Johnson Controls International plc

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP

.

10/03/2024, 02:38 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction 9

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? 9

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. 9

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. 9

(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. 10

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period? 11

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. 11

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? 12

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. 14

(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities? 15

(1.8.1) Please provide all available geolocation data for your facilities. 15

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? 24

(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? 25

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities 27

(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? 27

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? 29

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? 29

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. 29

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? 35

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? 35

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? 36

(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? 39

(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. 40

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 42

(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? 42

(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. 43

(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. 56

(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? 58

(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations? 69

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? 69

(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations. 69

(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by. 69

(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by? 71

(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? 71

(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. 71

(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. 80

C4. Governance 82

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? 82

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? 82

(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. 83

(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? 86

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization? 88

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 89

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? 92

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 93

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? 94

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. 95

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? ... 97

(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? ... 98

(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? ... 100

(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. ... 109

(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? ... 132

(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. ... 132

C5. Business strategy ... 136

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? ... 136

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis. ... 136

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis. ... 169

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan? ... 171

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning? ... 174

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy. ... 174

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning. ... 178

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition? ... 179

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition. ... 179

(5.4.2) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that was associated with eligible and aligned activities under the sustainable finance taxonomy in the reporting year. ... 182

(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities? ... 182

(5.5.2) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for capital goods products and services over the last three years. ... 183

(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? ... 186

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? ... 187

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon. ... 187

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? ... 190

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? ... 191

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? 193
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process? 196
(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. 197
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues. 201
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. 204
(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement? 209

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach 210
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data. 210

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change 212
(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? 212
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? 212
(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? 213
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. 213
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions. 214
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. 214
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 225
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 227
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. 229
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years. 239
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. 243
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements. 244
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 245
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 246
(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. 247
(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? 253

(7.11) How do your total Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year? 253
(7.11.1) For each Scope 3 category calculated in 7.8, specify how your emissions compare to the previous year and identify the reason for any change. 254
(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization? 260
(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2. 260
(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). 260
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. 262
(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division. 286
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity. 286
(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division. 287
(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity. 287
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. 288
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response? 289
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period. 289
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges? 517
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future? 517
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. 517
(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh. 518
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel. 521
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. 521
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year. 527
(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. 529
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. 546
(7.34) Does your organization measure the efficiency of any of its products or services? 584
(7.34.1) Provide details of the metrics used to measure the efficiency of your organization's products or services. 584
(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. 585
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business. 587
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? 588

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. 588
(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets. 596
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year? 600
(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production. 600
(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets. 603
(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s). 606
(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. 608
(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. 608
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below. 609
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? 610
(7.71) Does your organization assess the life cycle emissions of any of its products or services? 611
(7.71.1) Provide details of how your organization assesses the life cycle emissions of its products or services. 612
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services? 613
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? 613
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products. 613
(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year? 615

C9. Environmental performance - Water security 616

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? 616
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? 616
(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? 623
(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. 626
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. 628
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination. 630
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge. 632
(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? 634

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year. 635
(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? 699
(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member? 702
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency. 702
(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services. 703
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? 703
(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? 704
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact? 707
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets? 708
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. 708
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made. 709

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics 714
(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type? 714
(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities. 714
(10.3) Provide the total weight of plastic polymers sold and indicate the raw material content. 715
(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content. 715
(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content. 716
(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used. 717

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity 718
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? 718
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities? 718
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year? 718
(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity. 721

C13. Further information & sign off 732
(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? 732
(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used? 732

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored. 733
(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. 733
(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. 734

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

At Johnson Controls International plc, headquartered in Cork, Ireland, we've been making buildings smarter and more sustainable since 1885, and our capabilities, depth of innovation experience, and global reach have been growing ever since. Today, we offer the worlds largest portfolio of building technology and software as well as service solutions from some of the most trusted names in the industry. We believe our leadership in sustainability creates long-term benefits for our customers, employees, shareholders and society as a whole. This unwavering focus on sustainability is at the very heart of our purpose as a company and informs every aspect of our work, from our strategy and our customer service to our corporate citizenship. We approach our own ambitious decarbonization goals as an opportunity to lead by example, while our nearly 140-year heritage of building technologies and services provides new solutions for customers around the world to accelerate their own net zero journeys. Our work has never been more important. Buildings are responsible for nearly 40 percent of global carbon emissions. However, the good news is that, with the trifecta of efficiency, electrification and digitalization of buildings, we can slash carbon and operating costs at the same time. For that reason, the built environment represents one of the fastest paths, if not the fastest path, to meeting global climate targets and ensuring a viable future. At the same time, global climate targets set by the international community are achievable, but time is of the essence. We have only six years left to meet global targets. The time to act is now. We have the technologies, financing and experts to transform buildings from one of the greatest climate challenges into one of the biggest climate wins. We have very purposefully created a company that's uniquely qualified to meet the needs of customers at every level, creating the products, installing and servicing them, investing in advanced technologies like AI, and creating the financing structure to support end-to-end net zero journeys - wherever they are,

whatever the need. It's one of the reasons our products and solutions serve more than four million customers and are in 90 percent of the world's most iconic buildings. It's also an important factor in ensuring we live up to our ambitious carbon targets and vision for digital transformation. We're proud of the steps we've taken as a company to prioritize sustainability and lead from the front. Since 2017, we have achieved a 43.8 percent absolute reduction in scope 1 and 2 emissions, positioning us well on our way to achieving our 2030 goal of cutting carbon by 55 percent, a target aligned with maintaining a 1.5C world. In addition to this, we're also proud to have surpassed our 2030 commitment to cut our scope 3 emissions by 16 percent. As a result of this progress, we're currently ahead of schedule to reach our scope 1 & 2 net zero goal by 2040, 10 years ahead of the 2050 goal set by the Paris Agreement. Now, we're unleashing the next generation of digitally enabled operating equipment that can deliver up to 50 percent additional carbon savings for our customers, on top of the run-rate efficiency of the hardware itself. Our leadership in major organizations such as the Business Roundtable and Sustainable Markets Initiative, along with engagement at major events where our speakers are in high demand like COP28, the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos and New York and London Climate Weeks, demonstrates our commitment to thought and action leadership. As such, we're proud to have been a public voice urging the ratification of the Kigali Amendment by the US Senate and to have shown the way in delivering products that put not only low, but ultra-low GWP refrigerants to work. We were also a public voice in favor of the Inflation Reduction Act, as well as similar strong initiatives in Europe, and we're working to ensure that the important incentives in these laws and directives continue to provide businesses and individual consumers with the market signal they need to replace old equipment with clean, low-carbon technology. As we continue to shape and inform many of the most important global conversations, we affect positive change and promote the ongoing and necessary partnership between private and public entities. It is only through a coordinated and deliberate partnership that we'll solve the world's sustainability challenges. Many global challenges compete for attention on the world stage, which can often pull focus away from the pressing issue of climate change. As a team of more than 100,000, our focus and resolve remain unchanged. We're committed to creating a horizon of healthier, safer, more sustainable buildings and a brighter future for all. Wea re proud to share this CDP report of our progress to date.
[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

09/30/2023

(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?

26793000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

(1.5.1) Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.5.2) How does your reporting boundary differ to that used in your financial statement?

Johnson Controls utilizes absolute and intensity metrics to assess the impact of its energy and emissions. Energy and emissions reported include facilities and fleet (entities) as defined under the GHG Protocol Corporate Reporting and Accounting Standard, Operational Control approach. The following represent the operationally controlled entities included in the inventory: • Wholly-owned entities • Leased locations - leased locations where Johnson Controls is able to significantly modify operating policies for managing the facility through recognized leasing arrangements and other contractual requirements. More than 90 percent of our leased locations have leasing arrangements which allow us to manage our site operations, and thus are included in the inventory • Consolidated joint ventures greater than 50 percent equity control and financially consolidated

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

IE00BY7QL619

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

G51502105

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

JCI

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

BYZH9W8

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

549300XQ6S1GYKGBL205

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

98-0390500

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

☑ Guam
☑ Oman
☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Kuwait
☑ Turkey
☑ Austria
☑ Bahrain
☑ Belgium
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Qatar
☑ Spain
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Panama
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary

☑ Czechia
☑ Romania
☑ Ukraine
☑ Uruguay
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Ireland
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Argentina
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Uzbekistan
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Philippines
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ China, Macao Special Administrative Region

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No, this is confidential data	*Data below.*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 11 - 14408

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.442345

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

127.177024

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 18 - 14395A

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.823431

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.839734

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 2 - 13378

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.858092

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-106.603564

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 20 - 13381

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.479875

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.180299

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 8 - 13400

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.667864

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-106.393321

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 5 - 05344

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.788864

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-100.144432

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 4 - 14431A

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.908

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-97.584317

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 19 - 13379

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.274522

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-110.986429

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 13 - 13769

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

23.292786

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

72.346161

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 16 - 13396

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.001163

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-117.525454

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 9 - 13384

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.005009

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-117.537843

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 12 - 14687

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.911945

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-93.936075

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 3 - 13386, 13387, 13464

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.680492

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-106.444268

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 14 - 13804

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-23.588316

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-46.584737

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 1 - 04214

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.340613

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

27.13066

Row 17

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 2 - 13404

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.92582

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-96.923093

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 17 - 13407

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

14.071198

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.831393

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 10 - 13479

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

20.770231

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

72.982377

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 6 - 27989

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.962653

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-100.178529

Row 21

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 15 - 00484

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

26.05084

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-98.297895

Row 22

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 7 - 14278

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

52.907837

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

12.772491
[Add 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 2 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:
☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Johnson Controls' Procurement and Finance teams maintain a database of every Tier 1 supplier transaction to source goods and services. This data feeds a mapping tool which gives visibility into the flow of goods and services by commodity and supplier to every Johnson Controls manufacturing plant, engineering centre, field office, or other location. As most of our suppliers are unable to provide product-level emissions data or other specific characteristics today, this supplier mapping tool

serves as a reliable proxy for goods sourced upstream, and when combined with secondary emissions factors databases, enables the prioritization of suppliers for target engagement. Indeed, we have relied heavily on this supplier mapping tool as we set our own roadmaps to reduce the embodied carbon of our products and manage other climate risks across our value chain. Our supplier mapping tool has underscored the opportunity for JCI to manage its carbon footprint by focusing on the procurement of steel, given its high proportion of overall procurement activity and high emissions factors. Much of the steel we source is through the distribution channel, making steel manufacturers our secondary suppliers. Given the prioritization of steel as a decarbonization lever, we have focused specifically on engaging our secondary steel suppliers to seek visibility on the embodied carbon of our currently sourced steel and understand our current and future options to source lower-carbon alternatives. We have already learned that 80% of the steel we source in North America is manufactured using an Electronic Arc Furnace process, which can be 60-75% lower embodied carbon than traditional blast furnace steel. We anticipate that this initiative will drive significant reductions in our Scope 3, Category 1 emissions as we move toward reporting practices based on primary data, as well as bring us closer to our commitment to source 10% net zero steel per the First Mover's Coalition. In addition, we map our scope 3 upstream and downstream emissions including products in use.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ End-of-life management

(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

Select all that apply

☑ Recycling

☑ Waste to Energy

☑ Incineration

☑ Landfill

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

Our short-term horizon aligns with our internal financial and strategic planning horizon, as well as our near-term 2025 emissions, energy intensity, and water reduction targets; Our medium-term and long-term horizons were developed in alignment with our medium and long-term sustainability commitments, together with peer analysis. Our medium-term horizon is aligned with our science-based 2030 absolute scope 1,2 and 3 targets. Our long- term horizon is aligned with our 2040 scope 1 & 2 net zero commitment and 100% renewable electricity commitment in 2040.We utilize materiality assessments and climate and water-related risks and opportunities analysis to identify and assess our most material environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities. The result of this work was utilized to set short, medium and long term targets – establishing 2025 emissions and energy intensity targets and water reduction targets aligned with our short-term time horizon; 2030 science-based absolute scope 1, 2 and 3 targets approved by SBTi aligned with our medium-term time horizon; and a net zero commitment and 100% renewable electricity commitment in 2040 aligned with our long-term time horizon.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

4

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Our short-term horizon aligns with our internal financial and strategic planning horizon, as well as our near-term 2025 emissions, energy intensity, and water reduction targets; Our medium-term and long-term horizons were developed in alignment with our medium and long-term sustainability commitments, together with peer analysis. Our medium-term horizon is aligned with our science-based 2030 absolute scope 1,2 and 3 targets. Our long- term horizon is aligned with our 2040 scope 1 & 2 net zero commitment and 100% renewable electricity commitment in 2040.We utilize materiality assessments and climate and water-related risks and opportunities analysis to identify and assess our most material environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities. The result of this work was utilized to set short, medium and long term targets – establishing 2025 emissions and energy intensity targets and water reduction targets aligned with our short-term time horizon; 2030 science-based absolute scope 1, 2 and 3 targets approved by SBTi aligned with our medium-term time horizon; and a net zero commitment and 100% renewable electricity commitment in 2040 aligned with our long-term time horizon.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

11

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

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

Our short-term horizon aligns with our internal financial and strategic planning horizon, as well as our near-term 2025 emissions, energy intensity, and water reduction targets; Our medium-term and long-term horizons were developed in alignment with our medium and long-term sustainability commitments, together with peer analysis. Our medium-term horizon is aligned with our science-based 2030 absolute scope 1,2 and 3 targets. Our long- term horizon is aligned with our 2040 scope 1 & 2 net zero commitment and 100% renewable electricity commitment in 2040.We utilize materiality assessments and climate and water-related risks and opportunities analysis to identify and assess our most material environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities. The result of this work was utilized to set short, medium and long term targets – establishing 2025 emissions and energy intensity targets and water reduction targets aligned with our short-term time

horizon; 2030 science-based absolute scope 1, 2 and 3 targets approved by SBTi aligned with our medium-term time horizon; and a net zero commitment and 100% renewable electricity commitment in 2040 aligned with our long-term time horizon.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(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

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ EcoVadis

☑ WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards
☑ Regional government databases

Other

☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Desk-based research
☑ External consultants
☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Internal company methods
☑ Source Water Vulnerability Assessment
☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

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

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress
☑ Water stress
☑ Sea level rise
☑ Coastal erosion
☑ Change in land-use
☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Groundwater depletion
☑ Changing wind patterns
☑ Declining water quality
☑ Temperature variability
☑ Declining ecosystem services
☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies

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

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies
☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Changing customer behavior
☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

Reputation

☑ 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

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

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Moratoria and voluntary agreement

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Our double materiality assessment was guided by ESRS 1: General Requirements and EFRAG's IG 1: Materiality Assessment Implementation Guidance and was led by a third-party auditing firm to ensure accuracy and completeness. It focused on two dimensions: impact materiality and financial materiality. For a topic to meet the criteria of double materiality, it had to be material from either the impact or financial perspective, or both. Impact materiality considered the company's actual or potential positive or negative effects on people or the environment over different timeframes. Financial materiality related to risks or opportunities affecting our financial position, performance, cash flows, access to finance, or cost of capital. Our internal core team of ten (10) JCI representatives, including members from the ESG Leadership Committee, guided the double materiality assessment. Over fifty (50) Johnson Controls representatives across different functions participated in workshops to reach consensus on the scoring rubric for each Impact, Risk, and Opportunity (IRO) and validated the results. The core team managed each step, ensuring the involvement of relevant internal stakeholders and proxyholders throughout the assessment, alignment, and consensus phases.. The process involved the following steps: 1. Topic Identification: During the topic identification phase, an initial topic scan was done to consider entity- and industry-specific matters outlined by the ESRS 1 and a variety of other sources. These findings made up the initial longlist of topics, and after further refinement from the core team, resulted in the shortlist of potential material topics. 2. Identification of Impacts, Risks, and Opportunities (IROs): Impacts, risks and opportunities were researched for each shortlist topic. As potential IROs were identified they were refined and contextualized for our own operations and/or our value chain. Following IRO identification, the scoring methodology for topic IROs was set up. Two scoring rubrics and one illustrative example were drafted for impacts, risks and opportunities in alignment with our Enterprise Risk Management process. For impact materiality rubrics, descriptions of scale, scope and irremediability were adjusted by subject matter experts. 3. Assessment of IROs: Internal stakeholder engagement through workshops, surveys, or interviews assessed each topic's impacts, risks, and opportunities. The scoring results of this assessment were used to set a materially threshold. 4. Materiality Definition: The core team set a materiality threshold for both financial and impact materiality, designating these topics as highest priority for Johnson Controls. The materiality threshold was based on management judgment and

experience. 5. Consensus: Leadership reviewed assessment results, prioritizing material topics and discussing alignment with Johnson Controls ESG strategy. 6. Report: A materiality matrix visualized topics within scope for reporting.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

In 2024, we conducted a double materiality assessment which included the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities and was guided by ESRS 1: General Requirements and EFRAG's IG 1: Materiality Assessment Implementation Guidance.
[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
☑ Downstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

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

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

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

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

☑ Other location with substantive nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities, please specify **:**Land use, land use change, and forestry.

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We're engaged with the Taskforce on Nature-Related Financial Disclosure (TNFD), the nature counterpart to the Taskforce on Climate-Related Financial Disclosure (TCFD), and are proud to have helped guide the built environment pilot program as a partner and member. In addition, we're also engaged with the Science-Based Targets Network (SBTN) as we continue to create targets and strategies across nature-based topics. In line with this, we actively reduce our impact on nature through several initiatives. We use the Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare (LEAP) framework to align our strategy and look for new ways to reduce our impact on nature, while maximizing its beneficial impacts. To that end, we have identified dependencies and impacts that interface with nature and are aligned with five categories of nature; Climate Change, Pollution, Waste, Water, Biodiversity and Land Use Change. To further help address water risk and anticipated effects, we seek to reduce water use at our water-stressed facilities, and have achieved an 18.4% reduction since 2017. To identify priority sites, we conducted a detailed analysis of water stress with WRI Aqueduct tool. Water stress is defined as the ratio of water demand by human society to water availability (including renewable, surface or groundwater supplies). In the present-day, 28% of considered facilities have extremely high water stress, including facilities in Izmir, Turkey; Wuxi and Shanghai, China; Durango, Mexico; and Colorado and Texas, U.S. Water stress is projected to increase in the future across considered time horizons and scenarios due to changes in water supply and water demand. By 2050 under the high emissions SSP5-8.5 scenario, 42% of considered facilities are projected to have extremely high water stress. As an example of our water reduction strategy results, in Wuxi, China, at our facility which employs approximately 1,000 people, we've delivered significant water savings, estimated at 1200 cubic meters per year, by changing the way we interact with water. Every year, we complete new water-saving projects, including installing water meters in each workshop and the water-free testing of larger chillers, and recycling water from rain and steam condensate.

