14.5) Please explain

Suppliers of certain critical raw materials are subject to a special examination. We define critical raw materials as all raw materials that could potentially involve a supply risk or reputational risk, such as conflict minerals and renewable raw materials, including palm oil. We have established specific procurement strategies for these critical raw materials. The processes are integrated into a management system, where they are mapped. As well as monitoring suppliers of critical raw materials, we aim to examine the sustainability of all major raw material suppliers by 2025. To supplement our code of conduct for suppliers, our approach includes self-assessments, audits, and validation of suppliers through the Together for Sustainability (TfS) initiative. The chemical industry set up the TfS initiative for this purpose in 2011. Evonik is one of the six founding members. The aim of TfS is the joint development and implementation of a global assessment and audit program for responsible procurement of goods and services. We expect our suppliers to share our principles and act correctly in all respects, which means accepting responsibility towards their employees, business partners, society, and the environment. Validation is the first step in every new supply relationship. For this purpose, we use a validation process based on the values defined in our code of conduct for suppliers. Alongside quality, environmental protection, safety, health, and energy management, the assessment of potential risk factors includes corruption prevention, cybersecurity, labor and social standards (the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining), human rights (compulsory, forced, or child labor), conflict minerals, and responsibility within the supply chain. All details are entered online and evaluated using a validation matrix. The initial validation is a country-based process and does not include a separate review of the location of operations. All suppliers are informed about corruption prevention and the related measures in our code of conduct for suppliers and our general terms and conditions of purchase.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Risk of biodiversity loss

☑ Risk of human rights issues

☑ Risk of issues related to land tenure rights

☑ Presence of a neutral convener or implementer

☑ Opportunity for increased human well-being in area

☑ Opportunity to protect and restore natural ecosystems

☑ Opportunity to increase market access for smallholders and local communities

☑ Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Landscape project has been selected by mentioned focus areas and identified focus areas. Also within most suitable project partners and project host.

[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ1

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Tabin, Sabah

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Sabah

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

20000

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply
☑ Funder: Provides full or partial financial resources

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

2020

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Please specify :2025

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Local communities

☑ NGO and/or civil society

☑ Producers

☑ Private sector

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

Objective 1: PROTECT: Landscape Planning & Policy By 2025, an integrated land-use plan for the Tabin landscape supports protection of forests and certification of RSPO/NDPE palm oil at landscape level. By 2025, an effective policy framework at jurisdictional level supports the sustainable landscape approach across Sabah's landscapes. • Objective 2: PRODUCE: Sustainable Palm Oil By 2025, oil palm growers covering 20,000 ha in Tabin are RSPO certified (and NDPE compliant) through landscape approaches. Cooperation Agreement Evonik-WWF, status August 26, 2020 20200826_Cooperation WWF Evonik_Evonik final26 Page 3 of 25 • Objective 3: PROTECT: Wildlife Protection By 2025, populations of rare, threatened and endangered terrestrial mammals (e.g. Bornean Elephant, Orangutans etc.) are stabilized in Tabin Wildlife Reserve. • Objective 4: PROTECT: Human-Elephant Conflict By 2025, human-elephant conflicts in Tabin and its surrounding areas are *substantially reduced, preventing retaliatory killings. • Objective 5: RESTORE: Ecological Corridors By 2025, at least one ecological corridor is established and restored, allowing for wildlife migration and habitat connectivity. • Objective 6: Landscape Assessments and Methodologies By 2025, the cooperation has contributed to develop landscape assessments and methodologies supporting sustainable development in the Sabah-Tabin landscape and deforestation-free supply chains.*

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

Progress is continiously monitored and semi-annual project reports are drafted to inform about progress towards the set objectives by WWF

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ No, we are not making any claims, but we plan to in the next two years

[Add row]

(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.

Row 1

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

☑ LJ1

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

Row 2

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ2

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:
☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data
[Add row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply
☑ Palm oil

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Initiatives: UN Global Compact, Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), Forum for Sustainable Palm Oil (FONAP) vonik has signed the UN Global Compact in 2009 and has been a member since. In 2010, Evonik became an ordinary RSPO member. In 2022, Evonik has become an member of FONAP.
[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with certification

☑ Improvement of standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Evonik supports the " Living Landscape Sabah /Tabin" jurisdictional approach since 2020 together with partners. The Sabah Landscapes Program combines conservation and sustainable development by integrating the protection of forests, wildlife and rivers, with RSPO certified production of oil palm, and restoration of ecological corridors and riparian reserves. One of the objectives is reforestation:5. RESTORE: Ecological CorridorsBy 2026, at least one ecological corridor is established and restored, allowing for wildlife migration and habitat connectivity.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2020

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2026

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

20000

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

20000

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

5.25

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

118.666667

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practice

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

The project kick-off was at the end of 2020. Due to regional lockdown, no quantified results are available, yet. Communication of quantified achievements are restricted to the communication plan with project partners and will be reported in the future.

Row 3

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Threatened and protected species

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with certification

☑ Improvement of standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Evonik supports the " Living Landscape Sabah /Tabin" jurisdictional approach since 2020 together with partners. The Sabah Landscapes Program combines conservation and sustainable development by integrating the protection of forests, wildlife and rivers, with RSPO certified production of oil palm, and restoration of ecological corridors and riparian reserves. Two of the objectives are to support threatened and protected species:3. PROTECT: Wildlife ProtectionBy 2026, populations of rare, threatened and endangered terrestrial mammals are stabilized in Tabin Wildlife Reserve.4. PROTECT: Human-Elephant ConflictBy 2026, human-elephant conflicts in Tabin and its surrounding areas are substantially reduced, preventing retaliatory killings.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2020