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Exclusively for purposes of this report, Johnson Controls defines a substantive impact when identifying or assessing climate-related risks based on a mix of qualitative and quantitative assessments in line with our ERM framework. These assessments include potential impact (assuming minimal risk management efforts) measured in terms of the following factors: people, environmental, reputation, regulatory/ legal, and financial (profit) as well as the likelihood of the impact. For example, a major risk is defined within the ERM framework as an event causing a quantitative decline in financial performance, such as a 5 – 10% decrease in sales or profit, together with the occurrence of other qualitative factors, such as a major impact on market position and the ability to meet the Company's near-term strategic objective. The

mix of these quantitative or qualitative factors may result in identifying a substantive impact at a lesser or greater quantitative threshold, depending on the nature of the impact and its overall probability. For example, based on our fiscal 2023 revenue, a substantive impact would represent 1.3B impact on revenues or a 90 million impact on our profit, subject to the probability of the event and other non-qualitative factors listed above. "Substantive" as used in this report is used within the context of the CDP reporting framework and is different than the definition in the context of filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission. An issue deemed substantive for purposes of this report may not be considered substantive or material for reporting purposes under U.S. federal securities laws, including in filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Exclusively for purposes of this report, Johnson Controls defines a substantive impact when identifying or assessing climate-related risks based on a mix of qualitative and quantitative assessments in line with our ERM framework. These assessments include potential impact (assuming minimal risk management efforts) measured in terms of the following factors: people, environmental, reputation, regulatory/ legal, and financial (profit) as well as the likelihood of the impact. For example, a major risk is defined within the ERM framework as an event causing a quantitative decline in financial performance, such as a 5 – 10% decrease in sales or profit, together with the occurrence of other qualitative factors, such as a major impact on market position and the ability to meet the Company's near-term strategic objectives. The mix of these quantitative or qualitative factors may result in identifying a substantive impact at a lesser or greater quantitative threshold, depending on the nature of the impact and its overall probability. For example, based on our fiscal 2023 revenue, a substantive impact would represent 1.3B impact on revenues or a 90 million impact on our profit, subject to the probability of the event and other non-qualitative factors listed above. "Substantive" as used in this report is used within the context of the CDP reporting framework and is different than the definition in the context of filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission. An issue deemed substantive for purposes of this report may not be considered substantive or material for reporting purposes under U.S. federal securities laws, including in filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.
[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

We review chemicals and potential water pollutants used in our operations that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health and ensure they are effectively managed. We undertake routine screenings of chemicals used in our products and sourced from upstream suppliers. These chemicals are compared against pollutant data managed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, including substances regulated by the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). The most relevant metrics we use to track pollutant impact of our products are chemical volume and content percentage.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other synthetic organic compounds

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

At Johnson Controls, we focus on continuous improvements in our product performance to help us make significant strides in reducing our potential impacts and maintaining or improving energy efficiency, safety, and operational features. For example, we provide customers access to multiple types of water saving technologies, including water mist fire suppression equipment to replace legacy systems, water-efficient chillers, and infrastructure teams responsible for installing water efficient faucets, toilets, and other plumbing. In addition, across our HVACR portfolio, we now offer low and ultra-low GWP refrigerants. In 2023, 90 percent of new product research and development was invested in climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services. Innovations include reduction of emissions across Scope 1, 2 and 3, reduction of material usage, and improved life cycle management. We also discontinued the production and sale of Aqueous Film-Forming Foam (AFFF) as of June, 2024. Our HVACR products minimize refrigerant leakage to the atmosphere by design; refrigerant circuits are factory-sealed and installation is performed by trained, licensed technicians. It is fleetingly rare for refrigerant used in HVACR products to enter water bodies. In the event where refrigerant releases to the atmosphere, there is a chance that secondary degradant products precipitate into water sources. However, controls are in place to ensure the recovery and hermetic use of these fluids.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Resource recovery

☑ Procedure(s) under development/ R&D

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods
☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances
☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use
☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements
☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response
☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

We are proactive in our approach as we work to achieve our Zero Harm Vision. As just one example, at a major manufacturing facility in Matamoros, we established a water treatment plant to serve the full industrial park and ensure clean water for all. Under our Zero Harm Vision, we believe that all incidents to our workforce and adverse impact from the environment are preventable and share these priorities with all employees to ensure we embed a Zero Harm culture across the organization. Johnson Controls obtains and maintains wastewater and other water-related permits in accordance with local, state, and Federal law. It also ensures compliance with those permits by, among other things, reviewing its effluent in accordance with all local and federal regulations and ensuring any waste materials are properly handled and disposed. Additionally, we focus on transitioning to cleaner chemicals specific to our industry such as refrigerants. Across our HVACR portfolio, we now offer low and ultra-low GWP refrigerants. We provide comprehensive training to our direct operations and downstream partners for the proper and safe handling of chemicals. Our procedures include reducing leaks, promoting proper reclamation, and measuring and evaluating our chemical management with regular volume reporting.
[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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, only within our direct operations

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

Select from:

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

(3.1.3) Please explain

We conduct materiality assessments to understand the most impactful environmental, social and governance (ESG) topics for our business and to ensure we're building robust strategies to manage our strategic impacts, risks and opportunities. In 2023, we surveyed over 100 internal Johnson Controls leaders and 50 external stakeholders, including customers, suppliers, partners, NGOs and trade associations. The results of the ESG materiality assessment did not identify water as a material topic but did identify nine highest priority topics, which we then aligned under three material topics: sustainable products and solutions, greenhouse gas emissions, and social impact and employee experience. In 2024, we updated our materiality assessment and conducted a double materiality assessment guided by ESRS 1: General Requirements and EFRAG's IG 1: Materiality Assessment Implementation Guidance. This process was led by a third-party auditing firm in order to

ensure accuracy and completeness and involved a cross-functional team of stakeholders from across the business. This assessment did not find water to be a material risk to our company. However, we monitor our operations for water stress, include water within our climate -scenario analysis, and have established goals targeted to water-stressed sites.

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

We conduct materiality assessments to understand the most impactful environmental, social and governance (ESG) topics for our business and to ensure we're building robust strategies to manage our strategic impacts, risks and opportunities. In 2023, we surveyed over 100 internal Johnson Controls leaders and 50 external stakeholders, including customers, suppliers, partners, NGOs and trade associations. The results of the ESG materiality assessment did not identify plastics as a material topic but did identify nine highest priority topics, which we then aligned under three material topics: sustainable products and solutions, greenhouse gas emissions, and social impact and employee experience. In 2024, we updated our materiality assessment and conducted a double materiality assessment guided by ESRS 1: General Requirements and EFRAG's IG 1: Materiality Assessment Implementation Guidance. This assessment did not find plastics to be a material risk to our company. This process was led by a third-party auditing firm in order to ensure accuracy and completeness and involved a cross-functional team of stakeholders from across the business.
[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

☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Malta
☑ Latvia
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Estonia
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Spain
☑ Canada
☑ Cyprus
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Romania
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia

☑ Ireland
☑ Australia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Singapore
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Netherlands
☑ Slovenia
☑ New Zealand
☑ Switzerland
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Johnson Controls operates within a dynamic regulatory environment marked by increasingly stringent climate-related regulations. These regulations vary across different jurisdictions, necessitating continuous adaptation of products and services to comply with new standards. This evolving landscape presents financial, operational, and strategic risks, including product obsolescence driven by evolving regulatory standards, heightened regulatory reporting costs, increased procurement and manufacturing costs, the redesign of existing products or development of new products and potential delays or disruptions to production and expansion plans. To address these challenges, we invested roughly 90% of new product R&D in climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services in 2022 and 2023, including low GWP refrigerant alternatives, as well as upgrade manufacturing processes and test product compatibility. While JCI continuously innovates to enhance product efficiency through technological innovation and the use of the lowest GWP refrigerants feasible, there remains potential for further investment. Continued innovation in this area will be crucial to ensuring compatibility with existing products, maintaining regulatory compliance and effectively competing in the market.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:
☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term

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

Select from:
☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(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

In recent years, refrigerant regulations have focused on limiting their Global Warming Potential (GWP). Global targets for limiting the use of high GWP hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), a refrigerant in our HVAC portfolio today, were set in the 2015 Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol. National and subnational governments are establishing refrigerant regulations in response to the Kigali Amendment. In 2025, we expect that all new HVACR equipment sold in developed economies (North America, Europe, and mature Asian countries) will need to use low GWP refrigerants. Some of these governments are considering regulations in anticipation of a transition to ultra-low GWP refrigerants. Developing economies are provided more time to phase out the use of HFCs: under the Kigali Amendment phase down schedule, significant reductions in HFC consumption are not required until at least 2035. Many of our products consume energy and use refrigerants. Regulations which seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions present a risk to our global products business, predominantly our HVAC business, if we do not adequately prepare our product portfolio. Over the last decade, we accelerated research and development - 90% of which is attributable to sustainable solutions - and other capital expenditures to improve and enhance our product portfolio to meet new regulations and standards. Further, our customers and the markets we serve may impose emissions or other environmental standards through regulation, market-based emissions policies or consumer preference that we may not be able to timely meet due to the required level of capital investment or technological advancement. While we are committed to continuous improvements across our product portfolio to meet and exceed anticipated regulations and preferences, there is no assurance that we will be fully successful in every product, every segment, and in every region, and that our products will be accepted by the market, that proposed regulation or deregulation will not have a negative competitive impact, or that economic returns will reflect our investments in new product development. If we are unable to effectively adapt our products or services to meet evolving regulations and gain market acceptance, this could reduce our revenues, increase our operating costs or otherwise materially and adversely affect our business, financial condition, results of operations, and cash flows.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

4000000000

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

8000000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This financial impact is intended to provide an estimate of revenue at risk should we fail to update our product portfolio under a range of scenarios for emerging refrigerant regulations. It is calculated based on the potential annual impact to revenues at the end of the risk's time horizon (2027). The minimum impact figure (4 billion) assumes that governments in developed economies continue their regulatory approach to require low GWP refrigerants in HVAC equipment in 2025, which we view as a near certainty. The figure represents revenue from products sold in these markets which today use high GWP refrigerants. The maximum impact (8 billion) assumes all developed and developing economies accelerate the transition away from HFCs significantly faster than the targets established in the Kigali Amendment, establishing in the short-term regulations that achieve HFC reductions not required until 2036 and 2047 for developing and developed economies respectively. While some transitions may occur before the phase down targets in Kigali, we view this most aggressive pace as highly unlikely outside of niche products in specific markets. The figure provided represents the bulk of our HVACR product revenue globally that uses HFC and HFC-blend refrigerants today. While the potential financial effects of refrigerant regulations are large, JCI has advocated for and anticipated the required limits in GWP for our products. As a result, the short-term anticipated effect on our financial performance and cash flows, taking into account the effort and investment to improve our portfolio, is highly unlikely to be realized. Over the past decade, JCI has focused on updates to product performance that incorporate low and ultra-low GWP refrigerants while maintaining or improving energy efficiency, safety, and operational features. As these regulations begin to take effect in 2025, our product portfolio is fully up to date to comply with GWP limits. Our approach to low GWP refrigerant regulations exemplifies JCI's strategy to address climate regulations more broadly. From early stakeholder engagement through product innovation and launch, GHG emissions reductions – cemented market-wide by climate policy – informs our long-range plans in every market. Non-compliance and market exits are simply not considered. However, we will continue to face risks related to increasing product standards, requiring further investment and development of our products in the medium and long term.

(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

150000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Represents an approximated, illustrative figure of the cost for one product line to comply with the 2024-2025 refrigerant transition. The cost to prepare our portfolio is spread over roughly 5 years, and includes: • Engagement with refrigerant suppliers to assess available low GWP refrigerants for a given application, including changes to product performance, safety, and cost; • Product redesign and development, including new product innovation and engineering, updates to our manufacturing and production process; • Revisions as needed to our supplier procurement strategy to ensure adequate supply of the new refrigerants and product components.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Over the past decade, JCI has focused on updates to product performance that incorporate low and ultra-low GWP refrigerants while maintaining or improving energy efficiency, safety, and operational features. Throughout our HVACR portfolio, a wide array of low-emission products exist today and will continue to expand as we adapt to new regulations. As a result, we believe this risk is well-controlled. One important example of this strategy in action is the launch of the YORK YZ chiller, which uses a refrigerant with over a 99% reduction in GWP - effectively future-proofing the chiller from future refrigerant regulations – while also delivering an improvement in energy efficiency performance of 30% when compared to similar centrifugal chillers. The YZ chiller is a direct response to both anticipated regulation and customer demand for cooling solutions with the lowest possible carbon footprint, but our innovation in low GWP refrigerants has not stopped there. In 2024, we launched a refreshed platform for our residential and light commercial heating and cooling portfolio using refrigerants with a GWP of 466. In addition to this launch occurring before the regulatory requirement, the refrigerant GWP is 33% lower than required by regulation and 78% lower than the legacy refrigerant, all while maintaining or improving energy efficiency. JCI anticipates not only maintaining its revenue levels during the refrigerant transition, but also achieving a net increase in revenue, driven by the growing demand for lower carbon solutions.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Other acute physical risk, please specify **:**This risk describes the acute and chronic physical impact to our operations of water-related physical risks.

(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

☑ Italy

☑ Canada

☑ Mexico

☑ Turkey

☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Germany
☑ Republic of Korea

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Bravo
☑ Rhine
☑ Danube
☑ Gudena
☑ Elbe River
☑ Trinity River (Texas)
☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)
☑ Other, please specify **:Sabarmati**
☑ Rio Grande
☑ St. Lawrence
☑ Mississippi River
☑ San Antonio River
☑ Susquehanna River

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Johnson Controls did not identify water as a material topic or risk during its risk assessment, the company is voluntarily providing information on water risk based on the assessment's findings and the company's commitment to reduce water use at water-stressed sites. In addition to acute risks in water-stressed locations, chronic water risks from climate change could impact our operations, workforce, and supply chain and cash flows through changes in the frequency, intensity, and duration of water risks such as drought or floods. Water risk is projected to increase across the portfolio of JCI facilities, particularly in the medium- and long-term time horizons under SSP5-8.5, a high-emission scenario characterized by heavy reliance on fossil fuels. Greater water stress in regions near JCI facilities can lead to operational disruptions, increased costs, and heightened regulatory and reputational risks. To identify priority sites, we conducted a detailed analysis of water stress with World Resources Institute (WRI) Aqueduct 3.0 tool. Water stress is defined as the ratio of water demand by human society to water availability (including renewable, surface or groundwater supplies).

(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

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Water risk is projected to increase across the portfolio of JCI facilities, particularly in the medium- and long-term time horizons under SSP5-8.5, a high-emission scenario characterized by heavy reliance on fossil fuels. Unlike our approach of reviewing current water-stressed locations, this future-looking scenario analysis determined that potentially 28% of considered facilities would have extremely-high water stress, including facilities in Izmir, Turkey; Wuxi and Shanghai, China; Durango, Mexico; Aurora, CO and Lubbock,TX. This is an increased risk compared to our current analysis identifying 22% of facilities in water-stressed locations. Water stress is projected to increase across considered time horizons and scenarios due to changes in water supply and water demand. By 2050 under the high emissions SSP5-8.5 scenario, 42% of considered facilities are projected to have extremely high water stress. Greater water stress in regions near JCI facilities can lead to operational disruptions, increased costs, and heightened regulatory and reputational risks. In addition to acute risks in water-stressed locations, chronic water risks from climate changes could impact our operations, workforce, and supply chain and cash flows through changes in the frequency, intensity, and duration of water risks such as drought or floods. Flood exposure is a criteria assessed when evaluating sites for a new material facility and is monitored for current facilities.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

80000

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

3000000

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

80000

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

3000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on our analysis, we assessed the facilities identified as having the highest exposure to water risk. We calculated the potential financial exposure for each high risk location. Our minimum financial estimate is based on the 80,000 cost associated with retrofitting a facility to respond to water scarcity by implementing water conservation measures such as recycling and reuse., The financial impact is calculated based on the cost that would be incurred within a single fiscal year, assuming that only one facility would be affected during that period due to the overall low probability of such an event. Maximum financial impact is calculated from a water stress-based risk analysis where we reviewed specific OPEX costs related to water stressed locations that could be subject to acute drought risk in these regions and the cost associated with sourcing water to fulfill facility needs.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

3000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

We examined the facilities identified as having the greatest risk of exposure to water risk and calculated the potential financial exposure as approximately 3M. These amounts represent OPEX costs related to water stressed locations that could be subject to acute drought risk in these regions and the cost associated with sourcing water to fulfill facility needs and implement water efficiency, water reuse, and recycling and conservation practices.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

In 2024, we conducted a physical climate risk assessment and climate scenario analysis, focusing on water and other risks, to evaluate the current and future exposure of key facilities and supplier locations. The assessment utilized historical data and future projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 6 (CMIP6) global climate models, which are featured in the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, focusing on three scenarios: SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5. CMIP6 data is downscaled and bias corrected to enhance its suitability for climate risk assessment purposes. Our analysis included 30 JCI-owned or operated facilities and 10 supplier locations. JCI-owned/operated facilities were selected based on their Total Insurable Value and serve various purposes, including manufacturing, office, warehouse/depot, central utility plant, and security monitoring center. Supplier locations were chosen based on their importance to our two largest TIV facilities. We assessed a subset of physical hazards based on facility geography, stakeholder interviews, and historical impacts. The water risks evaluated included acute water-related risks (extreme precipitation and flood) and chronic risk (precipitation). Our physical risk assessment revealed that extreme precipitation poses one of the greatest potential risks across JCI facilities and supplier locations in the present-day. Water-related risks could lead to operational disruptions, increased maintenance costs, and potential safety hazards for our workforce. In the present-day, extreme precipitation risk is highest at JCI facilities in Florida, US; Texas, US; China; and Mexico. We have targeted water reduction efforts in our operations and products and services, especially focused on water stressed locations. Our water strategy results include a reduction of water use at water-stressed locations by 18.4% since 2017.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Other acute physical risk, please specify **:**This risk describes the acute and chronic physical impact to our operations of climate-related physical risks.

(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
☑ Italy
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Mexico
☑ Germany
☑ Republic of Korea

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Johnson Controls acknowledges that climate change could impact our operations, workforce, and supply chain through changes in the frequency, intensity, and duration of physical climate risks. The increasing severity and frequency of extreme weather events may lead to damage to our physical plants and other assets, create the need for new transportation routes, and impact our suppliers and customers, resulting in production delays, temporary reduction of our production capacity, and loss of revenue, among other impacts. For example, our manufacturing sites near coastal areas in APAC, EMEA, LATAM and the USA could be impacted by weather events like hurricanes. Impacts could include physical damage to our plants, local infrastructure, the degradation of our ability to ship finished goods or the inability of our customers to accept products. We track events and enact our crisis management program for potentially impacted sites during extreme weather events. We are in close contact with site management to ensure they are conducting pre-storm assessments, shutdown protocols and post-storm damage assessments to determine if business continuity plans need to be enacted to ensure continued operation for our customers. Climate science suggests a greater frequency of flooding and, as a result, flood exposure is a criteria assessed when evaluating sites for a new material facility and is monitored for current facilities.

(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

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

Select from:
☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Physical climate risk is projected to increase across the portfolio of JCI facilities, particularly in the medium- and long-term time horizons under SSP5-8.5, a high-emission scenario characterized by heavy reliance on fossil fuels. Currently, the 30 JCI-operated facilities face, on average, 18.1 days per year of extreme heat; under SSP5-8.5, facilities are projected to face 39 extreme heat days per year in the long-term time horizon. This would result in increased operational challenges, higher cooling costs, and potential disruptions to productivity and employee well-being. To mitigate the anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position and performance of the organization, we have a team dedicated to operational risk management, and specific processes in place to mitigate risk. Actions include expanding dual capability or creating extra inventory. Each facility has an emergency response plan to keep our employees and visitors safe as well as a business continuity plan to sustain business operations for each site that outlines site-specific potential courses of actions to ensure business continuity for our customers.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2000000

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

738000000

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

2000000

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

738000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on our analysis, we assessed the facilities identified as having the highest risk of exposure to adverse physical climate events. We calculated the potential financial exposure for each location at the greatest risk of exposure. The facility with the highest estimated replacement cost is valued at 738 million, while the facility with the lowest estimated replacement cost is valued at 2 million. These figures represent the estimated costs to replace the identified facilities if they were destroyed by an acute physical impact, excluding any potential insurance or other recoveries to offset the loss. The financial impact is calculated based on the costs that would be incurred within a single fiscal year, assuming that only one facility would be affected during that period due to the overall low probability of such an event. These costs represented in the financial impact would include labor, machinery, and building materials to construct a new plant and make the building operational along with the loss of business income during the rebuilding period and additional expense to ship materials from manufacturing locations in other areas. All company facilities are insured for physical and business interruption losses, so these figures represent the unmitigated risk.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Amend the Business Continuity Plan

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

2000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

At Johnson Controls, we have a team dedicated to operational risk management, and this data is in line with, and confirms our overall operational risk management approach which effectively mitigates these and other physical risks. We examined the facilities identified as having the greatest risk of exposure to an adverse physical climate event and calculated the potential financial exposure for locations at the greatest risk of exposure. The facility with the highest estimated replacement cost is valued at 738 million, while the facility with the lowest estimated replacement cost is valued at 2 million. These figures represent the estimated costs to replace the identified facilities if they were destroyed by an acute physical impact, excluding any potential insurance or other recoveries to offset the loss. These costs represented in the financial impact include labor, machinery, and building materials.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

In 2024, we conducted a physical climate risk assessment, including scenario analysis, to evaluate the current and future exposure of key facilities and supplier locations to these risks. The assessment utilized historical data and future projections from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 6 (CMIP6) global climate models, which are featured in the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, focusing on three scenarios: SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5. CMIP6 data is downscaled and bias corrected to enhance its suitability for climate risk assessment purposes. Our analysis included 30 JCI-owned or operated facilities and 10 supplier locations. JCI-owned/operated facilities were selected based on their Total Insurable Value and serve various purposes, including manufacturing, office, warehouse/depot, central utility plant, and security monitoring center. Supplier locations were chosen based on their importance to our two largest TIV facilities. We assessed a subset of physical hazards based on facility geography, stakeholder interviews, and historical impacts. The physical climate risks evaluated included five acute risks (extreme heat, extreme precipitation, flood, extreme wind, and severe convective storms) and two chronic risks (annual average temperature and precipitation). Our physical

risk assessment revealed that extreme heat, extreme precipitation, and severe convective storms pose the greatest potential risks across JCI facilities and supplier locations in the present-day. These risks could lead to operational disruptions, increased maintenance costs, and potential safety hazards for our workforce. Across considered hazards, physical climate risk is greatest at JCI facilities including those in Florida, U.S.; Reynosa, Mexico; and Wuxi, China.
[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)

6000000000

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

Select from:
☑ 21-30%

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

738000000

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The 6 billion represents the mid point between the minimum and maximum anticipated financial effect of risk 1 described in 3.1.1, risk of changes to regulation of existing products and services. The 738 million represents the location with the highest cost of replacement as described in 3.1.1 risk 2, acute and chronic physical impact to our operations.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

3000000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

3000000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The 3M USD represents OPEX associated with water withdrawals and sewage at JCI's facilities potentially subject to physical and transition risk identified by our risk assessment process described above.
[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

Italy
☑ Other, please specify **:**Tronto

(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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Kizilirmak

(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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

☑ Elbe 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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Thailand

☑ Other, please specify :Sa Keo

(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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Tapti 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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify **:**Sabarmati

(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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☑ Negro (Uruguay)

(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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Atlantic Gulf Coast

(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:

☑ 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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Republic of Korea

☑ Other, please specify **:**Taehwa

(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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 10

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

(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

9

(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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.

Row 12

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Santa Ana

(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:

☑ 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

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.
[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	*Johnson Controls was not subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply
☑ EU ETS

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

EU ETS

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

1

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

09/30/2022

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

09/29/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

0

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

1953

(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

FL Aviation participates in the EU ETS program and we charter our company plane from them. The numbers given are for FY23 per 1.4
[Fixed row]

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

Johnson Controls utilizes an implicit price on carbon as a reference point for energy efficiency and emissions reduction projects. The implicit price is calculated using the total annual investment divided by the annual MT of CO2e abated. The price is used as input to prioritize projects; however, it is not the only criteria used to guide our decision to invest in energy or emissions reduction projects. In 2023, Johnson Controls invested in several projects with an implicit price greater than 50 MT CO2e. We include the S&P Global Carbon Credit Index1 in our internal carbon price assessment as a point of reference, since it reflects real-world, market-based carbon pricing. Carbon credit futures are utilized to access carbon credit markets due to their liquidity and accessibility to investors. The eligible carbon credit futures for the index are selected based on the most liquid segments of the relevant markets. It provides a benchmark for comparison, insights into carbon market volatility and capturing market expectations of future carbon prices. Since its publication in June 2023, the average weighted carbon price was 52 MT CO2e for 2023.

(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
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Shift in consumer preferences

(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
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Malta
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Canada
☑ Cyprus
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Latvia
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Finland
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Australia

☑ Bulgaria
☑ Singapore
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Lithuania
☑ Switzerland
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We operate in a market where regulatory and business strategies are driving a shift toward energy-efficient, low-carbon technologies to decarbonize the built environment. For customers, regulations on building efficiency, and cost and emissions savings from energy-efficient technologies, are the primary drivers. This trend may present a significant financial opportunity, as the increasing demand for low-emissions, energy-efficient technology aligns with our product portfolio, boosting long-term revenue. Strategically, this opportunity requires continued short-term investments in low carbon technologies to realize these long-term benefits. JCI is well-positioned to capitalize on the growing demand for low-carbon technology and can leverage the extensive set of incentives for emissions-reducing technology to offset short-term costs. JCI performed a climate scenario analysis to understand how this opportunity may evolve under a subset of scenarios and future time horizons. Under aggressive action to mitigate climate change (SSP1-1.9), JCI could see increased product development opportunities due to heightened regulation and consumer focus on sustainability. Moderate action (SSP2-4.5) might slow returns due to some customer reluctance to adopt sustainable products. Insufficient action (SSP5-8.5) still allows JCI to progress current initiatives towards helping customers achieve their climate-related goals, but customers may have less focus on addressing expected regulations.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term
☑ Medium-term
☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(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 growing demand for emissions reduction technologies is poised to enhance our financial position, financial performance and cash flows. As regulatory frameworks become more stringent and global awareness of climate change intensifies, the market for sustainable solutions is expected to expand rapidly, increasing demand for our products, services and solutions. For example, the International Energy Agency estimates that heat pumps account for 10% of global heating demand today; this figure needs to reach 20% by 2030 and sales must expand 15% year over year thereafter to reach net zero emissions by 2050. This trend will lead to increased sales and revenue for Johnson Controls, as our advanced portfolio of sustainable products and services – including the world's broadest portfolio of heat pumps – aligns with these evolving market needs. By capitalizing on this demand, we can secure a larger market share and drive long-term financial growth. Moreover, the adoption of emissions reduction technologies often results in cost savings for our customers, further incentivizing them to invest in our solutions. For example, we offer best-in-class magnetic bearing chillers like the purpose-built for datacenters YVAM and the water-cooled YMC2, plus our digital optimization technology in our OpenBlue Suite, drive cooling solutions for our customers at the lowest possible operating costs and Scope 2 emissions. As businesses and governments prioritize sustainability, they will increasingly seek out partners who can provide reliable, efficient, and innovative technologies. Johnson Controls' commitment to sustainability positions us as a preferred choice, fostering customer loyalty and repeat business. This, in turn, will contribute to a robust and stable revenue stream, enhancing our financial resilience and enabling us to invest in further innovation and expansion. This, coupled with long-term forecasts for technology adoption, creates a financial opportunity that Johnson Controls is well-positioned to take advantage of.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

14000000000

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

14750000000

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

14750000000

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

15500000000

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

15500000000

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

21000000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The financial impact is intended to provide an estimate of Johnson Controls revenue growth opportunities under a range of scenarios for increased demand for decarbonization solutions. The financial impact is calculated based on revenues from the sale of products, services, and solutions aimed at reducing our customer's carbon footprint and boosting building sustainability, which was approximately 14B in the reporting year. Products such as high efficiency HVAC equipment, digital solutions, and decarbonization as-a-service fall into this category. To estimate short-term, medium-term, and long-term financial impacts, we apply incremental changes synthesized from Johnson Controls analysis and other external reports. Short-term impacts apply a conservative 0% change as a minimum and 5% as a maximum, as most near-term growth analyses fall within this range. As we assume continued year over year growth in sustainable revenues through 2035, the mid-term impact assumes a 5% increase in sustainable revenues as a minimum and 10% as a maximum. Long-term estimates use a 10% increase as a minimum and 50% as a maximum boundary, reflecting significant upside for decarbonization solutions in 2035 and beyond. Likewise, we expect the market for digital, connected, smart building systems to grow rapidly to drive operational efficiencies and emissions reductions for our customers. Even if the market shifts toward low-emissions solutions were not to materialize, global policy changes are a near certainty, which will at a minimum create opportunities for low-emission solutions.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

250000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

To capture the opportunity associated with the market transition to low emission products, we are investing in solutions to reduce our customer's emissions while enhancing their operational objectives. Key features of our investments include improving product performance and solutions that help our customers shift heating

loads from fossil fuel combustion to heat pumps, and digital, connected solutions that enable load optimization and increased utilization of low-carbon electricity sources. The 250M represents the average of 84% of the last three years of R&D expenditures as reported in our 10-K. The cost to realize the opportunity above represents our anticipated annual spend in climate related innovation as we do not report R&D costs by specific products or services in our financials. This excludes the cost of any inorganic investment, which we are unable to predict in amount or certainty.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Johnson Controls has strategically positioned itself to capitalize on the growing demand for sustainable solutions by helping customers reduce their carbon footprint, including commercial space heating. Recognizing the significant environmental impact of traditional heating systems, the company identified a unique opportunity to transform the market. In 2022, we introduced an innovative portfolio of air-to-water and water-to-water heat pumps in North America, which offer water temperatures up to 176F, hotter than previously available for the commercial heat pump market. These advanced heat pumps provide our customers with a viable alternative to fossil fuel-based heating systems, while also meeting hot water temperature requirements in existing commercial applications. The decision to launch these heat pumps was based on extensive market research and a deep understanding of customer needs. Johnson Controls recognized that to replace a boiler, many commercial buildings require heating solutions capable of delivering higher water temperatures for various applications for space heating. By developing heat pumps that can achieve these higher temperatures, the company has addressed a critical gap in the market, offering a solution that is both energy efficient and is free of fuel combustion. In just the last five years, sales of Johnson Controls Applied heat pumps have increased roughly approximately 67%. The shift to heat pumps sets the stage for deploying digital optimization technologies such as OpenBlue Connected Chillers and Central Utility Plant, to further enhance performance, another strategic growth vector for Johnson Controls. These advanced heat pumps also position the company as a leader in the sustainable heating and cooling market, attracting new business opportunities that prioritize emissions reductions. The integration of our OpenBlue suite further strengthens our position by providing customers with advanced tools optimize these systems, maximizing both emissions reductions and utility savings. These technology advancements underscore Johnson Controls' strategy to drive demand for sustainable buildings, realize increasingly larger revenue streams, and deliver on its commitment to decarbonization.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Reduced impact of product use on water resources

(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

☑ Germany

☑ Spain

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

☑ Ebro

☑ Elbe River

☑ Thames

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Johson Controls did not identify water as a material topic or opportunity during its risks and opportunities assessment, but is voluntarily including information on water opportunities based on the results of its assessment. We provide customers access to multiple types of water saving technologies, including water mist fire suppression equipment to replace legacy systems, water-efficient chillers, and infrastructure teams responsible for installing water efficient faucets, toilets, and other plumbing.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:
☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium-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

Johnson Controls realizes revenue from water conservation projects, estimated at 35 - 37M USD in FY23. These projects provide cost savings and resiliency for customers and deliver recurring revenue for Johnson Controls, improving our results of operations and cashflows. We expect water conservation revenue to continue to increase in the future, improving our financial position, performance, and cashflow. On a year-over-year basis, we expect single digit water conservation revenue growth in the 4-7% range.

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

35000000

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

40000000

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

40000000

(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)

50000000

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

100000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

These short, medium, and long-term estimates reflect 1, 5, and 10 year time horizon revenue estimates based on historical data and trends and assumes water conservation revenue growth of approximately 5% on a year-over-year basis.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

29000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

We track water conservation revenue, project data, and customer savings in a centralized database. These costs are estimated based on aggregated project margin and applied against total water conservation revenue.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We position water conservation as a customer cost and resource savings pathway via our Sustainable Infrastructure team. We expect to continue delivering water conservation projects through existing contracts and expand project opportunities through sales outreach.
[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)

14750000000

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

Select from:

☑ 51-60%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

This revenue estimate is aligned to the opportunity described in 3.6.1, shift in consumer preferences.

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)

37000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

This revenue estimate represents water conservation that JCI realizes each year. Water conservation revenue reflects a wide variety of projects implemented by Johnson Controls and is tracked in a central database.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*In conducting our double materiality assessment, this topic was considered and determined to be not a material issue to our organization.*

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Governance and Sustainability Committee of the board is apprised at least quarterly of sustainability and environmental performance by our Chief Sustainability Officer. The full Board also reviews matters related to the Company's sustainability strategy at least annually, including the adaptation of the Company's products and services to deliver decarbonization solutions and the Company's internal sustainability efforts. The Company also facilitates training for the Board on climate related topics though the use of outside experts providing tailored programming for Board members and encouraging participation in third party director education programs as part of the Company's Board education policy. The Governance and Sustainability Committee meets quarterly and reviews the Company's overall sustainability strategy, metrics, targets, goals and progress, as well as the development of new sustainability-based targets. The Governance and Sustainability Committee regularly receives updates on key climate-related areas of focus, including the Company's sustainability strategy, key sustainability initiatives, emerging climate-related regulations and the Company's climate-related reporting. For example, management reviewed and discussed with the Governance and Sustainability Committee the Company's net zero carbon transition initiatives, the Company's efforts to develop and implement a supplier sustainability framework, the Company's sustainability organizational structure, the execution of the Company's sustainable finance offerings and initiatives focused on water reduction. During these discussions, the members of the Governance and Sustainability Committee provided oversight, guidance and feedback on these issues. The Audit Committee provides oversight of the Company's initiatives to further enhance the quality, controls and accuracy of our emissions reporting, including testing and evaluation efforts led by the Company's internal audit function and initiatives to enhance the Company's data collection and internal controls for emissions reporting. The

Compensation and Talent Development Committee has implemented additional accountability for climate-related issues by integrating environmental, social and governance factors, including climate-related issues, into the annual goals of our executive team. These goals are included as part of the individual performance modifier of 10/-25 percent used to adjust executive compensation. Our CEO regularly reports on progress toward these goals to our board of directors and these goals are reviewed and considered by the Compensation and Talent Development Committee when applying the individual modifier to the compensation of our executives. Senior leaders are directed to cascade these goals. More than 21,000 employees have sustainability embedded in their annual performance goals.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Johnson Controls did not identify water as a material topic or opportunity during its risks and opportunities assessment, but is voluntarily including information on water opportunities based on the results of its assessment. The Governance and Sustainability Committee of the board is apprised at least quarterly of sustainability and environmental performance by our Chief Sustainability Officer. The full Board also reviews matters related to the Company's sustainability strategy at least annually, including the adaptation of the Company's products and services to deliver decarbonization solutions and the Company's internal sustainability efforts. The Governance and Sustainability Committee meets quarterly and reviews the Company's overall sustainability strategy, metrics, targets, goals and progress, as well as the development of new sustainability-based targets. The Governance and Sustainability Committee regularly receives updates on key climate-related areas of focus, including the Company's sustainability strategy, key sustainability initiatives, emerging climate-related regulations and the Company's climate-related reporting. For example, management reviewed and discussed with the Governance and Sustainability Committee the Company's net zero carbon transition initiatives, the Company's efforts to develop and implement a supplier sustainability framework, the Company's sustainability organizational structure, the execution of the Company's sustainable finance offerings and initiatives focused on water reduction. During these discussions, the members of the Governance and Sustainability Committee provided oversight, guidance and feedback on these issues. The Audit Committee provides oversight of the Company's initiatives to further enhance the quality, controls and accuracy of our emissions reporting, including testing and evaluation efforts led by the Company's internal audit function and initiatives to enhance the Company's data collection and internal controls for emissions reporting. The Compensation and Talent Development Committee has implemented additional accountability for climate-related issues by integrating environmental, social and governance factors, including climate-related issues, into the annual goals of our executive team. These goals are included as part of the individual performance modifier of 10/-25 percent used to adjust executive compensation. Our CEO regularly reports on progress toward these goals to our board of directors and these goals are reviewed and considered by the Compensation and Talent Development Committee when applying the individual modifier to the compensation of our executives. Senior leaders are directed to cascade these goals. More than 21,000 employees have sustainability embedded in their annual performance goals.
[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