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2026

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

20000

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

20000

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

5.25

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

118.666667

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practice

☑ Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

The project kick-off was at the end of 2020. Due to regional lockdown, no quantified results are available, yet. Communication of quantified achievements are restricted to the communication plan with project partners and will be reported in the future.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals are measured and recorded continuously by water meters on site during controlled operation, monitored monthly on-site and reported to corporate center for company-wide aggregation and evaluation on a yearly basis.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, 104 of 105 production sites (i.e., 99%) in 27 countries reported water withdrawals - total volumes. Thus, reporting covers almost all of our production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals are measured and recorded continuously by water meters on site during controlled operation, monitored monthly on-site and reported to corporate center with an indication of the water source for company-wide aggregation and evaluation quarterly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, 104 of 105 production sites (i.e., 99%) in 27 countries reported water withdrawals - volumes by source. We differentiate abstraction from groundwater, surface water, brackish water, sea water, and water from third party (e.g., potable water and reclaimed municipal wastewater). Thus, reporting covers almost all of our production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals are measured and recorded continuously by water meters on site during controlled operation, monitored monthly on-site and reported to corporate center with an indication of the water quality for company-wide aggregation and evaluation quarterly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, 104 of 105 production sites (i.e., 99%) in 27 countries reported water withdrawals quality. We differentiate freshwater, brackish water and sea water. Thus, reporting covers almost all of our production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharges are measured and recorded continuously by different methods (e.g., water meters, bills, calulations, etc.) on site during controlled operation, monitored monthly on-site and reported to corporate center for company-wide aggregation and evaluation quarterly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, 98 of 105 production sites (i.e., 93%) in 27 countries reported wastewater discharges - total volumes. Thus, reporting covers almost all of our production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharges are measured and recorded continuously by different methods (e.g., water meters, bills, calulations, etc.) on site during controlled operation, monitored monthly on-site and reported to corporate center with an indication of the discharge distination for company-wide aggregation and evaluation quarterly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, 98 of 105 production sites (i.e., 93%) in 27 countries reported wastewater discharges - volumes by destination. We distinguish direct and indirect discharges (to third parties). For direct discharges, we assume all are to freshwater, except for one site discharging significant once-through cooling water to the sea. Thus, reporting covers almost all of our production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharges are measured and recorded continuously by different methods (e.g., water meters, bills, calulations, etc.) on site during controlled operation, monitored monthly on-site and reported to corporate center for company-wide aggregation and evaluation quarterly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, 98 of 105 production sites (i.e., 93%) in 27 countries reported wastewater discharges. We distinguish direct discharge and indirect discharge (to third party). For direct discharges, the sites reported the highest level of treatment of their main wastewater. Thus, reporting covers almost all of our production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge quality (by standard effluent parameters) is analysed partly continuously, partly from water samples (frequency: daily to quarterly), according to local regulation. Data is recorded on site by water analysis systems. Data for direct dischargers is reported annually to corporate center for company-wide aggregation and evaluation. We monitor water discharge quality by standard effluent parameters at the facility level using online devices, automatic water samplers and lab testing.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, out of 105 production sites in 27 countries, 36 production sites reported direct discharges. When respective parameters exceed reporting thresholds, these sites must report respective emissions to water to corporate center (27 sites, i.e., 100%). Thus, reporting covers all relevant direct emissions to water, hence, all production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge quality (emissions to water) is analysed partly continuously, partly from water samples (frequency: daily to quarterly), according to local regulation. Data is recorded on site by water analysis systems. Data for direct dischargers is reported annually to corporate center for company-wide aggregation and evaluation. We monitor water discharge quality by standard effluent parameters at the facility level using online devices, automatic water samplers and lab testing.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, out 105 production sites in 27 countries, 36 production sites reported direct discharges. When respective parameters exceed reporting thresholds, these sites must report respective emissions to water to corporate center (27 sites, i.e., 100%). Thus, reporting covers all relevant direct emissions to water, hence, all production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, 98 of 105 production sites (i.e., 93%) in 27 countries reported wastewater discharges. All relevant water quality parameters are measured on site to comply with local regulation. However, water discharge quality - temperature is currently not reported to corporate center.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water consumption total volume is calculated each quarter as the difference between all reported water withdrawls and water discharges. Calculation is conducted at corporate level based on site-specific data reported for company-wide aggregation and evaluation.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Calculation for water cunsumption - total volume in 2023 is calculated as the difference between all reported water withdawals (104 sites) and discharges (98 sites) in the reporting period. Thus, reporting covers all relevant direct emissions to water, hence, all production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water recycled/reused is measured and recorded continuously by different methods (e.g., water meters, bills, calulations, etc.) on site during controlled operation, monitored monthly on-site and reported to corporate center for company-wide aggregation and evaluation quarterly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Data for water recycled/reused is based on reports of 47 sites (100%) that deploy open cooling circuits ("cooling towers"). These systems are the most relvant water recycling / reuse systems. Other forms of water recycling and reuse, e.g., reuse of steam condensate, process water, etc., are practiced as well, but water volumes are currently not reported to corporate center. Thus, reporting covers the most relevant volumes for the total production volume. The data are compiled using our intelex-based reporting system (ESTER) and is verified anually by an external auditor. All sites do report their site-specific environmental data online, thus evaluation of environmental data can take place centralized according to business level, facility-wise, region-wise etc.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We do not monitor and report wash services on corporate level any longer as we decided to delegate responsibility to site level.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

408835

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. According to our definition Evonik's total withdrawal did not change significantly in the reporting period (446'674 megalitres in 2022). Slight variations to our previous reporting, e.g., in sustainability reports, can occur, because there reports are based on reported volumes in a fast-close process, while data reported here represent actual values after the respective quarter. Withdrawn water is mainly used (80%) for once-through cooling. The required water volume therefore depends on capacity utilization in production and the water temperature. Due to minor changes in capacity utilization overall water consumption did not change significantly. Variations to detailed intake volumes by source given in questions below is due to consideration of accepted third party wastewater volumes as a water intake here (1'892 megalitres in 2023, 2'081 megalitres in 2022). Future water intake is supposed to decrease as our coal-fired power plant in Marl will be substituted by a gas-fired high-efficiency plant with 90%less cooling water demand in 2024.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

403977

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. According to our definition Evonik's total withdrawals did not change significantly in the reporting period (442'323 megalitres in 2022). Slight variations to our previous reporting, e.g., in sustainability reports, can occur, because there reports are based on reported volumes in a fast-close process, while data reported here represent actual values after the respective quarter. Discharged water is mainly caused (80%) by once-through cooling. The required water volume therefore depends on capacity utilization in production and the water temperature. Due to minor changes in capacity utilization overall water consumption did not change significantly. Variations to detailed discharged volumes by source given in questions below is due to consideration of water sold to third parties here (3'042 megalitres in 2023, 3'242 megalitres in 2022). Future water discharge is supposed to decrease as our coal-fired power plant in Marl will be substituted by a gas-fired high-efficiency plant with 90% lower cooling water demand in 2024.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