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

☑ Experience in an academic role focused on environmental issues

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

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

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

☑ Experience in an academic role focused on environmental issues

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

In 2024, we conducted a double materiality assessment guided by ESRS 1: General Requirements and EFRAG's IG 1: Materiality Assessment Implementation Guidance led by a third-party auditing firm to ensure accuracy and completeness. This assessment, which was validated by over 50 internal stakeholders and proxyholders, and that focused on impact and financial materiality, concluded that biodiversity is a non-material topic for our company.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ 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

(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

Johnson Controls vice president and chief sustainability and external relations officer (CSO) reports to the Chairman and CEO of Johnson Controls. The CSO provides regular updates to the Board Governance and Sustainability Committee. This role is responsible for driving the company's top-tier sustainability performance including CDP Climate Change A List 2023. The Executive Committee, including the CSO, reviews, approves and monitors our sustainability goals. Our Executive Committee - as well as more than 21,000 of our colleagues - have sustainability and diversity goals embedded into their performance goals. The CSO oversees the development and implementation of Johnson Controls climate transition plan, including sustainability governance oversight, assessing climate-related risks and opportunities utilizing scenario analyses, climate-related target setting and achievement, value chain engagement and low carbon initiatives, and climate policy engagement. Our CSO, Katie McGinty, has over 25 years of public and private sector experience and is a recognized innovator in clean energy and environmental protection. She serves on the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Steering Committee, was named as an inaugural board member of the Foundation for Energy Security and Innovation, and was named to the 2023 Constellation Research ESG50 which lists the most influential global executives who are advancing sustainability in their fields through new business models, emerging technologies and ethical, humane leadership. The ESG Leadership Committee is chaired by our Vice President of Global Sustainability and Regulatory Affairs, and reports to the Chief Sustainability Officer. The ESG Leadership Committee is charged with ensuring we are leaders across all measures of sustainability. All sustainability topics and associated targets, metrics and strategies fall into one of the ESG strategy workstreams.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

(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

Johnson Controls vice president and chief sustainability and external relations officer (CSO) reports to the Chairman and CEO of Johnson Controls. The CSO provides regular updates to the Board Governance and Sustainability Committee. This role is responsible for driving the company's top-tier sustainability performance

including CDP Climate Change A List 2023. The Executive Committee, including the CSO, reviews, approves and monitors our sustainability goals. Our Executive Committee - as well as more than 21,000 of our colleagues - have sustainability and diversity goals embedded into their performance goals. The CSO oversees the development and implementation of Johnson Controls climate transition plan, including sustainability governance oversight, assessing climate-related risks and opportunities utilizing scenario analyses, climate-related target setting and achievement, value chain engagement and low carbon initiatives, and climate policy engagement. Our CSO, Katie McGinty, has over 25 years of public and private sector experience and is a recognized innovator in clean energy and environmental protection. She serves on the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Steering Committee, was named as an inaugural board member of the Foundation for Energy Security and Innovation, and was named to the 2023 Constellation Research ESG50 which lists the most influential global executives who are advancing sustainability in their fields through new business models, emerging technologies and ethical, humane leadership. The ESG Leadership Committee is chaired by our Vice President of Global Sustainability and Regulatory Affairs, and reports to the Chief Sustainability Officer. The ESG Leadership Committee is charged with ensuring we are leaders across all measures of sustainability. All sustainability topics and associated targets, metrics and strategies fall into one of the ESG strategy workstreams.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

Sustainability and diversity performance goals are required for the top leaders of our company, including our CEO and executive team. These goals are included as part of the individual performance modifier of 10 percent to -25 percent, which is used to adjust the annual incentive award through a judgment-based assessment of how performance was delivered, taking into account our culture and values, as well as any exceptional circumstances during the year. To complement this, more than 21,000 employees also tied their annual goals to sustainability and diversity in 2023

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Sustainability and diversity goals are factored into the individual contribution modifier of 10 percent to -25 percent to assess individual contributions to our performance. This includes: Climate: Progress toward our emissionsreduction goals and achievement of top-tier sustainability ratings. Health and safety: Realizing our Zero Harm vision by championing health and safety initiatives that result in improved employee well-being and safety outcomes. Diversity and inclusion: Continued progress toward our diversity and inclusion goals. Employee and external engagement: Fostering a culture of sustainability and an enhanced employee experience that engages and attracts people who want to make a difference.
[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

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Shift to a business model compatible with a net-zero carbon future

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Sustainability and diversity performance goals are required for the top leaders of our company, including our CEO and executive team. These goals are included as part of the individual contribution modifier applied to their annual incentive award calculation, which assesses an individual's contributions and actions towards our business and operational improvements, as well as our progress in sustainability and diversity. Sustainability and diversity goals are factored into the individual contribution modifier of 10 percent to -25 percent to assess individual contributions to our performance. In addition, for 2024, more than 21,000 employees have tied their annual goals to sustainability, diversity or both, an increase in just one year of more than 5,000 employees who are committing to furthering sustainability and diversity at Johnson Controls.

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

Integrating sustainability into the goals of our executive team and linking them to compensation ensures sustainability is embedded in our products, services and culture. Sustainability and diversity performance goals tied to compensation are linked to the achievement of our environmental commitments: Climate: Progress toward our emissions reduction goals and achievement of top-tier sustainability ratings. Health and safety: Realizing our Zero Harm vision by championing health and safety initiatives that result in improved employee well-being and safety outcomes. Diversity and inclusion: Continued progress toward our diversity and inclusion goals. Employee and external engagement: Fostering a culture of sustainability and an enhanced employee experience that engages and attracts people who want to make a difference. In addition to this, our CEO reports to our Board of Directors on ESG progress on a quarterly basis. With this, a quarterly CEO scorecard is prepared with performance against annual ESG and other business targets, which is then reviewed by the full Board of Directors.
[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

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

As an early signatory of the United Nations Global Compact, Johnson Controls supports the Compact's Ten Principles: 1. Support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights. 2. Ensure the company is not complicit in human rights abuses. 3. Uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining. 4. Uphold the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labor. 5. Uphold the effective abolition of child labor. 6. Eliminate discrimination in employment and occupation. 7. Support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges. 8. Undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility. 9. Encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies. 10. Work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery. Our Commitment: We respect the environment, the communities in which we operate, and our employees' human rights, and we oppose corruption. Our Expectations: We expect our employees and suppliers to act in a socially and environmentally responsible manner. We require them to comply with applicable laws and regulations. We encourage corruption-free decision making and sound management based on appropriate environmental, occupational health and safety, and human rights and labor policies. Also see our public Energy and Climate Change Policy at https://www.johnsoncontrols.com/corporate-sustainability/reporting-and-policies

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to not funding climate-denial or lobbying against climate regulations

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify **:**Johnson Controls minimizes adverse effects of our operations on the community and environment, while safeguarding the health and safety of the public. Johnson Controls supports a precautionary approach to environmental challenges.

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of grievance/whistleblower mechanism to monitor non-compliance with the environmental policy and raise/address/escalate any other greenwashing concerns

(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 another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Human Rights and Sustainability Policy.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ UN Global Compact

☑ We Are Still In

☑ World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

☑ Other, please specify

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

In March of 2021, the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) approved our ambitious emissions reductions targets. The targets covering greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from our operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 1.5C, the most ambitious goal of the Paris Agreement. Our target for emissions from our value chain (scope 3) also meet the SBTi's criteria for ambitious value chain goals, and are therefore in line with current industry best practice. In 2023, we reduced absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 43.8% since 2017, putting us ahead of schedule in achieving our 2030 science-based target of a 55% reduction. In 2023, we also reported a 27.1% reduction in Scope 3 emissions derived from the use of our products, exceeding our 2030 science-based target of achieving 16% reduction in use of sold products by 2030. We first signed the United Nations Global Compact in 2004. Since then, we have remained committed to aligning our operations and strategies with the Compact's Ten Principles. Each year, we submit our Communication on Progress as required by the UNGC. In 2017, Johnson Controls signed the We Are Still In declaration, demonstrating our commitment to climate action in alignment with the Paris Agreement. In 2022, Johnson Controls joined the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. We are part of both the WBCSD decarbonization and circular economy workings groups for the Built Environment, focusing on designing low-to-no-carbon buildings, standardizing industry measurements, and delivering nature-positive solutions for sustainable, equitable cities. Our CSO is on the Board for the Built Environment Pathway and we have active engagement with building decarbonization. Last year, we were also part of the Taskforce on Nature-Related Financial Disclosures Pilot Program. In 2021, Johnson Controls joined The Climate Pledge. This commitment, co-founded by Amazon and Global Optimism, aims to achieve scope 1 & 2 net-zero carbon emissions by 2040. Our publicly stated net-zero carbon emission targets are in alignment with The Climate Pledge.
[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

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

We Are Still In.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

☑ Voluntary government register

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

US Registration of Lobbyists: Senate ID# 51150-12, House ID# 347450000; EU Transparency Register: REG Number 130225437251-64

(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

Our Sustainability and Government Relations teams are part of the same organization within the company. Our Government Relations team has responsibility for our policy engagement on environmental and energy issues. We use annual governmental affairs meetings and other regular business meetings to ensure that our direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with our overall climate change strategy and policy. Overall implementation of sustainability is the responsibility of company management with oversight by the CEO, the Executive Committee and the Governance and Sustainability Committee of the Board of Directors. Our Energy and Climate Change Policy helps guide and ensure consistency across our climate change strategy and work. Our leadership also encourages employees to have an annual performance goal linked to sustainability. In 2024, more than 21,000 employees tied their annual goals to sustainability. Our policies, including those relating to climate change and associated strategies are publicly available on our website at https://www.johnsoncontrols.com/corporate-sustainability/reporting-and-policies and our commitments including We are Still In Commitment to Paris Agreement are available on our website at https://www.johnsoncontrols.com/corporate-sustainability/commitments. Key policies and principles that outline our climate change processes and expectations on

these pages include: 1) Position on Energy and Climate Change, 2) Energy and Climate Change Policy, 3) Human Rights and Sustainability Policy 4) Our commitment to the UN Global Compact principles
[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

HFC Regulations: Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are potent greenhouse gasses which are used as conventional refrigerants. JCI strongly supports the phase out of HFCs in alignment with the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol which, if implemented globally, could prevent a 0.5C increase in average temperatures.

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Environmental impacts and pressures
☑ Emissions – CO2

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

Select from:
☑ Global

(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

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

☑ Responding to consultations

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

(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

Johnson Controls has committed to a 16% reduction in Scope 3, Category 11 emissions by 2030, and the transition to low GWP refrigerants plays an important role in the achievement of this target. HFC regulations will help move the market toward the use of these low GWP refrigerants, which, in turn, will lower the carbon footprint of our products.

(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

Row 2

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

Energy Efficiency: We strongly support advancing energy efficiency policies at all levels of government, especially when such policies can improve efficiency at the building systems level. A key opportunity for building energy efficiency is through performance contracting, and we strongly support federal policies which set efficiency and emissions targets that can be achieved through ESPCs. We also support measures that incentivize the reuse of waste heat for district heating and cooling.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Energy and renewables

☑ Energy efficiency requirements

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

Select from:

☑ Global

(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

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers
☑ Responding to consultations
☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

(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

We are committed to achieving our climate transition plan, supporting governments and corporations in delivering on their commitments under the Paris Agreement on climate change. The world must work together to limit global average temperature rise to well below 2C above pre-industrial levels. Scientific studies demonstrate many of the worst impacts of climate change may even be realized with a 1.5C rise in global temperatures.

(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

Row 3

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

Renewable Energy: We strongly support the expansion of tax credits for renewable energy. We support policies that place a price on carbon emissions, such as clean energy standards.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Energy and renewables

☑ Renewable energy generation

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

Select from:

☑ Global

(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

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

☑ Responding to consultations

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

(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

Johnson Controls has committed to a 55% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030, and to net zero Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2040. Having access to zero-carbon electricity plays an important role in the achievement of these target. These policies will drive increased investment in renewable electricity generation, which, in turn, will provide increased access to zero-carbon electricity, and help bring us closer to our decarbonization targets.

(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

Row 4

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

Federal Funding: We support U.S. federal funding of climate-related activities, research and mitigation.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

(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

☑ United States of America

(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

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

☑ Responding to consultations

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

(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

Federal government resources for climate change research, programs, and policy helps support access to data, technical expertise, and funding by a diverse group of stakeholders. Ultimately, this support helps shift markets at the federal, state, and local levels toward solutions that improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions. The continued growth of these markets will help Johnson Controls achieve its Scope 1, 2, and 3 targets. In 2024, Johnson Controls was awarded a 33 million grant from the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Manufacturing and Energy Supply Chains. The grant aims to increase domestic production of electric heat pumps by expanding three U.S.-based manufacturing sites. These facilities, located in San Antonio, Texas, Wichita, Kansas, and Waynesboro, Pennsylvania, will be able to produce approximately 200,000 electric heat pumps per year, representing a nearly 200% production increase. This substantial volume will help combat climate change. Upon completion, the initiative is estimated to save 1.63 million metric tons of CO^2 emissions from residential heating and 25 million metric tons from commercial and industrial heating per year – equivalent to greenhouse gas emissions from more than 5.5 million gasoline-powered vehicles driven for one year.

(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

Row 5

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

Decarbonization Policies. Green Taxonomies

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

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

Select from:

☑ Global

(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

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

☑ Responding to consultations

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

(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

Europe has set a legally binding commitment to decrease C02 emissions by 55% based on 1990 levels by 2030. European Energy Efficiency Policy of Buildings obliges commercial buildings to meet higher energy performance standards by 2027. To measure the energy performance of buildings, digital tools and effective buildings automation control systems are a necessity. As energy performance certificates are binding at legal transaction point for commercial buildings for sale,

major renovation and new lease contracts, the energy performance of a building defines the value of a building as a commercial asset. This rationale is further expressed by European Taxonomy criteria and Sustainable Financial Reporting that defines green building stock as an asset for commercial building owners. With a ban on funding for fossil fuel based heating and cooling systems as of 2035 and an obligation for municipalities to reuse waste heat and invest in energy efficiency measures for communities above 45.000 inhabitants, and binding transparent reporting for data center owners, energy efficiency requirements drive the market to increased use of district heating and cooling and the use of heat pumps. In the case of Latin America, Decarbonization Policies and Green Taxonomies are based on the National Determined Contributions (NDC) to reduce emissions. This aligns with our business strategy and global environmental commitments. We aim to drive the agenda to accelerate sustainability agenda in the region. Some countries have started to land Net Zero roadmaps like Colombia (with a NDC of reducing 51% GHG by 2030) and Chile (NDC of reducing up to 45% in Net emissions based on 2016 by 2030) that refer to the relevance of the built space to achieve their decarbonization goals. As a result, we have also seen some good progress in the creation of Green Taxonomies in Colombia and in Mexico (NDC of unconditional reduction of 35% emissions by 2030) that include buildings as part of the core economic activities that should drive decarbonization towards net zero. It also points out the requirements (energy and water efficiency) that should be met in order to be eligible to green financing offerings.

(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

[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

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**Efficient Buildings Europe

(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

Efficient Buildings Europe, formerly EuroACE, is a coalition of companies which provide energy efficiency products and services. The mission of Efficient Buildings Europe is to work together with the European institutions to help Europe move towards a more efficient use of energy in buildings, thereby contributing to the EU's commitments on energy efficiency, carbon emission reductions, job creation and energy security. Efficient Buildings Europe believes in the increase energy efficiency by reducing demand for imported energy, contributing to the reduction of CO2 emissions, and encouraging building renovation towards Near Zero Energy Buildings (NZEBs). Efficient Buildings Europe is managing as well. Renovate Europe, a political communications campaign with the ambition to reduce the energy demand of the EU building stock by 80% by 2050 compared to 2005 levels. We are a member of Efficient Buildings Europe and work to promote our values of energy efficiency and sustainability in their advocacy.

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

0

(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 4

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify **:**American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE)

(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 American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) is a non-profit organization that acts as a catalyst to advance energy efficiency policies, programs, technologies, investments, and behaviors. ACEEE provides research and thought leadership for energy efficiency policies that help address climate change. Through our membership with ACEEE we play an active role in shaping legislation and regulation that positions energy efficiency in buildings as a critical piece of decarbonization policy. Our Chief Sustainability and External Affairs Officer serves on the Board of ACEEE.

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

0

(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 5

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify **:**Building Decarbonization Coalition (BDC)

(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 Building Decarbonization Coalition unites building industry stakeholders with energy providers, environmental organizations and local governments to help electrify California's homes and workspaces with clean energy. Through research, policy development, and consumer inspiration, the BDC is pursuing fast, fair action to accelerate the development of zero-emission homes and buildings that will help California cut one of its largest sources of climate pollution, while creating safe,

healthy and affordable communities. Through the BDC Trailblazer Program, our Senior Director of Sustainability and Regulatory Affairs, actively promotes optimal pathways to decarbonization through building electrification, while also prioritizing energy efficiency, grid management, and consumer cost-effectiveness.

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

0

(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 6

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Air Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute (AHRI)

(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:

☑ Mixed

(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

AHRI is the trade association that represents manufacturers of air-conditioning, heating, commercial refrigeration, ventilation and water heating equipment. AHRI encourages the adoption of energy efficient equipment in homes and businesses. AHRI strives to work with environmental advocates and federal agencies to craft energy efficiency policies that will help reduce national energy consumption. AHRI also supports efforts by the U.S. to engage in negotiations to include a phase down of HFCs in the Montreal Protocol. AHRI also supports policies and incentives to promote recovery, recycling, reclaiming and/or destruction of HFCs, and to develop low-GWP compounds and products that use low GWP compounds. We support AHRI's efforts to promote the development of energy efficient equipment for heating and cooling, as well as the phase down of HFCs and the efforts to develop low GWP compounds. Our President Global Residential and Light Commercial Solutions, Johnson Controls, sits on the board of directors of AHRI.

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

0

(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 7

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**European Partnership for Energy and the Environment (EPEE)

(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

EPEE advocates for stronger requirements for energy efficiency in equipment and buildings, and integration of renewables in buildings. EPEE represents the heating, cooling and refrigeration industry in Europe and strongly supports the energy efficiency first principle. JCI has strong participation in EPEE, including the following: a) VP and Europe South is Chair of the Board and through this role is active in promoting energy efficiency. b) Strategy Group (Board of Directors) Vice Chair, VP and GM Europe South c) Steering Committee: Director of European Government Relations d) Energy Efficiency Working Group: Christina von Westernhagen, Chair e) Ivo Eiermann, Product Manager, Applied Equipment, Eco-Design working group (standards included). As a team, we contribute to EPEE's work regarding the development of effective European policies and regulations (F- Gas, Eco-Design, Energy Efficiency, Renewables etc.), standards, in order to achieve a long-term sustainability agenda. f) Giovanni Egisto, EcoDesign Working Group

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

0

(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 8

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**European Buildings Automation Controls Association (EU-BAC)

(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

EU-BAC aims to increase energy efficiency and flexibility in buildings by optimizing the use of building automation controls and building energy management systems. Our company is represented in EU-BAC as follows: a) Mario Lieder, Senior Director HVAC-R Germany: Board and Building Automation sector group b) Marianna Duarte, Solutions Manager Digital Solutions and Smart Buildings: Building Automation sector group, Marketing & Communications Panel and TG IoT Strategy paper and Smart Readiness Indicator c) Christina von Westernhagen, Director of Government Relations Europe, Advocacy panel Main priorities of the team are: inclusion of BACs in the Eco-Design regulation, advocating for mandatory requirements for BACs in the non-residential sector, ensure policy implementation, leading discussion leading discussions on Smart Buildings, Smart Indicator and Internet of Things, etc.

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

0

(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 9

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Sustainable Markets Initiative (SMI)

(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:

☑ Mixed

(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

George Oliver, Chairman & CEO at Johnson Controls is the chair of the SMI Sustainable Buildings Taskforce. The Sustainable Buildings Task Force is made up of global CEOs from throughout the buildings industry working together to accelerate the delivery of net zero buildings to reduce carbon emissions. Together, the Members are united by a common ambition to harness the power of technology and drive partnerships and policy decisions that enable the adoption of sustainable building technology and drive a lower carbon future. Founded by His Majesty King Charles III in 2020, as Prince of Wales, the Sustainable Markets Initiative has become the world's 'go-to' private sector organization on transition. Launched in 2021, the Terra Carta serves as the Sustainable Markets Initiative's mandate with a focus on accelerating positive results for Nature, People and Planet through real economy action. At COP28, the Sustainable Markets Initiative announced a new roadmap for addressing embodied carbon in the built environment. Its Sustainable Buildings Task Force chaired by Johnson Controls Chairman and CEO, George Oliver, released a new report, titled Decarbonization in the Built Environment: Addressing Embodied Carbon in mechanical, electrical and plumbing (MEP) systems. The report outlines solutions, challenges and best practices for reducing embodied carbon in a building's MEP system – a significant, but often not highlighted, component of a building's overall emissions. Embodied carbon can represent as much as 50% of overall life cycle emissions in new, energy efficient buildings, making it a key factor in reducing GHG emissions. In the newly released report, the Task Force outlines opportunities, challenges, and recommendations on how to reduce embodied carbon In addition to the report, the Task Force is helping Sustainable Markets Initiative members engage in and support a commitment to having at least one carbon neutral building by 2030, while decarbonizing heat and deploying ultra-low carbon building materials when possible. This builds on a commitment by the companies in the Sustainable Buildings Task Force made in 2022 at COP27.

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

0

(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 10

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify **:**National Association of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO)

(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 National Association of Energy Service Companies is the leading advocacy and accreditation organization for Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) and is dedicated to modernizing America's building infrastructure through performance contracting. Uniting the energy service industry, NAESCO promotes favorable government policies; sponsors a rigorous accreditation program; provides training and education; and champions ESCOs interests across the Nation. Chuck McGinnis, VP Performance Infrastructure North America, Johnson Controls, is a member of the board of NAESCO and as such promotes the use of performance contracting as a highly cost-effective approach to reducing emissions in the buildings sector.

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

0

(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 11

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**World Green Building Council (WorldGBC)

(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 World Green Building Council (WorldGBC) catalyzes the uptake of sustainable buildings for everyone, everywhere. It is focused on three strategic areas, including climate action, health & wellbeing, and resources & circularity and is a global action network comprised of around 70 Green Building Councils globally. As members of the UN Global Compact, the WorldGBC work with businesses, organizations and governments to drive the ambitions of the Paris Agreement and UN Global Goals for Sustainable Development. Through a systems change approach, the network is leading the industry towards a net zero carbon, healthy, equitable and resilient built environment. JCI is actively involved with the WorldGBC as a founding member of the Americas Regional Network. JCI is also actively involved with several country level Green Building Councils, including Costa Rica, Colombia, Mexico, and Singapore. Our teams are active locally helping to drive green building and net zero policy agendas. Brigitte Solis, Sustainability Manager Building Solutions serves as Vice President of the Costa Rica GBC. We actively participate in WorldGBC events and initiatives, such as the Leadership Summit and the Building Efficiency Accelerator (BEA) project to promote Net Zero Carbon policies in the Latin America Region.

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

0

(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 12

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**European Heat Pump Association (EHPA)

(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 European Heat Pump Association represents the majority of the European heat pump industry. Its members comprise of heat pump and component manufacturers, research institutes, universities, testing labs and energy agencies. Its key goal is to promote awareness and proper deployment of heat pump technology in the European market for residential, commercial and industrial applications. Heat pumps are a key enabler in the road to decarbonization and EHPA advocates for adoption of the technology. Our Director of Government Relations Europe, Johnson Controls, serves on the Advocacy Group of EHPA.

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

0

(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 13

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**American Chamber of Commerce

(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

AmCham speaks for American companies committed to different jurisdictions on trade, investment and competitiveness issues. It aims to ensure a growth- oriented business and investment climate in various regions. AmCham supports a low-carbon and competitive economy. For AmCham EU, Marc Vandiepenbeeck, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, is a member of the AmCham EU Executive Council. Christina von Westernhagen, Director of European Government Relations, is a member of the Transport, Energy and Climate Committee and promotes energy efficiency in their advocacy. For AmCham Mexico-Monterrey Chapter, Ricardo Bussey, Director of Government Relations and Public Affairs for LATAM sits on the board of directors. Additionally, JCI is an active member of the chamber in Colombia.

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

0

(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 14

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy (ARAP)

(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 Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy (ARAP) is a non-profit organization that was formed to address the issue of stratospheric ozone depletion. It is the primary voice of manufacturers, businesses and trade associations who make or use fluorinated gases (HFC) for the global market. ARAP coordinates industry participation in the development of economically and environmentally beneficial international and domestic policies at the nexus of ozone protection and climate change. They strongly supported the implementation of the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, which will significantly phase down the use of HFCs in both developed and developing countries by 2033. Chris Forth, Vice President of Regulatory, Codes, and Environmental Affairs, Johnson Controls, is on the board of ARAP and sits on the Energy Efficiency Committee. As such, he continues to promote the phase-down use of HFCs, energy efficiency, and the other core values of Johnson Controls.

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

0

(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 15

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global
☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Alliance to Save Energy (ASE)

(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 Alliance to Save Energy is a non-profit organization that promotes energy efficiency worldwide through research, education and advocacy. ASE encourages business, government, environmental and consumer leaders to use energy efficiency as a means to achieve a healthier economy, a cleaner environment and greater energy security. ASE views energy efficiency as an immediate and necessary part of the solution to global climate change. Climate change affects the environment and people throughout the world. Energy efficiency is the most readily available and cost-effective solution to climate change. The Alliance supports the creation of a domestic cap-and-trade program that sets a carbon price, implements complementary energy efficiency policies and invests in complementary energy efficiency programs. A strong climate policy will spur unprecedented levels of energy efficiency and result in smarter resource use in various economic sectors by reducing the costs and increasing the pace of cutting greenhouse gas emissions. In short, energy efficiency is an immediate and necessary part of the solution to global climate change.

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

0

(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 16

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**The Business Council for Sustainable Energy (BCSE)

(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

BCSE is a coalition of companies and trade associations from the energy efficiency, natural gas and renewable energy sectors, and also includes independent electric power producers, investor-owned utilities, public power, commercial end-users and project developers and service providers for environmental markets. The Business Council for Sustainable Energy advocates energy and environmental policies that promote markets for clean, efficient and sustainable energy products and

services. The Council strives to be the premier organization promoting clean energy technologies, energy efficiency, renewable energy and natural gas to achieve the goals of sustainable development, including a cleaner environment, a prosperous economy and greater energy security. The Business Council for Sustainable Energy aims to: • Promote strategies that accelerate the deployment of energy efficiency, renewable energy resources and natural gas; • Implement cost-effective programs and policies that recognize the environmental attributes of energy sources; • Advocate policies that increase the efficiency of the U.S. economy and improve energy security; and • Encourage market-based initiatives for energy and environmental policies. More about this organization at: http://www.bcse.org Our Senior Director, Sustainability and Regulatory Affairs, is on the board of BSCE of the organization and as such continues to promote energy efficiency and the other core values of Johnson Controls.

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Biodiversity indicators

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

The entirety of our 2024 Sustainability Report addresses these elements.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024-Sustainability-Report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Johnson Controls recognizes the importance of transparency, reporting in accordance with recognized frameworks including the Global Reporting Index (GRI), the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), Sustainable Accounting Standards Board (SASB) Standards, the UN Global Compact, European Union Non-Financial Disclosure and CDP. This sustainability report is produced to provide greater detail on our sustainability activities, as well as additional information material to our stakeholders. Since 2003, we have reported sustainability data in accordance with the GRI guidelines. This report has been prepared in accordance with the GRI Standards for fiscal year 2023. We're also a SASB reporter, now part of the IFRS Foundation, utilizing the SASB Standard for the Resource Transformation Sector – Electrical and Electronic Equipment in this report. In December 2023, the ISSB amended the SASB Standards in connection with the International Applicability of SASB Standards project. These most current standards are used in this report, while our separate annual United Nations Communication on Progress qualifies for the Global Compact Advanced level.

Row 2

(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

☑ Other, please specify **:**Disclosures within the Non-Financial Report align to NFRD, the Non-Financial Reporting Directive. Our Sustainability Report aligns to GRI, TCFD and TNFD.

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- ☑ Strategy
- ☑ Governance
- ☑ Emission targets
- ☑ Emissions figures
- ☑ Public policy engagement
- ☑ Water accounting figures
- ☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

See pages 23 - 29 of the Irish Statutory Reports and Non-Financial Report for Fiscal 2023of the Irish Statutory Reports and Non-Financial Report for Fiscal 2023

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

jci-plc-2023-irish-annual-report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

These non-financial information disclosures are included for the purpose of complying with European Union (Disclosure of Non-Financial and Diversity Information by certain large undertakings and groups) Regulations 2017 (as amended) for fiscal 2023.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every two years

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every two years
[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

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :SSP1, SSP2, SSP5 narratives

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Consumer attention to impact

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

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). For our physical climate risk analysis, we leveraged a selection of global climate model outputs for three climate scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5) from the CMIP6 data archive. Although the CMIP6 outputs used in our physical climate risk assessment are bias-corrected and downscaled to enhance their usability for local climate impact assessments, there are inherent assumptions, uncertainties, and constraints that affect the reliability and accuracy of these data and projections. Uncertainties include climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms,

variability in model outputs due to differences in model structure, parameterizations, and resolution, and future socio-economic developments impacting greenhouse gas emissions. Constraints encompass computational limitations that restrict model resolution and complexity, as well as necessary simplifications and approximations to represent complex climate processes (e.g., cloud formation, ocean circulation).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify **:**SSP1, SSP2, SSP5 narratives

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). Water risks were evaluated using the WRI's Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. The WRI Aqueduct tool leverages CMIP6 data, which comes with assumptions, uncertainties and constraints as noted above. For our water risk analysis, we leveraged WRI Aqueduct output for three climate scenarios (SSP1–2.6, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5). The WRI Aqueduct tool's data on water stress is based on assumptions regarding future climate scenarios, water demand, and supply projections, which may not fully capture local variations or unforeseen changes in water usage patterns. Additionally, uncertainties arise from the quality and granularity of input data, as well as the inherent unpredictability of climate impacts and socio-economic developments affecting water resources. WRI notes that projections of future water stress are subjective and cannot be directly measured or validated. The water stress indicator does not account for environmental flow requirements, water quality, or access to water.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the

potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify **:**SSP1, SSP2, SSP5 narratives

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). For our physical climate risk analysis, we leveraged a selection of global climate model outputs for three climate scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5) from the CMIP6 data archive. Although the CMIP6 outputs used in our physical climate risk assessment are bias-corrected and downscaled to enhance their usability for local climate impact assessments, there are inherent assumptions, uncertainties, and constraints that affect the reliability and accuracy of these data and projections. Uncertainties include climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms, variability in model outputs due to differences in model structure, parameterizations, and resolution, and future socio-economic developments impacting greenhouse gas emissions. Constraints encompass computational limitations that restrict model resolution and complexity, as well as necessary simplifications and approximations to represent complex climate processes (e.g., cloud formation, ocean circulation).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :SSP1, SSP2, SSP5 narratives

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). Water risks were evaluated using the WRI's Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. The WRI Aqueduct tool leverages CMIP6 data, which comes with assumptions, uncertainties and constraints as noted above. For our water risk analysis, we leveraged WRI Aqueduct output for three climate scenarios (SSP1–2.6, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5). The WRI Aqueduct tool's data on water stress is based on assumptions regarding future climate scenarios, water demand, and supply projections, which may not fully capture local variations or unforeseen changes in water usage patterns. Additionally, uncertainties arise from the quality and granularity of input data, as well as the inherent unpredictability of climate impacts and socio-

economic developments affecting water resources. WRI notes that projections of future water stress are subjective and cannot be directly measured or validated. The water stress indicator does not account for environmental flow requirements, water quality, or access to water.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify **:**SSP1, SSP2, SSP5 narratives

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). For our physical climate risk analysis, we leveraged a selection of global climate model outputs for three climate scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5) from the CMIP6 data archive. Although the CMIP6 outputs used in our physical climate risk assessment are bias-corrected and downscaled to enhance their usability for local climate impact assessments, there are inherent assumptions, uncertainties, and constraints that affect the reliability and accuracy of these data and projections. Uncertainties include climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms, variability in model outputs due to differences in model structure, parameterizations, and resolution, and future socio-economic developments impacting greenhouse gas emissions. Constraints encompass computational limitations that restrict model resolution and complexity, as well as necessary simplifications and approximations to represent complex climate processes (e.g., cloud formation, ocean circulation).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the

potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify **:**SSP1, SSP2, SSP5 narratives

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). Water risks were evaluated using the WRI's Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. The WRI Aqueduct tool leverages CMIP6 data, which comes with assumptions, uncertainties and constraints as noted above. For our water risk analysis, we leveraged WRI Aqueduct output for three climate scenarios (SSP1–2.6, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5). The WRI Aqueduct tool's data on water stress is based on assumptions regarding future climate scenarios, water demand, and supply projections, which may not fully capture local variations or unforeseen changes in water usage patterns. Additionally, uncertainties arise from the quality and granularity of input data, as well as the inherent unpredictability of climate impacts and socio-economic developments affecting water resources. WRI notes that projections of future water stress are subjective and cannot be directly measured or validated. The water stress indicator does not account for environmental flow requirements, water quality, or access to water.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is

part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). For our physical climate risk analysis, we leveraged a selection of global climate model outputs for three climate scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5) from the CMIP6 data archive. Although the CMIP6 outputs used in our physical climate risk assessment are bias-corrected and downscaled to enhance their usability for local climate impact assessments, there are inherent assumptions, uncertainties, and constraints that affect the reliability and accuracy of these data and projections. Uncertainties include climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms, variability in model outputs due to differences in model structure, parameterizations, and resolution, and future socio-economic developments impacting greenhouse gas emissions. Constraints encompass computational limitations that restrict model resolution and complexity, as well as necessary simplifications and approximations to represent complex climate processes (e.g., cloud formation, ocean circulation).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). Water risks were evaluated using the WRI's Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. The WRI Aqueduct tool leverages CMIP6 data, which comes with assumptions, uncertainties and constraints as noted above. For our water risk analysis, we leveraged WRI Aqueduct output for three climate scenarios (SSP1–2.6, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5). The WRI Aqueduct tool's data on water stress is based on assumptions regarding future climate scenarios, water demand, and supply projections, which may not fully capture local variations or unforeseen changes in water usage patterns. Additionally, uncertainties arise from the quality and granularity of input data, as well as the inherent unpredictability of climate impacts and socio-economic developments affecting water resources. WRI notes that projections of future water stress are subjective and cannot be directly measured or validated. The water stress indicator does not account for environmental flow requirements, water quality, or access to water.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ 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

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). For our physical climate risk analysis, we leveraged a selection of global climate model outputs for three climate scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5) from the CMIP6 data archive. Although the CMIP6 outputs used in our physical climate risk assessment are bias-corrected and downscaled to enhance their usability for local climate impact assessments, there are inherent assumptions, uncertainties, and constraints that affect the reliability and accuracy of these data and projections. Uncertainties include climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms, variability in model outputs due to differences in model structure, parameterizations, and resolution, and future socio-economic developments impacting greenhouse gas emissions. Constraints encompass computational limitations that restrict model resolution and complexity, as well as necessary simplifications and approximations to represent complex climate processes (e.g., cloud formation, ocean circulation).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional

rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy
☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ 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
☑ Global regulation
☑ Level of action (from local to global)
☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). Water risks were evaluated using the WRI's Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. The WRI Aqueduct tool leverages CMIP6 data, which comes with assumptions, uncertainties and constraints as noted above. For our water risk analysis, we leveraged WRI Aqueduct output for three climate scenarios (SSP1–2.6, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5). The WRI Aqueduct tool's data on water stress is based on assumptions regarding future climate scenarios, water demand, and supply projections, which may not fully capture local variations or unforeseen changes in water usage patterns. Additionally, uncertainties arise from the quality and granularity of input data, as well as the inherent unpredictability of climate impacts and socio-economic developments affecting water resources. WRI notes that projections of future water stress are subjective and cannot be directly measured or validated. The water stress indicator does not account for environmental flow requirements, water quality, or access to water.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We employed three scenarios: SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. For water risk analysis, the scenarios used were SSP1, SSP3, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. The SSP3 scenario describes a fragmented world characterized by regional rivalry and a lack of global cooperation. This pathway is marked by slow economic growth, limited technological advancement, and weak environmental policies. For JCI, SSP3 underscores significant physical risks due to inadequate climate action. By considering SSP3, JCI can evaluate the impacts of minimal mitigation efforts and prepare for a future with substantial physical and geopolitical challenges. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ 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