4858

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. According to our definition, Evonik's total consumption did not change significantly in the reporting period (4'352 Megaliters in 2022). Slight variations to previous reporting, e.g., in sustainability reports, can occur, because there reports are based on reported volumes in a fast-close process, while data reported here represent actual values after the respective quarter. Water consumption is caused mainly, e.g., by evaporation in open circuit cooling systems ("cooling towers"), water incorporated in products, etc. Water consumption therefore depends on capacity utilization in production. Due to minor changes in capacity utilization, overall water consumption did not change significantly.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

4298

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

1.05

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. In contrast to previous reporting, we used a different tool (WWF Water Risk Filter). We identified 17 production sites located in water scarce areas (Changchun, Dossenheim, Greensboro, Ham, Hanau-Wolfgang, Jhagadia, Little Rock, Obernburg am Main, Onzonilla, Qingdao, Rayong, Rodange - Route de Longwy, Shanghai-Xinzhuang, Steinau, Ulsan, Vernon - Los Angeles, Zubillaga). These sites have either, (i), a risk score 3.4 in the category "1: Water Scarcity", and/or, (ii), a score of 4 in category "1.1-Water Depletion" (corresponding to WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas indicator "Baseline water stress" "High"), and/or, (iii), a score of 4 in category "1.2-Baseline Water Stress" (corresponding to WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas indicator "Baseline water depletion" "High"). Water withdrawal in areas with water stress were similar to the previous year (4'266 Megaliters in 2022). It represents 1.05% of our total water withdrawn. Additional ten sites are located in regions with medium water scarcity risks (category "1: Water Scarcity": 2.6

[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

81051

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. Evonik's fresh surface water withdrawal and rainwater use was lower than in the previous reporting period (90'864 Megaliters in 2022). Changes in volumes to previous reporting is that we now distinguish between fresh surface water (TDS

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

257834

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%.Evonik's withdrawal from brackish surface water and sea water was about the same as in the previous reporting period (278'853 Megaliters in 2022). Changes in volumes to previous reporting is that we now distinguish between fresh surface water (TDS

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

47278

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%.Evonik's withdrawal from groundwater and sea water was about the same as in the previous reporting period (52'435 Megaliters in 2022). For reporting to corporate centre, we do not distinguish between renewable and non-renewable groundwater sources, because we do not use non-renewable groundwater in our operations. Groundwater is mainly used for cooling and production purposes. The water volumes therefore depend on capacity utilization in production.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

As in previous years, non-renewable groundwater is not relevant in 2023 as we do not use non-renewable groundwater in our operations. We do not have any sites in regions with non-renewable groundwater aquifers. Therefore we do expect unchanged "non-relevance" for our operations in future.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

As in previous years, entrained water is not relevant in 2023 as we do not use entrained water in our operations. Currently we do expect unchanged "non-relevance" for our operations in future.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

22804

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. Freshwater from third party sources include drinking water and reclaimed municipal wastewater (reuse water). Evonik's withdrawal of third party sources remained about the same in compared to the previous reporting period (24'463 in 2022).
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

211906

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our change definitions: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. Data is from 98 of 105 production sites (93%) in 27 countries, reporting wastewater discharges by destination. We distinguish direct and indirect discharges (to third parties). For direct discharges, we assume all are to freshwater, except for one site discharging significant once-through cooling water to the sea. Evonik's surface water discharge decreased from 235,840 megaliters in 2022, *mainly due to cooling water demand, which depends on production capacity utilization and water temperature. Minor changes in capacity utilization led to this reduction. With plans to replace a coal-fired power plant at our largest site in Marl (Germany) with a modern IGCC power plant, we anticipate further reductions in water discharge volumes in the future.*

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

182528

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. Figures are based on 98 out of 105 production sites (i.e., 93%), reporting wastewater discharges by destination. We distinguish direct and indirect discharges (to third parties). For direct discharges, we assume all are to freshwater, except for one site discharging significant once-through cooling water to the sea. Figures reported here are based on Evonik's discharge into sea, which was similar to the previous reporting period (196'565 megaliters in 2022). Future seawater discharge is anticipated to remain unchanged due to economic forecasts.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Evonik does not discharge water to groundwater.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

6500

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. Data is from 98 of 105 production sites (93%) in 27 countries, reporting wastewater discharges by destination. We distinguish direct and indirect discharges (to third parties). In 2023, we discharged a similar volume to third-party facilities (e.g., municipal facilities) for treatment (indirect discharge) as in the in the previous year (6'676 megaliters in 2022). Taking into consideration that third party destinations contribute less than 5% to overall water discharge, a detailed analysis does not seem to be appropriate. Future discharge is expected unchanged.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

28370

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Relevant: In 2023, 37 Evonik sites reported direct discharges of wastewater which was not once-through cooling water. Out of these, five sites (14%) had a tertiary treatment as highest level of treatment for their main wastewater. We updated this figure in comparison with previous reports due to adaptions in our reporting of the sites to corporate centre. Figures reported here represent total volumes of direct wastewater discharges at these sites that was not once-through cooling water, even if different highest levels of treatment are given at one site, as this degree of detail is not recorded at corporate level. Based on these information, tertiary treatment was applied to 7% of the total wastewater volumes discharged. The discharged volume after tertiary treatment was at about the same level as in the previous *reporting period (2022: 29’085 megalitres). Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. All discharge volumes were subject to strict water quality controls before being released to receiving water bodies. Anticipated future trend: According to current plannings no major change on production will take place except the substitution of an existing coal-fired power plant by an IGCC which 90% less cooling water demand. Thus discharge volumes are expected to decrease.*

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3676

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Relevant: In 2023, 37 Evonik sites reported direct discharges of wastewater, which was not once-through cooling water. Out of these, six sites (16%) had a secondary treatment as highest level of treatment for their main wastewater. We updated this figure in comparison with previous reports due to adaptions in our reporting of the sites to corporate centre. Figures reported here represent total volumes of direct wastewater discharges at these sites, even if different highest levels of treatment are *given at one site, as this degree of detail is not recorded at corporate level. Based on these information, secondary treatment was applied to 1% of the total wastewater volumes discharged. The discharged volume after secondary treatment was at about the same level as in the previous reporting period (2022: 3'939 megalitres). Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. All discharge volumes were subject to strict water quality controls before being released to receiving water bodies. Anticipated future trend: Discharge volumes treated to secondary level are expected to remain the same in the upcoming years as no significant alterations are being planned for the production processes.*