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). For our analysis, we leveraged a selection of global climate model outputs for three climate scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5) from the CMIP6 data archive. Although the CMIP6 outputs used in our physical climate risk assessment are bias-corrected and downscaled to enhance their usability for local climate impact assessments, there are inherent assumptions, uncertainties, and

constraints that affect the reliability and accuracy of these data and projections. Uncertainties include climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms, variability in model outputs due to differences in model structure, parameterizations, and resolution, and future socio-economic developments impacting greenhouse gas emissions. Constraints encompass computational limitations that restrict model resolution and complexity, as well as necessary simplifications and approximations to represent complex climate processes (e.g., cloud formation, ocean circulation).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Three scenarios were used to conduct scenario analysis including SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices, and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities under varying levels of climate action and socioeconomic developments, enabling robust strategic planning and resilience building.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ 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

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical climate risks were evaluated using the assumptions, uncertainties and constraints associated with data from the Sixth Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), as featured in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report. The CMIP6 data archive, a collection of climate model outputs, is globally utilized to understand climate dynamics and project future climate changes under various scenarios. This archive is part of an international effort coordinated by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). For our analysis, we leveraged a selection of global climate model outputs for three climate scenarios (SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5) from the CMIP6 data archive. Although the CMIP6 outputs used in our physical climate risk assessment are bias-corrected and downscaled to enhance their usability for local climate impact assessments, there are inherent assumptions, uncertainties, and constraints that affect the reliability and accuracy of these data and projections. Uncertainties include climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms, variability in model outputs due to differences in model structure, parameterizations, and resolution, and future socio-economic developments impacting greenhouse gas emissions. Constraints encompass computational limitations that restrict model resolution and complexity, as well as necessary simplifications and approximations to represent complex climate processes (e.g., cloud formation, ocean circulation).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Three scenarios were used to conduct scenario analysis including SSP1, SSP2, and SSP5. These three scenarios were chosen to provide a diverse array of potential futures to understand how JCI's exposure to climate-related risk varies depending on these potential futures. The SSP1 scenario describes a future in which the world makes significant strides towards sustainability. This pathway is characterized by proactive efforts to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive global cooperation and the adoption of green technologies and sustainable practices, and allows for JCI to understand the full extent of transition risks to the company based on strict regulations and the potential for increased incentives for mitigation and adaptation activities. The SSP2 scenario

represents a future where socioeconomic trends broadly follow their historical patterns. This pathway is characterized by moderate progress in economic development, technological advancement, and environmental policies. For JCI, SSP2 provides insights into both physical and transition risks under a balanced approach to climate policy, where neither extreme mitigation nor extreme inaction occurs. This scenario helps JCI evaluate the potential impacts of gradual policy changes and moderate shifts in market dynamics. SSP5 describes a future characterized by rapid economic growth driven by intensive fossil fuel use and limited climate action. This pathway is marked by high greenhouse gas emissions and significant global warming, with a focus on achieving high levels of human development through conventional energy sources. For JCI, SSP5 highlights the potential risks and impacts associated with severe physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events and also underscores the potential for increased operational costs and disruptions due to these physical risks. JCI leveraged three climate scenarios to assess the range of potential risks and opportunities under varying levels of climate action and socioeconomic developments, enabling robust strategic planning and resilience building.
[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

☑ 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

We are taking significant action in light of our findings from our climate-related risks and opportunities scenario analyses. Understanding that buildings account for approximately 40% of global emissions, we bring new products to market that are critical to achieving decarbonization. Our products are designed to lower emissions, including the transition to electrification, low-GWP potential refrigerants, and digital offerings to monitor and optimize the energy, emissions, and water usage. We offer alternative refrigerants across all chiller platforms, with GWP reductions of more than 99 percent compared to conventional refrigerants. For example, the Sabroe DualPAC, among other applied water-to-water heat pump systems, replace fossil fuel combustion boilers in buildings and industrial applications with high-

efficiency heat pump heating, thereby enabling and accelerating the electrification of key sectors of our economy—a key step in decarbonizing those sectors. These heat pumps can be as much as 8 times more efficient than conventional heating and cooling, utilizing ultra-low GWP refrigerants. The York YZV and YZT residential cold climate heat pumps provide efficient, reliable heating down to 5 degrees Fahrenheit ambient outdoor temperatures. These heat pumps can significantly displace, and in some cases fully replace, home heating systems in the coldest North American climates that traditionally rely on fossil fuel combustion. Since its inception, we have been part of the DOE Cold Climate Heat Pump Challenge, developing heat pumps that push the limits of performance at very low ambient temperatures and will ultimately be necessary as governments seek to reduce and eliminate fossil fuel combustion heating. We know that digitalization is also essential if we are to achieve net zero buildings. OpenBlue can add 50% additional efficiency gains to the operation of a building in addition to enabling integration of renewable assets and electric vehicles into buildings. OpenBlue Net Zero Buildings can deliver net zero building operations by creating a retrofit roadmap to decarbonization and guaranteed emission reduction outcomes. Revenue from sustainable products and services continues to increase as a percent of our total revenue. Sustainable revenue (as calculated utilizing the Corporate Knights Taxonomy) in 2023 was 57 percent of total company revenues, up from 48 percent in just two years. We recognize the urgency of delivering climate solutions now along with the significant opportunity we have to build on our company's history of providing sustainable products and solutions and helping our customers decarbonize. Thus, our strategy includes the commitment aligned to a short-term time horizon to invest 75 percent of our new product development R&D in climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services. In fiscal year 2023, 90 percent of new product R&D was invested in climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services. We include sustainability key performance indicators in product design during the stage gate review of our innovation process. Innovations include reduction of emissions across Scope 1, 2 and 3, reduction of material usage, and improved life cycle management. We have invested in new services and solutions to capitalize on opportunities created by the efforts to combat climate change. We have invested in, developed and deployed solutions such as Net Zero Buildings as a Service. This as-a-service offering includes turnkey access to successful net zero building roadmaps. We are addressing future regulations by transitioning to low-GWP refrigerants, improving energy performance, and investing in efficient electric heat pump heating and cooling equipment to meet and exceed anticipated standards. Johnson Controls also partners with customers, leading technology companies, research institutions and government entities to build innovative solutions in pursuit of net zero carbon.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

(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

Johnson Controls drives emissions and water reductions in our customers' operations and in our own. In water, we focused our efforts on those locations we most impact and where we are most impacted, and sought to reduce water use by 10 percent at water-stressed locations in 2025 from our 2017 baseline. We achieved this metric two years early in 2023 and achieved an 18.4 percent reduction since 2017. In 2021, we updated our water-stressed locations in alignment with WRI Aqueduct 3.0. As a result, we determined that we had 22 manufacturing and R&D facilities in water-stressed locations, driving us to continue our focused effort on water reduction. For example, in Kadi, India, we've delivered significant water savings, estimated at a 26% reduction in withdrawals per year, by changing the way we interact with water. This facility produces many products and incorporates new water recycling and reclamation initiatives to reduce water withdrawals. Every year, we complete new water-saving projects, including fixing underground water leakage, installing water meters in each workshop and the water-free testing of larger chillers. We also recycle water from rain and steam condensate. We also deliver water-saving technologies through the products we deliver. A few examples: • Air-cooled chillers, including the purpose-built YVAM chiller, which provide cooling at industry-leading energy efficiencies without relying on water consumption. • Water-to-water heat pumps that provide simultaneous heating and cooling, diverting water away from cooling towers and thus reducing consumption. • AquaMist Ultra Low Flow low-pressure water mist technology helps building owners meet their sustainability goals and minimize strain on local water resources - As a low-pressure water mist system, it offers significant sustainability benefits, including remarkable water efficiency during fires, using up to 80 percent less water than traditional fire sprinkler systems. AquaMist ULF is particularly appealing for areas facing water scarcity, such as desert climates and those prone to drought conditions. • Wastewater – Our teams have executed wastewater projects that reduce the consumption of energy from the grid, while also producing renewable energy, delivering over 4 million in wastewater savings to customers in the process. As just one example, our water conservation upgrades helped us deliver over 290 million gallons of water and sewer savings during a large construction project. In partnership with the construction firm, we installed high-efficiency water fixtures to over 16,000 homes, dramatically reducing water withdrawals. Water conservation – We deliver projects in water metering and leak detection, providing over 8 million to customers in water savings as a result.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

(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

Johnson Controls is a leader in supporting the clean energy transition. Our climate transition plan, containing the key elements of a credible transition plan outlined by CDP, is dispersed throughout this CDP questionnaire. Though we won't include a spending and revenue commitment in our transition plan, Johnson Controls is a climate leader, taking significant climate action now, and is well on its way to achieving its commitment to net zero scope 1 and 2 carbon emissions by 2040, ten years ahead of the goal set out in the Paris Climate Agreement. By 2030, the company aims to cut its scope 1 and 2 emissions by 55 percent and is currently ahead of schedule, having already achieved a reduction of more than 43 percent in FY23 from our 2017 baseline. It also aims to reduce scope 3 emissions from Use of Sold Products by 16 percent and has reduced emissions by 27 percent in FY23 from our 2017 baseline. These ambitious 2030 emissions reduction targets have been approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative (SBTi).Many of our product lines have transitioned to fully electric, and our recent historic announcement on increasing our heat pump production will further our climate leadership -- our updated Johnson Controls plants will produce an estimated 200,000 residential, commercial and industrial heat pumps a year, an increase of 200%, and create approximately 1,000 new jobs. Internally, we are bringing electric vehicles into our fleet as we shift to ever more efficient vehicles. And in 2023, 42.1 percent of the electricity we purchased globally was met or matched by renewable sources of energy, putting us well on our way to our target to have 100 percent of our electricity globally met or matched by renewables by 2040.

(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

As part of developing our climate transition plan, we conduct materiality assessments to understand the most impactful environmental, social and governance (ESG) topics for our business and to ensure we're building robust strategies to manage our strategic impacts, risks and opportunities. This work includes obtaining stakeholder feedback. In 2023, Wwe surveyed over 100 internal Johnson Controls leaders and 50 external stakeholders, including customers, suppliers, partners, NGOs and trade associations. The results of the ESG materiality assessment identified nine highest priority topics, which we then aligned under three material topics: sustainable products and solutions, greenhouse gas emissions, and social impact and employee experience. Our targets are the result of our Materiality Assessment. In addition, as part of our climate-related risks and opportunities analysis, we held nine focus groups with stakeholders to obtain their input on our most significant climate-related risks and opportunities. In addition, we engage in bi-annual outreach to our largest shareholders to discuss and receive feedback on environmental, social and governance topics. These discussions regularly include our environmental goals and strategy, where investors can provide learnings and feedback on how we are managing climate risk and our progress toward achieving our carbon reduction goals.

(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

Addressing climate change necessitates that we manage our entire carbon footprint in alignment with a 1.5C reduction trajectory. The three primary contributors of our scope 1 and 2 emissions are energy usage at our global facilities, refrigerant loss in manufacturing and our global fleet. We measure emissions monthly, applying continuous improvement throughout the year, and have teams organized under our climate workstream to drive our carbon transition. These teams develop strategies and three-year roadmaps to ensure organizational alignment on the improvement measures, timing and investments needed. Our scope 1 and 2 carbon reduction strategy is driven by: 1. Facility decarbonization 2. Refrigerant loss reduction in manufacturing 3. Fleet emission reduction through efficiency and electrification 4. Transition to renewable electricity globally With the vast majority of our scope 3 emissions coming from the use of sold products, it's critical that we deliver low-carbon solutions to our customers. At Johnson Controls, we're leading the carbon transition with sustainable products and services across three strategic pillars: energy efficiency, low-GWP refrigerants and electrification. Delivering sustainable products and solutions is core to our business and our growth as a global leader in smart, healthy, sustainable buildings. As we work to help our customers manage their carbon transition and enable deep decarbonization of their facility footprints, we employ a four-part strategy: 1. Develop low-carbon and energy-efficient products 2. Drive OpenBlue digital solutions to accelerate customer success in decarbonization 3. Reduce embodied carbon of our products to enable customers to build net zero carbon facilities 4. Weigh sustainability equal to other key metrics in supplier performance evaluations and require suppliers representing 80 percent of our procurement spend to undergo third-party independent sustainability performance assessment by 2028

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

Johnson Controls continues to take significant climate action and has committed to achieving net zero scope 1 & 2 carbon emissions by 2040, ten years ahead of the goal set out in the Paris Climate Agreement. By 2030, we aim to cut our scope 1 & 2 emissions by 55 percent and have already achieved a reduction of more than 43 percent from our 2017 baseline. We also aim to reduce our scope 3 emissions by 16 percent and have reduced emissions by 27 percent from our 2017 baseline. These ambitious 2030 emissions reduction targets have been approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative. We launched our Facility Decarbonization Program in collaboration with our Sustainable Infrastructure business which works with a cross-functional team to determine our cost-effective and impactful plan to net zero. Our refrigerant decarbonization roadmap includes the reduction of refrigerant loss within facilities and the global transition to products with low and ultra-low Global Warming Potential. Emissions from refrigerants continue to drop and represented just 17 percent of overall operational emissions in 2023. For our fleet, in 2023, we launched the Early Adopter Electric Vehicle program in the US, along with our first EV request for proposal across fleet manufacturers, as we build our decarbonization roadmap to 2026. Our first full wave of electric vehicles will be implemented in 2024. We continue to expand our purchases of renewable energy, and in 2023, 42.1 percent of the electricity we purchased globally was met or matched by renewable sources of energy. We have invested around the world to deliver renewable electricity directly to our facilities. For our customers, we deliver a market-leading portfolio of energy-efficient HVAC products and continue to improve the energy efficiency of our products, assisting our customers in making optimal product selections for their applications, and shifting our share of products sold to higher efficiency models. Our OpenBlue suite of applications includes Enterprise Manager, which produces real-time performance dashboards to drive energy and greenhouse gas emission improvements. This can also be integrated with Net Zero Advisor, which supports customers' increasing need for data and transparency when reporting to internal and external stakeholders. We look at the upstream and downstream impact of our products, Downstream, we reduce the embodied carbon of our products. As a founding member of the First Movers Coalition, we're committed to reducing our impact and purchasing 10 percent near net zero steel by 2030. We launched a closed-loop partnership with Nucor - thousands of tons of scrap steel from our manufacturing facilities is recycled using electric arc furnace technology

which generates 60 – 75% fewer emissions than traditional steel manufacturing. Upstream, sustainability is now weighted at 21 percent of preferred suppliers' global scorecards, making sustainability equal to cost, quality and delivery.

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

CDP Climate Change JCI FULL final submission.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other environmental issue considered

[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

☑ Water

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

We are taking significant action in light of our climate-related risks and opportunities, and sustainability is integrated into all parts of our strategy. Understanding that buildings account for approximately 40% of global emissions, we bring new products to market that are critical to achieving decarbonization. Our products are designed to lower emissions, including the transition to electrification, low-GWP potential refrigerants, and digital offerings to monitor and optimize the energy, emissions, and water usage. We offer alternative refrigerants across all chiller platforms, with GWP reductions of up to 99 percent compared to conventional refrigerants. For example, the Sabroe DualPAC, among other applied water-to-water heat pump systems, replace fossil fuel combustion boilers in buildings and industrial applications with high-efficiency heat pump heating, thereby enabling and accelerating the electrification of key sectors of our economy—a key step in decarbonizing those sectors. These heat pumps can be as much as 8 times more efficient than conventional heating, utilizing ultra-low GWP refrigerants. The York YZV and YZT residential cold climate heat pumps provide efficient, reliable heating down to 5 degrees Fahrenheit ambient outdoor temperatures. These heat pumps can significantly displace, and in some cases fully replace, home heating systems in the coldest North American climates that traditionally rely on fossil fuel combustion. Since its inception, we have been part of the DOE Cold Climate Heat Pump Challenge, developing heat pumps that push the limits of performance at very low ambient temperatures and will ultimately be necessary as governments seek to reduce and eliminate fossil fuel combustion heating. We know that digitalization is also essential if we are to achieve net zero buildings. OpenBlue can add substantial efficiency gains to the operation of a building by enabling integration of renewable assets and electric vehicles into buildings. Please also see our risk and opportunity description in 3.1.1 and 3.6.1.

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

Recognizing the climate-related risks to our supply chain, we are committed to incorporating supplier sustainability into our business strategy. Sustainability is now weighted at 21 percent of preferred suppliers' scorecards, making sustainability equal to cost, quality and delivery in supplier performance evaluations. We partnered with EcoVadis, a globally recognized sustainability assessment ratings agency, to adopt a systematic ratings program to evaluate suppliers based on their environmental, business, and social practices. EcoVadis not only evaluates disclosures submitted from suppliers but utilizes a global monitoring system to evaluate business practices. Starting in 2022, EcoVadis is evaluating our supply chain using sustainability criteria across four core themes: environment, labor and human rights, ethics and sustainable procurement. Currently, 38 percent of our enterprise procurement spend, accounting for over 1,600 suppliers, has been assessed in detail across each of these dimensions. Our target is to have detailed assessments of 50 percent of our supplier spend by the end of 2026 and 80 percent by the end of 2028. We also formed a Supplier Council to share sustainability best practices, evaluate and launch new sustainability programs, and contribute to our long-term strategy for supplier engagement. We are proud to have been honored by CDP as a Supplier Engagement Leader and to have achieved Gold standing from EcoVadis, joining the top 5% of the more than 100,000 companies they assess worldwide across Environment, Labor & Human Rights, Ethics and Sustainable Procurement.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ 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

We recognize the urgency of delivering climate solutions now along with the significant opportunity we have to build on our company's history of providing sustainable products and solutions and helping our customers decarbonize. Thus, our strategy includes the commitment aligned to a short-term time horizon to invest 75 percent of our new product development R&D in climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services. In 2023, 90 percent of new product research and development was invested in climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services. Innovations include reduction of emissions across Scope 1, 2

and 3, reduction of material usage, and improved life cycle management. We include sustainability key performance indicators in product design during the stage gate review of our innovation process. We have invested in new services and solutions to capitalize on opportunities created by the efforts to combat climate change. We have invested in, developed and deployed solutions such as Net Zero Buildings as a Service. This as-a-service offering includes turnkey access to successful net zero building roadmaps. Regulations which seek to reduce GHG emissions present a significant risk to our global products business, predominantly our HVAC solutions, if Johnson Controls does not adequately prepare its product portfolio. We are addressing future regulations by transitioning to low-GWP refrigerants, improving energy performance, and investing in efficient electric heat pump heating and cooling equipment to meet and exceed anticipated standards. In addition, Johnson Controls is partnering with customers, leading technology companies, research institutions and government entities to build innovative solutions in pursuit of net zero carbon. Johnson Controls was honored as the 2023 Microsoft Global Independent Software Vendor Partner of the Year among a global field of top Microsoft partners for demonstrating excellence in innovation and implementing customer solutions utilizing Microsoft technology. Johnson Controls and Microsoft are united in our mission to use digitalization and AI to accelerate the net zero transformation of buildings globally.