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

17373

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Relevant: In 2023, 37 Evonik sites reported direct discharges of wastewater, which was not once-through cooling water. Out of these, 17 sites (46%) had a primary treatment as highest level of treatment for their main wastewater. We updated this figure in comparison with previous reports due to adaptions in our reporting of the *sites to corporate centre. Figures reported here represent total volumes of direct wastewater discharges at these sites, even if different highest levels of treatment are given at one site, as this degree of detail is not recorded at corporate level. Based on these information, primary treatment was applied to 4% of the total wastewater volumes discharged. The discharged volume after secondary treatment was at about the same level as in the previous reporting period (2022: 18'233 megalitres). Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. All discharge volumes were subject to strict water quality controls before being released to receiving water bodies. Anticipated future trend: Discharge volumes treated to primary level are expected to remain the same in the upcoming years as no significant alterations are being planned for the production processes.*

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

349425

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 81-90

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Relevant: In 2023, 36 Evonik sites reported direct discharges of once-through cooling water and/or direct wastewater discharge to the environment without treatment, which was not once-through cooling water. Figures reported here represent total volumes of once-through cooling water discharges plus a minor volume of direct wastewater discharges at sites discharging wastewater directly to the environment without treatment, even if different highest levels of treatment are given at one site, as this degree of detail is not recorded at corporate level. Based on these information, the total volume released to the environment represent 86% of the total volumes discharged, of which the highest fraction was by far once-through cooling water. The discharged volume discharged without treatment was at about the same level as in the previous reporting period (2022: 385'105 megalitres). Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. All discharge volumes were subject to strict water quality controls before being released to receiving water bodies. Anticipated future trend: Discharge volumes without treatment are dominated by volumes from once-through cooling systems, which are expected to remain the same in the upcoming years as no significant alterations are being planned for the production processes.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

6500

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

At corporate level, we do not distinguish between indirect discharge to third party with or without pretreatment. In 2023, 64 Evonik sites reported indirect discharges of wastewater to a third party, which was not once-through cooling water (out of 98 sites reporting wastewater discharges). Note that these sites partly also reported direct discharges, e.g., if several wastewater discharge systems are in place. Figures reported here represent total volumes of wastewater discharged to third party. Based on these information, wastewater discharged to third party represent 2% of the total wastewater volumes discharged. The wastewater volume discharged to third party was at about the same level as in the previous reporting period (2022: 6'610 megalitres, i.e., 1%). Our definition for change: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: -10%, Much lower: -50%. All discharge volumes were subject to strict water quality controls before being released to receiving water bodies. Anticipated future trend: Discharge volumes to third party are expected to remain the same in the upcoming years as no significant alterations are being planned for the production processes.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

NN
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

222

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☑ Nitrates

☑ Phosphates

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Organic substances—expressed as chemical oxygen demand (COD)—account for the highest proportion of our wastewater loads. COD is the concentration of all substances in the wastewater that can be oxidized under certain conditions. The decrease in COD was mainly attributable to the reduction in production. The increase in total nitrogen (N) emissions was caused by the temporary malfunctioning of one of our wastewater treatment plants.
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

24

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

In our direct operations, we define a facility as a site/location with production activity. We have identified 24 of our sites, representing approximately 23% of our total production sites, as potentially exposed to substantive water risks by 2050 under the SSP 3 scenario. We assess water risks using the WWF Water Risk Filter, considering basin physical risks, regulatory risks, and reputational risks, with weighted factors recommended for the chemical industry. We consider water risks *substantive if: (i) The WWF Water Risk Filter assigns a risk index of 3.4 (high to very high) for 2050 under SSP 3. (ii) Sites exhibit high operational water risk (assessed through site interviews) and/or high water intensity/dependency. While water risks at a single facility may not be substantive, simultaneous risks across multiple watersheds could lead to significant financial impacts. Water is crucial for many manufacturing processes, such as heating, cooling, and production. Business disruptions due to water scarcity could affect our ability to deliver to customers, potentially causing delays, claims, and reputational damage. However, our extensive network of over 100 global sites and robust logistics capabilities mitigate these risks, keeping the potential impact on global revenue low. The exact percentage of affected revenue depends on various factors, including the type, magnitude, and duration of the impact, as well as the specific knock-on effects on our manufacturing sites.*

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

We are already working on the assessment of water risk upstream. First of all, we have identified our raw materials with the highest water consumption. For those, we are now checking their country of origin. This requires a deep understanding of the value chain and data exchange with our supplier.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Changchun

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Amur

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

43.86486

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

125.38602

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

31

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

31

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

27

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

27

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

5

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 3.1, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Jhagadia

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify **:**Arabian Sea

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.646728

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.150232

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

236

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

236

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

264

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

264

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-28

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 3.5, indicating it is located in a water-stressed area (3.4). We monitor water withdrawals and discharges locally using sources such as water meters, bills, calculations, and estimates. This data is reported quarterly to our corporate center for aggregation and evaluation. While we do not currently collect data on the renewability of groundwater sources, we assume all groundwater and aquifer sources are renewable within 50 years. We categorize withdrawal water quality as follows: freshwater, brackish water, and sea water. For discharges, we do not centrally collect data on the water quality (e.g., TDS) of discharge points, and we assume all discharges to surface water are to freshwater, except for one site, where significant volumes of once-through cooling water are discharged to the sea. Water consumption is calculated as withdrawals minus discharges. Instances of negative consumption can occur due to factors such as metering inaccuracies, especially of large wastewater volumes, managed rainwater runoff, etc. Our change definitions are: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Qingdao

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Yellow Sea & East China Sea

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

36.07408

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.14777

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

440

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

440

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

402

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

402

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

38

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 3.7, indicating it is located in a water-stressed area (3.4). We monitor water withdrawals and discharges locally using sources such as water meters, bills, calculations, and estimates. This data is reported quarterly to our corporate center for aggregation and evaluation. While we do not currently collect data on the renewability of groundwater sources, we assume all groundwater and aquifer sources are renewable within 50 years. We categorize withdrawal water quality as follows: freshwater, brackish water, and sea water. For discharges, we do not centrally collect data on the water quality (e.g., TDS) of discharge points, and we assume all discharges to surface water are to freshwater, except for one site, where significant volumes of once-through cooling water are discharged to the sea. Water consumption is calculated as withdrawals minus discharges. Instances of negative consumption can occur due to factors such as metering inaccuracies, especially of large wastewater volumes, managed rainwater runoff, etc. Our change definitions are: Much higher: 50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Rayong

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Thailand
☑ Other, please specify :Gulf of Thailand

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.730339

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

101.139088

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

771

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

771

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

694

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

694

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

77

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 3.3, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Dombivli

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify **:**Arabian Sea

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

19.204258

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.097976

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

142

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

142

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

18

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

18

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

125

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 2.1, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

La Zaida

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Ebro

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.325852

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.427248

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

610

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

604

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

6

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

213

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

213

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

398

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 3.0, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Umbogintwini

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify :Indian Ocean

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-30.021687

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.87925

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

73

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

73

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

23

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

23

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

50

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 2.7, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Bekasi-Cikarang

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :Java

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.280365

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

107.14223

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

344

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

344

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

63

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

63

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

281

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.6, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Bekasi-Timur

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify **:**Java

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.249116

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

107.013564

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

21

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

21

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

4

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

4

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

17

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.6, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Mapleton

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Mississippi River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.565464

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-89.72323

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1169

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

1169

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

947

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

947

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

222

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.5, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 20

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Milton

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Mississippi River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

42.779308

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-88.96771

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

30

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

30

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

30

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

30

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.7, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 21

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Memphis - Stiles Dr.

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Mississippi River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.189782

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-90.052291

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

14

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

14

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

4

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

4

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

10

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.3, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 22

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Calvert City

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify **:**Ohio

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.044797

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-88.353416

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1953

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

60

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

1893

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2018

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

2015

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

3

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-65

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.4, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 23

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Barra do Riacho

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☑ Other, please specify :South Atlantic

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-19.83155

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-40.062489

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

387

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

387

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

165

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

165

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

222

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 2.6, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 24

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Taoyuan City

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Taiwan, China
☑ Other, please specify :Taiwan

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.075933

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.183354

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1079

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

949

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

130

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

863

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

863

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

216

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.8, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 25

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Americana

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil
☑ Other, please specify :Tiete

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-22.729113

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-47.347173

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

560

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

558

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

2

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

454

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

454

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

106

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 2.2, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 26

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Jilin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Yalu Jiang

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

43.93478

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

126.51843

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

105

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

105

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

15

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

15

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

90

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.5, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 27

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Zhenjiang

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.22826

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.42665

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

16

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

29

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

29

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-13

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.3, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 28

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Nanping-Laizhou

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Yellow Sea & East China Sea

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

26.57261

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

118.27638

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1474

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1459

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

15

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1486

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

1486

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-12

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.4, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 29

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 21

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Shanghai- MUSC

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Yellow Sea & East China Sea

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.786593

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.458189

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1920

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

1920

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

713

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

706

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

7

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1207

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 2.6, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 30

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 22

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Nanning

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify **:**Zhu Jiang

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.15866

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

108.27461

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

612

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

293

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

341

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

612

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

612

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

22

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.9, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 31

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 23

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Arifiye

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify :Black Sea

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.703845

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.388103

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1726

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1726

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1554

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

1554

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

173

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 3.2, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:

Row 32

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Janesville

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Mississippi River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

42.671082

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-89.041975

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

804

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

804

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

664

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

429

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

235

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

139

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

For this site, the current WWF Water Risk Filter score for the 'BRC1: Water Scarcity' indicator is 1.7, indicating it is not located in a water-stressed area (50%, Higher: 10%, About the same: 10% to -10%, Lower:
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

not relevant

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ This is confidential

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	15300000000	*37423.41*	*lower as capex for smart water technologies has been allocated.*

[Fixed row]

(9.6) Do you calculate water intensity for your activities in the chemical sector?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.6.1) For your top five products by production weight/volume, provide the following water intensity information associated with your activities in the chemical sector.

Row 1

(9.6.1.1) Product type

Other chemicals

☑ Specialty inorganic chemicals

(9.6.1.2) Product name

Precipitated Silica

(9.6.1.3) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

16.5

(9.6.1.4) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.6.1.5) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton

(9.6.1.6) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.6.1.7) Please explain

For reasons of confidentiality, data provided here are average data for all products belonging to the product platform “precipitated silica” with different specificities (e.g. quality grades, concentration, etc.) and produced at different sites. Water consumption figures are reported per ton product as 100% a) Numerator: Data provided represent the Blue Water Consumption (BWC) of the product calculated by Life Cycle Assessment. It takes into account water consumption required for the raw materials used in the manufacturing process, transports, water used for the own process (water evaporated, water to river etc.), tap water, water consumed in cooling systems, water consumed for energy production and water consumed at the end of life of the product life cycle. BWC was selected as numerator as it is the most relevant water KPI in the scope of water scarcity. Indeed, it refers to the proportion of water "consumed" i.e. not available anymore for the watershed. Blue Water refers to surface and groundwater. Water consumption figures for raw materials come from LCA database (secondary data) as no supplier specific data are available. Primary data are used for our own production process. b) Denominator: Absolute Blue Water consumption for the product for the year 2023 i.e. related to the amount sold in the respective year (m3) was divided by the production volume of the year 2023 (ton) of the related product to have the Blue Water intensity. c) Comparison with previous year: About the same was selected as the value is depending of the amount of the different products sold within the product platform. d) Anticipated future trends: We expect an overall reduction of our company's water intensity in order to reach our 2030 water target (reduction of 3% of specific freshwater intake between 2021 and 2030). This reduction is also expected for our Top products. e) Use of metrics within organizations: We use BWC and freshwater intake to monitor our impact and dependencies related to water but also to assess our current and future water risks and identify hotspots products/sites. In addition, we use these KPIs to track our progress regarding water use/consumption - especially in the scope of our water target.