Operations

(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

☑ Water

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

Johnson Controls drives emissions reductions in our customers' operations and in our own. We continue to take significant climate action and have committed to achieving net zero Scope 1 and 2 carbon emissions by 2040 – ten years ahead of the goal set out in the Paris Climate Agreement. By 2040, we also seek to meet or match 100 percent renewable electricity usage globally. We are ahead of schedule on our ambitious operational emissions targets approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative. We have committed to a scope 1 and 2 reduction of 55 percent in 2030; we have already reached 43.8 percent absolute emissions reduction across our operations since 2017. We also more than doubled our progress toward our goal to reduce greenhouse gas intensity. Our goal is to reduce greenhouse gas intensity by 25 percent in 2025 from our 2017 baseline, and we have achieved a 52.4 percent reduction. The three primary contributors of our scope 1 and 2 emissions are our facilities, refrigerants and fleet. We apply continuous improvement across all categories throughout the year. We have working groups organized under our climate workstream to drive our climate transition plan, including the improvement measures, investments and timing by area: facility, fleet, refrigerants and renewable energy. In 2023, 42.1 percent of our electricity globally was met or matched by renewable sources of energy. In addition to our renewable electricity and 13 sites with on-site renewables, we voluntarily purchase certified Green-e Energy renewable energy certificates (RECs) to match 100 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions for the remainder of our electricity use at our US office, manufacturing, research and development, and branch locations.

[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 allocation

☑ 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

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

Climate-related considerations have influenced our capital and liquidity planning and will continue to influence our financial strategy going forward. We are proud to be a leader in sustainable finance as the first S&P 500 company to have issued three distinct sustainable finance instruments that incentivize combatting climate change. We are the first S&P 500 industrial to issue a sustainability-linked bond in the US debt capital markets. Our sustainability-linked bond ties the interest rate on the bond to the achievement of 2025 interim targets of 35 percent emissions reduction for Scope 1 and 2 and five percent emissions reduction for Scope 3. We have also completed two green bond issuances, making Johnson Controls one of the first industrial companies to issue a green bond in the US debt capital markets. The proceeds of green bond issuance are allocated toward eligible green and social projects. In December 2019, Johnson Controls became one of the first industrial companies to tie its senior revolving credit facilities to individual sustainability metrics in the US syndicated loan market. Our sustainability-linked bond and green bond were issued in line with our integrated sustainable finance framework. This framework is aligned with the International Capital Market Association principles and guidelines for green, social, sustainability, and sustainability-linked bonds and loans. These principles intend to promote integrity of the sustainable financing market by offering guidelines that recommend transparency, disclosure and reporting to drive investment in sustainable projects. This integrated framework received a

positive second-party opinion from Sustainalytics. They called the framework "credible and impactful", noting that our key performance indicators are "very strong" and our sustainable performance targets are "ambitious" to "highly ambitious". This opinion affirms our desire to provide an ESG impact via our debt financing and to further strengthen our commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We have established a Sustainable Finance Committee responsible for evaluating and selecting projects that will receive allocations related to use of proceeds financings, based on adherence to our framework. It also ensures that all eligible green and social projects selected are aligned with our Enterprise Risk Management program.
[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 the organization level only

[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:

☑ Other, please specify :Corporate Knights Sustainable Economy Taxonomy

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue/Turnover

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

14456000000

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

57

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

58

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

80

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

We follow the Corporate Knights Sustainable Economy Taxonomy standard for defining sustainable products and calculating sustainable revenue, with modifications used where necessary to align with specific Johnson Controls solution definitions. Corporate Knights reviews our sustainable revenue metrics and has listed Johnson Controls as number 31 on Corporate Knights Clean 200, up from number 40 last year. The sustainable revenue definition includes: • Products that enable beneficial electrification of heating • Products that exceed minimum energy efficiency regulations for cooling or heating • Products that use low-GWP refrigerants • Products that enable greater energy efficiency in buildings, including energy recovery, building control and automation systems, and other connected products • Digital solutions,

such as OpenBlue, our complete ecosystem of connected technologies, expertise and services • Products that are manufactured with recycled or reground materials • Revenue from the installation, maintenance and service attributable to the products listed above

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:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Corporate Knights Sustainable Economy Taxonomy

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

☑ Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

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

244700000

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

41

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

42

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

50

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

The sustainable CapEx calculation comes from our JCI definition using the CK Taxonomy and the categories in our Sustainable Finance framework. The Johnson Controls Sustainable Finance Framework follows the 2021 editions of the ICMA Green & Social Bond Principles, Sustainability Bond Guidelines and LSTA Green & Social Loan Principles. These principles intend to promote integrity of the Sustainable financing market by offering guidelines that recommend transparency, disclosure and reporting in order to drive investment into Sustainable projects. The Johnson Controls Sustainable Finance Framework has also been established in accordance with the 2020 ICMA Sustainability-Linked Bond Principles and 2021 LSTA Sustainability-Linked Loan Principles.
[Add row]

(5.4.2) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that was associated with eligible and aligned activities under the sustainable finance taxonomy in the reporting year.

Row 1

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:
☑ Acquisition and ownership of buildings
[Add row]

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

(5.5.1) Investment in low-carbon R&D

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.5.2) Comment

Johnson Controls has publicly committed to invest at least 75% of new product R&D into climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services. We have exceeded that goal, with some 90% of our portfolio of research investments related to smart building systems, energy efficiency, and building decarbonization in 2022, areas that will remain top focal areas of R&D focus going forward. We have methodically grown our patent portfolio, reflecting these investments. We were named Forbes 2022 Change the World List in recognition of our innovative OpenBlue solutions offering. Our CEO George Oliver said, " Buildings represent about 40% of global emissions and there is no decarbonizing our future without decarbonizing buildings. We're proud to deliver the innovative, sustainable technology and services that make net zero leadership easier to achieve through our OpenBlue suite of solutions and services. Our recognition on Fortune's 2022 Change the World list underscores the impact that we're continuing to make for our customers, our communities, the built environment and the world." These real-world impacts are already coming to fruition. We have introduced new lines of heat pumps across all of our HVAC product segments, allowing more of our customers to efficiently electrify greater shares of their heating loads. We've introduced new high efficiency cooling solutions as well, including for the rapidly growing datacenter segment, enabling significant reductions in carbon emissions and water consumption for these customers. More of our hardware solutions are integrating with our rapidly expanding digital solutions platform to enable deeper customer insights, operating efficiencies, and sustainable outcomes. In fact, JCI was named Global Sustainability Changemaker and U.S. IoT Partner of the Year for 2022 at Microsoft's annual awards. The Sustainability award was made for the significant societal impact Johnson Controls OpenBlue Enterprise Manager is having on boosting sustainability in buildings, improving ESG scores and enabling data-driven decision-making by customers. The IoT Partner award recognizes Johnson Controls for its OpenBlue platform which collects and primes data from IoT-connected devices inside buildings. It then uses machine learning to deliver insights enabling exceptional efficiency, occupant comfort and safety outcomes.
[Fixed row]

(5.5.2) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for capital goods products and services over the last three years.

Row 1

(5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:
☑ Low to medium temperature heating

(5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Large scale commercial deployment

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

46

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

0

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

47

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

R&D investment in this technology area is focused on new product development and introduction for our hardware platforms, including improvements to energy efficiency and the transition to low and ultra-low GWP refrigerants in our heating and cooling portfolio chiller portfolio, as well as the integration of these products with smart, connected controls. These solutions enable comfort and process heating and cooling, and dramatically reduce our customer's carbon footprint by reducing energy consumption and shifting from fossil combustion to electric end uses. Examples recent product launches from of new product development activities include platform updates to our applied air-to-water and water-to-water YMAE, YVWH, and CYK heat pumps. Heat pumps now utilize low and ultra-low GWP refrigerants that go beyond regulatory requirements, while enabling efficient electrification of heating end uses at efficiencies as high as 8.0 COP. We also improved the hot water temperature of these heat pumps to up to 176F, while also introducing modular design strategies for easier installation.

Row 3

(5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Control systems

(5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Full/commercial-scale demonstration

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

30

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

0

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

35

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

R&D in this technology area is focused on development and demonstration of our digital solutions, including our OpenBlue platform and expanding its suite of capabilities. These solutions are an enabler of smart building buildings, connect discrete building systems, and optimize building operations to deliver healthy, secure, efficient, and net zero outcomes. Examples of recent product launches from new product development activities include: 1. Our OpenBlue Connected Chillers platform, which gathers data from over 200 points on a chiller and uses advanced AI to create a detailed picture of how it's performing. The platform can identify ways to optimize chiller operation and keep it running at maximum efficiency, delivering energy savings of 20% or more. 2. OpenBlue Net Zero Advisor, which enables building asset managers to set targets for and track against Scope 1 and 2 emissions for their facilities. Net Zero Advisor integrates with our other OpenBlue solutions to help our customers make continued progress toward their own decarbonization goals.

Row 4

(5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Low to medium temperature heating

(5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Applied research and development

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

9

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

0

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

10

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

R&D investment in this technology area is focused on discrete component-level development and testing and product development intended to address new applications or expanded operating maps. Included in this category is work on new compressor designs that can utilize low and ultra-low GWP refrigerants in existing applications. This effort may create new opportunities for certain segments of our cooling portfolio that are currently transitioning to low GWP refrigerants, but where feasible ultra-low GWP refrigerant options have not yet been identified.
[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)

6.5

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

7.5

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

6.5

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

7.5

(5.9.5) Please explain

After major investments in 2022, we normalized increases in water CAPEX and OPEX to more regular levels. However, several facilities were able to implement water projects in a cost effective manner and we increased the scope of facilities covered by water projects over the year. The percentage change is estimated based on water spend on water consumption and projects implemented to improve water conservation. Forward trend data is proposed in our long-range planning process and subjecto change. Several investments specifically focused on implementing sanitary water reuse and rainwater collection in India and Mexico.
[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:
☑ Implicit price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Drive energy efficiency
☑ Drive low-carbon investment
☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making
☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
☑ Influence strategy and/or financial planning

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify

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

We include the S&P Global Carbon Credit Index1 in our internal carbon price assessment as a point of reference, since it reflects real-world, market-based carbon pricing. Carbon credit futures are utilized to access carbon credit markets due to their liquidity and accessibility to investors. The eligible carbon credit futures for the index are selected based on the most liquid segments of the relevant markets. It provides a benchmark for comparison, insights into carbon market volatility and capturing market expectations of future carbon prices. Since its publication in June 2023, the average weighted carbon price was 52 per MT CO2e for 2023. 1https://indicesweb.ihsmarkit.com/Carbon/details/index?idGLCARB

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:
☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:
☑ Evolutionary

(5.10.1.9) Indicate how you expect the price to change over time

We use the S&P Global Carbon Credit Index as a benchmark in our internal carbon price assessment because it mirrors market-based pricing. As this index evolves or new methodologies emerge, we will adjust our reference points and refine our carbon pricing strategies to align with our emissions reduction goals.

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

52

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

52

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

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Operations

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify **:**We use the price to prioritize emissions reduction projects and investments.

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

100

(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

Johnson Controls utilizes an implicit price on carbon as a reference point for energy efficiency and emissions reduction projects. As we prepare for the upcoming fiscal year, we assess the list of improvement initiatives, targeted emissions reductions, and the associated investment or cost savings for each measure. Our Climate Council prioritizes and selects projects based on their potential for both emissions reduction and financial savings/costs to be implemented in the next fiscal year. For each initiative, we evaluate the cost of carbon abatement per metric ton while balancing selections against the implicit price of carbon. The price is used as input to prioritize projects; however, it is not the only criteria used to guide our decision to invest in energy or emissions reduction projects. In 2023, Johnson Controls invested in several projects with an implicit price greater than 50 MT CO2e.
[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 ☑ Water ☑ Plastics
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

The threshold for classify suppliers having substantive dependencies on the environment is an Ecovadis score under 45.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

529

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

☑ Impact on water availability

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

The threshold for classify suppliers having substantive dependencies on the environment is an Ecovadis score under 45.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

529

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

☑ Impact on plastic waste and pollution

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

The threshold for classify suppliers having substantive dependencies on the environment is an Ecovadis score under 45.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

529
[Fixed row]

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

☑ Vulnerability of suppliers

☑ Product safety and compliance

☑ Supplier performance improvement

☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, we expanded our Supplier Sustainability Program to include EcoVadis, a globally-recognized environmental, social and governance (ESG) assessment ratings agency, in order to evaluate our supply chain. As part of the evaluation, we measure climate related measures and use those to score and prioritize the suppliers we engage with.

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

☑ Material sourcing
☑ Regulatory compliance
☑ Reputation management
☑ Vulnerability of suppliers
☑ Product safety and compliance
☑ Supplier performance improvement
☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to water

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, we expanded our Supplier Sustainability Program to include EcoVadis, a globally-recognized environmental, social and governance (ESG) assessment ratings agency, in order to evaluate our supply chain. As part of the evaluation, we measure water related measures and use those to score and prioritize the suppliers we engage with.

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
☑ Material sourcing
☑ Regulatory compliance
☑ Reputation management
☑ Vulnerability of suppliers
☑ Product safety and compliance
☑ Supplier performance improvement
☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to plastics

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, we expanded our Supplier Sustainability Program to include EcoVadis, a globally-recognized environmental, social and governance (ESG) assessment ratings agency, in order to evaluate our supply chain. As part of the evaluation, we measure plastic related measures and use those to score and prioritize the suppliers we engage with.
[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

Our supplier contract terms and conditions include a Sustainability section. Suppliers agree that there is a recognition, belief in, and practice of the principles of sustainable business woven into the fabric of how they will conduct themselves. Elements considered include supporting the Global Reporting Initiative, taking voluntary initiatives to reduce environmental impacts and participation in the Carbon Disclosure Project. Our supplier scorecards weight sustainability equal to cost, quality and delivery in supplier performance evaluations.

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:

☑ 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

Our supplier contract terms and conditions include a Sustainability section. Suppliers agree that there is a recognition, belief in, and practice of the principles of sustainable business woven into the fabric of how they will conduct themselves. Elements considered include supporting the Global Reporting Initiative, taking voluntary initiatives to reduce environmental impacts and participation in the Carbon Disclosure Project. Our supplier scorecards weight sustainability equal to cost, quality and delivery in supplier performance evaluations
[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:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ 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:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(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:

☑ None

(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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Through our EcoVadis program, we assess our suppliers and create transparency on four key pillars: environment, labor and human rights, ethics and sustainable procurement. When an issue arises, we proactively work with the supplier to develop corrective actions. Our sourcing board reviews the supplier scorecard and specific sustainability ratings. Supplier evaluations are reviewed by category managers. Suppliers identified as high-risk require an improvement plan. Where the supplier has scored poorly, we expect all issues will be immediately resolved by the supplier or that the category manager will raise the issue to the procurement leadership lead for immediate risk mitigation. If the supplier doesn't remedy the issues, it can result in termination of the business relationship. We also rely on local, state and federal agencies to monitor suppliers' compliance with environmental and labor laws. We often have direct discussions with regulatory agencies to review a supplier's compliance record and we even perform site audits of selected suppliers to ensure that the proper environmental and social processes are documented, implemented and remain effective. Further supplier oversight may also be prompted by negative reports regarding the environmental and social conditions of a supplier's facility or process. Along these same lines, the falsification of data is taken very seriously and appropriate follow-up actions are taken whenever data is suspect.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ 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:

☑ 100%

(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:

☑ 100%

(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:

☑ 100%

(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:

☑ None

(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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Through our EcoVadis program, we assess our suppliers and create transparency on four key pillars: environment, labor and human rights, ethics and sustainable procurement. When an issue arises, we proactively work with the supplier to develop corrective actions. Our sourcing board reviews the supplier scorecard and specific sustainability ratings. Supplier evaluations are reviewed by category managers. Suppliers identified as high-risk require an improvement plan. Where the supplier has scored poorly, we expect all issues will be immediately resolved by the supplier or that the category manager will raise the issue to the procurement leadership lead for immediate risk mitigation. If the supplier doesn't remedy the issues, it can result in termination of the business relationship. We also rely on local, state and federal agencies to monitor suppliers' compliance with environmental and labor laws. We often have direct discussions with regulatory agencies to review a supplier's compliance record and we even perform site audits of selected suppliers to ensure that the proper environmental and social processes are documented, implemented and remain effective. Further supplier oversight may also be prompted by negative reports regarding the environmental and social conditions of a

supplier's facility or process. Along these same lines, the falsification of data is taken very seriously and appropriate follow-up actions are taken whenever data is suspect.
[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

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

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

As a founding member of the US State Department and World Economic Forum's First Movers Coalition, we are committed to reducing our impact in high-carbon sectors, dialing down carbon in one of the tough-to-abate sectors: steel. Johnson Controls continues to make progress to significantly reduce embodied carbon, with more than 70 percent of our steel purchases in the US and 45 percent globally produced from recycled scrap materials using the low-carbon electric arc furnace steel-making technology, which averages 60 to 75 percent less carbon than traditional blast furnace steel manufacturing. In 2023, We launched a circular steel program with Nucor Steel where 100 percent of steel scrap from five major manufacturing locations in the US, including Norman, Oklahoma and Wichita, Kansas, will be reused in new purchased products. We also have a circular aluminum program with 100 percent of aluminum scrap from these Norman and Wichita plants going back to our aluminum supplier. We are accelerating our supplier engagement for other sourced components to expand low-carbon materials options and improve the accuracy of our product carbon footprint.