Row 2

(9.6.1.1) Product type

Other chemicals

☑ Specialty inorganic chemicals

(9.6.1.2) Product name

Hydrogen peroxide

(9.6.1.3) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

11.4

(9.6.1.4) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.6.1.5) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton

(9.6.1.6) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.6.1.7) Please explain

For reasons of confidentiality, data provided here are global average data for all products belonging to the product platform “hydrogen peroxide” with different specificities (e.g. quality grades, concentration, etc.) and produced at different sites. Water consumption figures are reported per ton of product as 100% (concentration/active content). The Blue Water Consumption of hydrogen peroxide is 11.4 m3 water/ton incl. water from hydropower generation and 5.46 m3 water/ton when water consumed during hydropower generation is excluded. Please note that electricity from hydropower is used at several hydrogen peroxide’s production sites and water consumed in hydropower plants has a high share on the overall BWC. However, our producing sites having a high share of electricity from hydropower are not located in water stress areas. a) Numerator: Data provided represent the Blue Water Consumption (BWC) of the product calculated by Life Cycle Assessment. It takes into account water consumption required for the raw materials used in the manufacturing process, transports, water used for the own process (water evaporated, water to river etc.), tap water, water consumed in cooling systems, water consumed for energy production and water consumed at the end of life of the product life cycle. BWC was selected as numerator as it is the most relevant water KPI in the scope of water scarcity. Indeed, it refers to the proportion of water "consumed" i.e. not available anymore for the watershed. Blue Water refers to surface and groundwater. Water consumption figures for raw materials come from LCA database (secondary data) as no supplier specific data are available. Primary data are used for our own production process. b) Denominator: Absolute Blue Water consumption for the product for the year 2023 i.e. related to the amount sold in the respective year (m3) was divided by the production volume of the year 2023 (ton) of the related product to have the Blue Water intensity. c) Comparison with previous year: About the same was selected as the value is depending of the amount of the different products sold within the product platform. d) Anticipated future trends: We expect an overall reduction of our company's water intensity in order to reach our 2030 water target (reduction of 3% of specific freshwater intake between 2021 and 2030). This reduction is also expected for our Top products.

Row 3

(9.6.1.1) Product type

Other chemicals

☑ Specialty organic chemicals

(9.6.1.2) Product name

Methionine

(9.6.1.3) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

8.2

(9.6.1.4) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.6.1.5) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton

(9.6.1.6) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.6.1.7) Please explain

For reasons of confidentiality, data provided here are average data for all products belonging to the product platform “methionine” with different specificities (e.g. quality grades, concentration, etc.) and produced at different sites. Water consumption figures are reported per ton product as 100% a) Numerator: Data provided represent the Blue Water Consumption (BWC) of the product calculated by Life Cycle Assessment. It takes into account water consumption required for the raw materials used in the manufacturing process, transports, water used for the own process (water evaporated, water to river etc.), tap water, water consumed in cooling systems, water consumed for energy production and water consumed at the end of life of the product life cycle. BWC was selected as numerator as it is the most relevant water KPI in the scope of water scarcity. Indeed, it refers to the proportion of water "consumed" i.e. not available anymore for the watershed. Blue Water refers to surface and groundwater. Water consumption figures for raw materials come from LCA database (secondary data) as no supplier specific data are available. Primary data are used for our own production process. b) Denominator: Absolute Blue Water consumption for the product for the year 2023 i.e. related to the amount sold in the respective year (m3) was divided by the production volume of the year 2023 (ton) of the related product to have the Blue Water intensity. c) Comparison with previous year: About the same was selected as the value is depending of the amount of the different products sold within the product platform. d) Anticipated future trends: We expect an overall reduction of our company's water intensity in order to reach our 2030 water target (reduction of 3% of specific freshwater intake *between 2021 and 2030). This reduction is also expected for our Top products. e) Use of metrics within organizations: We use BWC and freshwater intake to monitor our impact and dependencies related to water but also to assess our current and future water risks and identify hotspots products/sites. In addition, we use these KPIs to track our progress regarding water use/consumption - especially in the scope of our water target.*

Row 4

(9.6.1.1) Product type

Other chemicals

☑ Specialty organic chemicals

(9.6.1.2) Product name

MTBE products

(9.6.1.3) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

6

(9.6.1.4) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.6.1.5) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton

(9.6.1.6) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.6.1.7) Please explain

For reasons of confidentiality, data provided here are average data for all products belonging to the product platform “MTBE” (methyl tertiary-butyl ether) with different specificities (e.g. quality grades, concentration, etc.) and produced at different sites. Water consumption figures are reported per ton product as 100% a) Numerator: Data provided represent the Blue Water Consumption (BWC) of the product calculated by Life Cycle Assessment. It takes into account water consumption required for the raw materials used in the manufacturing process, transports, water used for the own process (water evaporated, water to river etc.), tap water, water consumed in cooling systems, water consumed for energy production and water consumed at the end of life of the product life cycle. BWC was selected as numerator as it is the most relevant water KPI in the scope of water scarcity. Indeed, it refers to the proportion of water "consumed" i.e. not available anymore for the watershed. Blue Water refers to surface and groundwater. Water consumption figures for raw materials come from LCA database (secondary data) as no supplier specific data are available. Primary data are used for our own production process. b) Denominator: Absolute Blue Water consumption for the product for the year 2023 i.e. related to the amount sold in the respective year (m3) was divided by the production volume of the year 2023 (ton) of the related product to have the Blue Water intensity. c) Comparison with previous year: About the same was selected as the value is depending of the amount of the different products sold within the product platform. d) Anticipated future trends: We expect an overall reduction of our company's water intensity in order to reach our 2030 water target (reduction of 3% of specific freshwater intake between 2021 and 2030). This reduction is also expected for our Top products. e) Use of metrics within organizations: We use BWC and freshwater intake to monitor our impact and dependencies related to water but also to assess our current and future water risks and identify hotspots products/sites. In addition, we use these KPIs to track our progress regarding water use/consumption - especially in the scope of our water target.

Row 5

(9.6.1.1) Product type

Other chemicals

☑ Specialty organic chemicals

(9.6.1.2) Product name

LPG (Liquefied Petroleum Gas)

(9.6.1.3) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

5.1

(9.6.1.4) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.6.1.5) Denominator

Select from:
☑ Ton

(9.6.1.6) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.6.1.7) Please explain

For reasons of confidentiality, data provided here are average data for all products belonging to the product platform LPG with different specificities (e.g. quality grades, concentration, etc.) and produced at different sites. Water consumption figures are reported per ton product as 100% a) Numerator: Data provided represent the Blue Water Consumption (BWC) of the product calculated by Life Cycle Assessment. It takes into account water consumption required for the raw materials used in the manufacturing process, transports, water used for the own process (water evaporated, water to river etc.), tap water, water consumed in cooling systems, water consumed for energy production and water consumed at the end of life of the product life cycle. BWC was selected as numerator as it is the most relevant water KPI in the scope of water scarcity. Indeed, it refers to the proportion of water "consumed" i.e. not available anymore for the watershed. Blue Water refers to surface and groundwater. Water consumption figures for raw materials come from LCA database (secondary data) as no supplier specific data are available. Primary data are used for our own production process. b) Denominator: Absolute Blue Water consumption for the product for the year 2023 i.e. related to the amount sold in the respective year (m3) was divided by the production volume of the year 2023 (ton) of the related product to have the Blue Water intensity. c) Comparison with previous year: About the same was selected as the value is depending of the amount of the different products sold within the product platform. d) Anticipated future trends: We expect an overall reduction of our company's water intensity in order to reach our 2030 water target (reduction of 3% of specific freshwater intake between 2021 and 2030). This reduction is also expected for our Top products. e) Use of metrics within organizations: We use BWC and freshwater intake to monitor our impact and dependencies related to water but also to assess our current and future water risks and identify hotspots products/sites. In addition, we use these KPIs to track our progress regarding water use/consumption - especially in the scope of our water target.
[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Precipitated Silica

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

16.5

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

ton

(9.12.5) Comment

Please refer to the description in the previous question.

Row 2

(9.12.1) Product name

Hydrogen peroxide

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

11.4

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

ton

(9.12.5) Comment

Please refer to the description in the previous question.

Row 3

(9.12.1) Product name

Methionine

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

8.2

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

ton

(9.12.5) Comment

Please refer to the description in the previous question.

Row 4

(9.12.1) Product name

MTBE

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

6

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

ton

(9.12.5) Comment

Please refer to the description in the previous question.

Row 5

(9.12.1) Product name

LPG

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

5.1

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

ton

(9.12.5) Comment

Please refer to the description in the previous question.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern for Authorisation above 0.1% by weight (EU Regulation)

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Less than 10%

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

We do track hazardous substances in our HAZAPP2023; Substances categorized as CMR CAT1 and/or PBT/vPvB do amount to 3%.
[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

Products defined as low water impact are those having a positive impact upstream or downstream in comparison to a market reference regarding ecosystems. Products having a low water impact means that these products enable water savings or improving water quality in comparison to established alternative on the market in their application. The classification as low water impact is made in the scope of the yearly sustainability analysis of our business (peer reviewed). Those products have a positive impact in the Signal Category 5 (environmental and social performance along the value chain) and are flagged as Next Generation Solution. It is checked that these products do not have any negative material signals in other signal categories. The methodology used to evaluate water impact is a comparative Life Cycle Analysis..

(9.14.4) Please explain

Products having a low water impact means that these products enable water savings or improving water quality in comparison to established alternative on the market in their application. These products are flagged as Next Generation Solution in the scope of the Sustainability Analysis of our business. Low water impact can mean enabling water savings (reduce quantity), improving water quality,
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Water discharge quality also considered as Wastewater loads (nitrates, phosphates, sulphate, chlorine, heavy metals, COD, AOX) is analysed partly continuously and partly daily and recorded by water analysis systems on site and reported to corporate center for company-wide aggregation and evaluation quarterly. We monitor our wastewater loads at the facility level using automatic water samplers and lab testing. As waste water loads are subject to site-specific regulations that are based on precautionary principles we do not assume to set specific targets on pollution.

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Health and safety of our employees are very important aspects. We constantly monitor and assess our HSE performance on a monthly basis including the existence of fully-functioning wash services through our internal audits worldwide, according to annual HSEAudit programs. Thus we do not assume to set specific targets.

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

We consider reduction of water withdrawls as the most important topic.
[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per product

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

15.7

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/30/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

15.23

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

16.36

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-140

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Evonik is dedicated to protecting water resources and enhancing water-use efficiency. Since 2010, Evonik has holistically assessed its water performance. We now use the WWF Water Risk Filter Tool to identify sites at risk and analyze local water projects. A new distinction between freshwater and non-freshwater revised our water target base year figure from 26.8 m^3/t to 15.7 m^3/t.

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We employ site-specific water management (WM) tools and have set a group-wide target to ensure all sites in water-scarce areas have a WM system. Sustainable WM balances water consumption and availability, tailored to local conditions. Our 'Ecological and Sustainability Assessment of New Investments Guideline' evaluates the environmental impacts of new projects. Evonik's monitoring tool annually analyzes all water-related KPIs, including site-specific risk reviews and corporate-level progress analysis.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

NN
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

	Targets in place
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

High Performance Polymers in many different applications

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

office supplies not relevant

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

packaging of our products involves plastics to wrap bags and supersacks

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

we need to assess whether we have sites that operate waste or water management facilities

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Products that are used in plastics processing and recycling
[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water management

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Law & policy

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ Pressure indicators

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
		☑ Other, please specify :Based on IPBES' definition of the direct drivers of biodiversity loss (land/sea-use change, pollution, invasive species etc.), Evonik uses indicators like e.g. water intake, water consumption, waste generation and CO2 Emissions

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

we use a distance of 1 kilometer as a criterion for "near to". Table 11.4.1 shows areas important for biodiversity in the near of our ten biggest production sites.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

we use a distance of 1 kilometer as a criterion for "near to". Table 11.4.1 shows areas important for biodiversity in the near of our ten biggest production sites.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

we use a distance of 1 kilometer as a criterion for "near to". Table 11.4.1 shows areas important for biodiversity in the near of our ten biggest production sites.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

we use a distance of 1 kilometer as a criterion for "near to". Table 11.4.1 shows areas important for biodiversity in the near of our ten biggest production sites.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

we use a distance of 1 kilometer as a criterion for "near to". Table 11.4.1 shows areas important for biodiversity in the near of our ten biggest production sites.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

we use a distance of 1 kilometer as a criterion for "near to". Table 11.4.1 shows areas important for biodiversity in the near of our ten biggest production sites.
[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Japan

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Kasumigaura-Kitaura

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

3.4

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

General answer for all sites: we use a distance of 1 kilometer as a criterion for "near to". Various products from the chemical industry are manufactured at the sites. Different processes are used. For example, the activities produce emissions (e.g. in air, in water) or water is taken from the corresponding water bodies. Thus, there are potential influences on protected areas and dependencies on ecosystem services.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