(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 **:**The low-carbon electric arc furnace steel-making technology uses on average 60 to 75 percent less carbon than traditional blast furnace steel manufacturing greatly reducing negative impacts on the environment.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Substitution of hazardous substances with less harmful substances

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

☑ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

Financial incentives

☑ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

☑ Include long-term contracts linked to environmental commitments

Information collection

☑ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect water quality information at least annually from suppliers (e.g., discharge quality, pollution incidents, hazardous substances)

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

In Mexico, many water kaizens were performed during our fiscal year as part of our environmental initiatives in our manufacturing plants. For example, at one site, our restroom water is recycled gray water from an industrial park that helps to maintain the circularity of water. One of the most important achievements, however, occurred at our Cienega site, where our EHS and maintenance teams led to working with our suppliers on a project to install water-saving equipment, including new plumbing and more efficient toilets. As a result of this, we've reduced approximately 38 percent of our 2023 average water withdrawals in cubic meters/earned hours. We measure consumption from facilities in our operational control of our manufacturing and office buildings, as well as detecting and repairing water leaks,

recalibrating flow meters and deploying water-saving technologies. Since 2018, we've implemented projects globally to work with our suppliers to reduce water consumption and promote recycling and reuse processes, further enhancing circular processes throughout our global network of facilities. To complement this, our recycling processes also enable the proper discharge of water through wastewater treatment processes to prevent discharge to the natural, freshwater environment.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Plastics

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

[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

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Other innovation and collaboration, please specify **:**For our customers, we offer a broad product portfolio of products and services that help them reduce the emissions of their facilities.

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

For our customers, we offer a broad product portfolio powered by OpenBlue, together with our direct channel service and solutions capabilities, to address customers' needs in improving energy efficiency and reducing GHG emissions. OpenBlue Net Zero Buildings as a Service is a turnkey solution for companies looking to achieve net zero carbon and renewable energy goals. It offers real-time performance dashboards that analyze energy, water, materials and greenhouse gas emissions. Our line of YORK chillers includes the YORK YZ magnetic-bearing centrifugal chiller, the most efficient chiller in the world. In addition to delivering a 35% improvement in energy efficiency over a conventional chiller, it also utilizes a next-gen refrigerant with a 99% reduction in global warming potential and a refrigerant charge up to 60% lower than other systems. We have introduced ducted systems products that exceed the Department of Energy standards for energy efficiency well ahead of the compliance date, including our YORK Sun Choice rooftop units, which are up to 45% more efficient than these standards. Lastly, our world-class heat pumps. These products enable homes, buildings, campuses, and district systems to achieve efficient, beneficial electrification by shifting away from direct fuel combustion. Johnson Controls-Hitachi launched its latest variable refrigerant flow heat pump platform. It achieves an approximate 50% improvement in energy efficiency over the first-gen design, offers low ambient heating options to deliver reliable operation in colder climates, and features a frost wash function to keep the outdoor heat exchanger clean while boosting energy performance. We also launched a new side flow product platform to improve design flexibility and performance. The modular system features a 40% smaller footprint and 15% lower refrigerant charge when compared to conventional systems. Both help provide heating and cooling without the use of on-site fuel combustion. We also help our customers achieve energy savings using Energy Performance Contracting. We deploy equipment upgrades and management services to deliver guaranteed energy savings and help customers achieve GHG reductions.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We measure the effectiveness of our engagement with customers through the operational savings and emissions savings achieved through the use of our products and services. To date, our performance-contracting projects alone have directly delivered nearly 39 million metric tons in avoided CO2 e and are set to save more than 8.4 billion for our customers through energy and operational savings over project terms.

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

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Johnson Controls' Sustainable Infrastructure teams partners with many of our customers to deliver significant water savings. The team is responsible for install water conservation equipment and updating customer building management systems to reduce water use and provide utility savings across a wide range of customer sectors. In 2023, we guaranteed customers 1.021 trillion gallons in water savings by working with them to determine what aspects of a building can improve water conservation. Project scope is based on customer needs and can vary from equipment retrofits to complete building redesigns.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We track water conservation savings based on water conserved in gallons and cost savings measured in U.S. dollars. In 2023, we guaranteed customers 1.021 trillion gallons in water savings and 23.493 million in cost savings.

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

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

In January 2023, we conducted a materiality assessment to understand the most impactful environmental, social and governance (ESG) topics for our business and to ensure we're building robust strategies to manage our strategic impacts, risks and opportunities. The materiality assessment followed a process where we

identified a list of 25 topics related to leadership and governance, human and social capital, environment, and business model and innovation. We then surveyed 50 external stakeholders including investors and shareholders to gain insight on the highest priority topics.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We measure the effectiveness of engagement by evaluating the number of investors that provide input into our assessment. We also know that investors and shareholders invest in us as we develop sustainable products and solutions.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**NGOs and Trade Associations

(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:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

In January 2023, we conducted a materiality assessment to understand the most impactful environmental, social and governance (ESG) topics for our business and to ensure we're building robust strategies to manage our strategic impacts, risks and opportunities. The materiality assessment followed a process where we identified a list of 25 topics related to leadership and governance, human and social capital, environment, and business model and innovation. We then surveyed 50 external stakeholders including NGOs and trade associations to gain insight on the highest priority topics.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We measure the effectiveness of engagement by evaluating the number of NGOs and trade associations that provide input into our assessment. We also engage in thought leadership activities with many NGOs and trade associations on climate related topics.
[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

[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

We have chosen the Operational Control approach in order to best manage our climate impact. Emissions reported include those facilities (i.e., entities) "controlled" by Johnson Controls. Consistent with the GHG Protocol and Climate Leaders Design Principles: control is "the ability to direct the operating policies of a facility or entity." Energy and emissions reported include facilities and fleet (entities) as defined under the GHG Protocol Corporate Reporting and Accounting Standard, Operational Control approach. The following represent the operationally controlled entities included in the inventory: • Wholly-owned entities • Leased locations - leased locations where Johnson Controls is able to significantly modify operating policies for managing the facility through recognized leasing arrangements and other contractual requirements. More than 90 percent of our leased locations have leasing arrangements which allow us to manage our site operations, and thus are included in the inventory • Consolidated joint ventures greater than 50 percent equity control and financially consolidated.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

We have chosen the Operational Control approach in order to best manage our climate impact. Emissions reported include those facilities (i.e., entities) "controlled" by Johnson Controls. Consistent with the GHG Protocol and Climate Leaders Design Principles: control is "the ability to direct the operating policies of a facility or entity." Energy and emissions reported include facilities and fleet (entities) as defined under the GHG Protocol Corporate Reporting and Accounting Standard, Operational Control approach. The following represent the operationally controlled entities included in the inventory: • Wholly-owned entities • Leased locations -

leased locations where Johnson Controls is able to significantly modify operating policies for managing the facility through recognized leasing arrangements and other contractual requirements. More than 90 percent of our leased locations have leasing arrangements which allow us to manage our site operations, and thus are included in the inventory • Consolidated joint ventures greater than 50 percent equity control and financially consolidated.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**NA

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

NA

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**NA

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

NA
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, a change in methodology

☑ Yes, a change in boundary

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

In 2023 we undertook a strategic review to re-screen the organization for each Category of Scope 3 emissions, update calculation methodologies to align with industry best practices, and include sources of information that had been previously unavailable. This resulted in revised calculations for our 2017 base year for Scope 3 Categories 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, and 12. Revisions to our previously stated emissions for Categories 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are relatively modest. Revisions to Category 11 are significant, as previously unavailable sources of data allowed us to (1) expand our boundary to include more product types sold and (2) update our

methodology to incorporate granular product characteristics. Revisions to Category 12 are significant, as previously unavailable sources of data allowed us to better estimate the emissions resulting from the end of life treatment of more embodied product materials.
[Fixed row]

(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3

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

If we change our emission calculation methodologies or data, for any reason (e.g., improvements in methodology/data or discovery of an error, discovery of a previously unidentified source), and if application of the new methodologies would contribute to a cumulative total change in our base year emissions of more than five percent, we will recalculate our base year using the new methodologies. This ensures that our base year will remain comparable with the more recent emissions data.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*We report both location-based and market-based scope 2 emissions to ensure full transparency.*

[Fixed row]

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

682761.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse

Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

400442.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

396612.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3826000.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Standards, methodologies, assumptions and calculation tools used for direct (scope 1) and indirect (scope 2 and 3) GHG emissions: Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1891000.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Standards, methodologies, assumptions and calculation tools used for direct (scope 1) and indirect (scope 2 and 3) GHG emissions: Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European

Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Standards, methodologies, assumptions and calculation tools used for direct (scope 1) and indirect (scope 2 and 3) GHG emissions: Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

460000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

As above

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

As above

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

As above

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

203000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

As above

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/30/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

238338000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Standards, methodologies, assumptions and calculation tools used for direct (scope 1) and indirect (scope 2 and 3) GHG emissions: Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The

Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4276000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Standards, methodologies, assumptions and calculation tools used for direct (scope 1) and indirect (scope 2 and 3) GHG emissions: Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

09/29/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

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

405288

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Past year 1

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

410103

(7.6.2) End date

09/29/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Past year 2

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

451311

(7.6.2) End date

09/29/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate

Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)
[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)

200819

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

308046

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Past year 1

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

331839

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

213336

(7.7.3) End date

09/29/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)

Past year 2

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

212918

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

300725

(7.7.3) End date

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Activity data is mostly tracked using our Environmental Health and Safety Information System (EHSIS) tool. A small portion of the data is also tracked using templates consistent with the below listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance, An amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator Tool • Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Direct fugitive emissions from refrigeration, air conditioning, fire suppression and industrial gases • The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol • The Climate Registry: Electric Power Sector (EPS) Protocol • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Indirect Emissions from Purchases/Sales of Electricity and Steam • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion • U.S. EPA Climate Leaders: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources and DEFRA • GHG emissions consolidation approach for scopes 1 and 2: Operational control • Emission factor sources: - US EPA Emissions Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2022 - Scope 1 Stationary and Mobile Emissions Sources - US EPA, eGRID 2022 - US, market- and location-based electricity - National Inventory Report 1990–2018 (Canada) – Canada electricity - International Energy Agency (IEA) Emissions Factors 2022 - rest of world, market- and location-based electricity - DEFRA Conversion Factors 2022 - UK scope 1 and 2 emissions sources - European Residual Mixes 2021, Association of Issuing Bodies - multiple European countries, market-based electricity - Comparison of Particulate Emissions from Liquid-Fueled Pool Fires and Fire Whirls at Different Length Scales, UC Berkeley, March 2021 - heptane - GWP values taken from: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 years)
[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)

3164000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We use a spend-based method for estimating the emissions of purchased goods and services per the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Standard. We have a global spend report for the fiscal year broken down by commodity category. Some of the included categories are: metals, services, etc. Using this categorization level, we mapped the spend report using the categories provided in the EPA EEIO model, and calculate our emissions using the CO2e factors provided.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

680000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We use a spend-based method for estimating the emissions of capital goods per the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Standard. We have a global spend report for the fiscal year broken down by commodity category. Some of the included categories are: metals, services, etc. Using this categorization level, we mapped the spend report using the categories provided in the EPA EEIO model, and calculate our emissions using the CO2e factors provided.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

29000

(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

For this category we compute the emissions from the transmission and distribution losses for the volume of electricity consumed and "well-to-tank" emissions for other fuels consumed. For electricity, we use the "Electric Power Transmission and Distribution Losses (% of Output)" data table from the International Energy Agency. We then extract our Scope 2 location-based emissions for electricity by country and apply the latest T&D loss factors by country accordingly in order to compute a global total of emissions. For losses from the consumption of other fuels, we extract consumption data used to calculate our Scope 1 emissions and apply WTT emissions factors provided by DEFRA.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

173000

(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

75

(7.8.5) Please explain

Our transport logistics teams compile information regarding the weight and distance of inbound, intercompany, and outbound shipping by region and mode of transportation. This data is used to calculate the ton-mileage of our upstream transportation and distribution, per the EPA SmartWay methodology, and apply emissions factors by mode of transportation. For shipments where ton-mileage data is unavailable, a spend-based method is used to estimate emissions through extrapolation.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

15000

(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

Using the mass of waste hauled during the fiscal year by disposition method, we compute process emissions from the waste generated in our operations. Emissions factors for CO2e per ton of waste from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership are used.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

30000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Air travel: Johnson Controls works with travel agencies who are able to generate and provide us with a GHG report that shows total miles flown as well as total GHG emissions attributed to them per division globally. Latest emission factors for air travel from UK DEFRA are used to estimate emissions. Rental vehicles: We retrieve mileage driven by employees using rental vehicles. We use EPA emission factors for emissions per vehicle-mile to estimate impact.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

213000

(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

We use the average commuting profile for the US and Europe, the company's largest employee density areas, to estimate the emissions from commuting. These profiles were applied to the average distance a sample of employee travel from their home to work on a work year based on prior year survey. These emissions were then extrapolated to the rest of the global employees.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Indirect emissions from leased space are already estimated and reported under Scope 1 and Scope 2.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Johnson Controls does not directly pay for or control the transport or distribution of our inbound or outbound products once they are sold to our customers. In addition to not having control over this category, Johnson Controls has recognized that this category is not material from a magnitude standpoint as category 4 -upstream transportation & distribution would be, when analyzing the transportation of its products. Thus in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report according to Scope 3-category 4.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category has been defined as being not relevant, not material for Johnson Controls. Our products do not undergo additional processing other than simple assembly making this category not relevant for our business activities.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

173772000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :see explanation

☑ Methodology for indirect use phase emissions, please specify :see explanation

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This value represents the lifetime use phase emissions from HVACR products that Johnson Controls sold during our reporting year period. Our HVACR products represent the material portion of our use phase emissions sources. Our team developed an assessment methodology that estimates the GHG emissions - driven by energy consumption and fugitive refrigerant losses - for the life of the product. The methodology utilizes actual product performance and energy efficiency data for all products sold, and estimates product duty cycles based on sales location, to estimate direct and indirect emissions resulting from their use. Products in the scope of our analysis include the following business units: Ducted Systems, Johnson Controls-Hitachi Joint Venture, Commercial Chillers, Air Handlers and Industrial Refrigeration Equipment. Product attributes include heating and cooling capacity, heating and cooling efficiency, refrigerant charge, and refrigerant GWP. The category excludes Controls, Fire, Security and sourced products without Johnson Controls branding as these products generally have low-to-no energy consumption and therefore de minimis use phase emissions. Within our included product categories, some exclusions are made for product volumes or use phase emissions deemed de minimis.

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)

2495000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average product method

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

50

(7.8.5) Please explain

This value represents the estimated emissions at the end of life for the HVACR products sold in a reporting year. For refrigerant emissions, refrigerant charge data is extracted from our Scope 3, category 11 data to determine the total volume of refrigerant charged by GWP and product type. End of life leakage rate estimates, which vary by product, are applied from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership. For all other materials, average material breakdown and weight are taken by analyzing representative products and extrapolated to all products sold in a reporting year. Emissions factors for end of life disposal by material type are applied from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have a handful of office spaces that are subleased, but they are a minor footprint that is immaterial to our overall Scope 3 emissions. Therefore, this category is not relevant to our company.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Johnson Controls does not own any franchises, therefore, this category is not relevant to our Scope 3 emissions.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Johnson Controls has previously focused on collecting data for its minority non-operationally controlled joint ventures that are not included in scope 1 and 2. In the past the material portion of this category existed under the Automotive Seating business which is no longer part of the company and is now an independent company.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Johnson Controls has no other upstream scope 3 emissions.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Johnson Controls has no other downstream scope 3 emissions.

[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

09/30/2022

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

3515000

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

694000

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

33000

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

236000

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

15000

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

18000

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

214000

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

222592000

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

2974000

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

We have reduced scope 3 emissions from the use of sold products by 27 percent compared to fiscal year 2017. The use of sold products represents more than 95 percent of our scope 3 emissions.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

09/30/2021

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

2858000

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

564000

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

43000

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

403000

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

11000

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

9000

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

215000

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

224871000

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

4058000

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

We have reduced scope 3 emissions from the use of sold products by 27 percent compared to fiscal year 2017. The use of sold products represents more than 95 percent of our scope 3 emissions.
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

GHG JCI FY 2023 Verification Statement.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

1-3

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

GHG JCI FY 2023 Verification Statement.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1-3

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
☑ Scope 3: Business travel
☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products
☑ 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: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

GHG JCI FY23 Verification Statement.PDF

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

1-3

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(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)

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

N/A

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17334

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.78

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The emissions value (percentage) represents the decrease in other emissions reduction activities of 17,334 metric tons CO2e from FY2022 to FY2023 divided by total FY2022 Scope 1 and 2 total emissions of 606,107 metric tons CO2e.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Change in output

(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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A
[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

(7.11) How do your total Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.11.1) For each Scope 3 category calculated in 7.8, specify how your emissions compare to the previous year and identify the reason for any change.

Purchased goods and services

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:
☑ Change in material efficiency

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

351000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

10

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Modest changes in material carbon intensity and procurement volume.

Capital goods

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☑ Change in material efficiency

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

14000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

2

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Modest changes in material carbon intensity and capital investment.

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

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

4000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

12

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Improvements in the energy efficiency of our operations drove lower energy consumption, and thus a decrease in emissions from energy losses.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:
☑ Other emissions reduction activities

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

173000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

27

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Decreases in shipment weight due to packaging improvements, decreases in shipment volume, and improvements in fuel efficiency.

Waste generated in operations

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

In 2023, 23 manufacturing locations, representing 25 percent of our total manufacturing locations, had a 100 percent diversion rate and were recognized as zero landfill. In addition, in 2023, our overall landfill diversion rate was 89 percent, with every location encouraged to increase the reuse and recycling of materials. While this landfill diversion rate excludes landfill and incineration with no energy recovery, it includes documented reuse, recycling, composting and incineration with energy recovery.

Business travel

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:
☑ Change in output

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

12000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

67

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Changes in post-COVID travel restrictions led to an increase in business travel overall.

Employee commuting

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☑ Change in output

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

1000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

0

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Changes in employee headcount.

Use of sold products

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☑ Change in product efficiency

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

48820000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

22

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Significant improvements in product efficiency, improvements in customer energy intensity, improvements in refrigerant GWP, shifts in product volume.

End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:
☑ Change in material efficiency

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

479000

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

16

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Improvements in refrigerant GWP, shifts in product volume.
[Fixed row]

(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.

	CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)	Comment
	4313	*Biogenic emissions are the result of wood pellet combustion, ethanol consumption and the purchase of steam from verified biomass sources.*

[Fixed row]

(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)

303853

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

51

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

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

98

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ HFCs

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

101286

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 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)

457

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

127

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

127

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1678

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

1675

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

1675

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1049

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

86

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

0.001

Bahrain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

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

8

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

8

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

840

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

140

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

127

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

721

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

692

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

692

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17544

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

4746

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

4746

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1737

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

888

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

888

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32795

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

68852

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

68852

China, Macao Special Administrative Region

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

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

13

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

13

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

77

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

34

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

34

Costa Rica

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

244

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

2

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

2

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

358

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

1089

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