General answer for all sites: Our activities near protected areas could potentially affect negatively biodiversity through our greenhouse gas emissions, pollution and water consumption as they are key drivers of biodiversity loss according to the IPBES' definition. For biodiversity analyses, we use a geoinformation system based on the data of the IBAT Alliance. On this basis, we annually examine the potential impact of our worldwide sites on areas of special significance for biodiversity. This focuses on all sites within one kilometer of protected areas or key biodiversity areas. In addition to compiling data on conservation areas we used the WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter and the WWF Water Risk Filter to assess the risks of all sites.. Our actions to minimize the impacts are based on an extensive, integrated management system for ESHQ. This applies to the whole of the Evonik Group and is based on legal requirements, internal policies, and standard operating procedures. In addition to meeting compliance requirements, we therefore support a targeted improvement in our environmental performance. Furthermore, we require our manufacturing sites to be validated as conforming to ISO 14001. We are driving forward the reduction of all climate-relevant emissions and other environmental impacts of our business activities. The main lever to reduce GHG emissions is our own production. In the reporting period, the emission reduction targets submitted by Evonik were successfully validated by the SBTi. Alongside of the reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases we aim to reduce other emissions into air as well. We take the emissions situation into account when planning new facilities. Our clean air measures include returning exhaust gases to the production process, thermal processing of residual gases with a high calorific value well as the use techniques to reduce emissions to air from production facilities. Our aim is to reduce specific freshwater intake. Integrated heat management measures can reduce the demand for cooling water, which in turn reduces the demand for freshwater. We are also continuing our work on established water management topics, including monitoring our sites in water stress areas. When planning new production plants, we consider the use of processes that generate little or no wastewater. We have high technology standards and infrastructure for the disposal of wastewater at our sites. Wastewater discharged from our sites is carefully monitored. These analyses support the management of our wastewater treatment facilities. Our efforts to further reduce production waste are aligned with a clear principle: the first priority is to avoid waste; otherwise, waste should be recycled or used to generate energy. Evonik uses this principle to implement the five-step waste hierarchy. Continuous optimization of production processes contributes to avoiding and minimizing waste.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Schorren en Polders van de Beneden-Schelde

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Waddenzee

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 4

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Rheinniederung Elchesheim-Karlsruhe

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 5

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ France

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Vallée du Rhin: Strasbourg à Lauterbourg

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1.8

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 6

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Bienwald u. Viehstrichwiesen

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 7

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Qingdao-Rizhao coastal wetland and islands

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

4

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 8

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Tafeljura-Landschaft Baselland - Solothurn

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 9

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ France

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Vallée du Rhin: Strasbourg à Lauterbourg

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 10

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Rheinniederung von der Rench- bis zur Murgmündung

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 11

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Taiwan, China

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Dapingding and Hsutsuo Harbor

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 12

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Niagara River Corridor

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 13

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Niagara River Corridor

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 14

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Ethekwini south

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

2

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 15

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Schelde- en Durmeëstuarium van de Nederlandse grens tot Gent (Natura 2000)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 16

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

De Slikken En Schorren Langsheen De Schelde (Flemish Ecological Network)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 17

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Groot Buitenschoor En Galgenschoor (Certified Nature Reserve)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 18

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Schorren en Polders van de Beneden-Schelde (Natura 2000)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 19

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Ramsar sites

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Schorren van de Beneden Schelde

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

25

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 20

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Vance Street (Local Conservation Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 21

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Troy Street (Local Conservation Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 22

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Erlensee bei Erlensee und Bulau bei Hanau (Natura 2000)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 23

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

US-Militärgelände bei Großauheim (Natura 2000)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 24

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Stadt Hanau (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 25

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Rote Lache Von Wolfgang (Natur Reserve)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 26

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:
☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Auenverbund Kinzig (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 27

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Park Hordel, Dahlhausen, Hueller Bach, Hofsteder Bach Und Marbach In Bochum-Mitte (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 28

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Suedlich Holsterhauser Strasse/Stadtgrenze Bochum (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 29

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Dorneburger Muehlenbach In Bochum-Mitte (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 30

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Nsg Hofsteder Weiher (Nature Reserve)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 31

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Oberbruch, Grundend (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 32

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Muendelheimer Rheinbogen (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 33

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Oppumer Feld (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 34

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Nsg In Der Elt (Nature Reserve)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 35

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Rheinuferbereich (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 36

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Elt (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 37

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Latumer Bruch mit Buersbach, Stadtgräben und Wasserwerk (Natura 2000)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 38

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Wea Creek Gravel Hill Prairie (Conservation Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 39

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Wabash Breaks Site Fee (Private Conservation Land)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 40

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lookout Point Site Fee (Private Conservation Land)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 41

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Frentroper Mark (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 42

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Nsg Lippeaue (Nature Reserve)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 43

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Grosse Heide, Wulfener Heide, Lange Heide (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 44

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Lippramsdorfer Flachwellen Und Niederungen (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 45

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Haltern Lippetal Und Dattelner Lippetal (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 46

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Sickingmuehlenbach (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 47

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lippeaue (Natura 2000)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 48

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category Ia-III

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Dupont Provincial Park (Nature Reserve Class)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 49

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:
☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Schloß Beuggen (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 50

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Eichenwaldreservate Rheinfelden (Wasserloch, Rüchi Und Heimeholz) (Forest Reserves)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 51

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Nsg Langeler Auwald, Rechtsrheinisch (Nature Reserve)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 52

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:
☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Freiraeume Um Zuendorf, Wahn, Libur, Lind Und Langel Rechtsrheinisch (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 53

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Freiraeume Um Meschenich, Immendorf Und Rondorf (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 54

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Entenfang (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 55

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:
☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Landschaftskorridore (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 56

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Rhein-Fischschutzzonen zwischen Emmerich und Bad Honnef (Natura 2000)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 57

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Urfelder Weiden Und Rhein (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 58

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lsg-Rhein, Rheinauen Und Uferbereiche Von Rodenkirchen Bis Langel Rechtsrheinisch (Landscape Protection Area)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply
☑ Project design
☑ Physical controls
☑ Operational controls
☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1

Row 59

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Nsg Luelsdorfer Weiden (Nature Reserve)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

see answer in row 1

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Physical controls

☑ Operational controls

☑ Abatement controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

see answer in row 1
[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ Water consumption– total volume

☑ Water discharges– total volumes

☑ Water discharges – volumes by destination

☑ Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

☑ Water withdrawals– total volumes

☑ Water withdrawals – volumes by source

☑ Emissions to water in the reporting year

☑ Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Evonik evaluates, verifies and reports on EU taxonomy annually in Evonik's non-financial statement. Consequently, similar to the rest of the non-financial statement, all abovementioned numbers for the year 2023 have been part of a third-party limited assurance review according to ISAE 3000.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CDP_2024_LimitedAssurance.pptx
[Add row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Evoniks CDP climate change response has been signed off by the highest level of direct responsibility for climate change, the Chief Human resource officer (C-HRO), member of the Board of Evonik.

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Director on board

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute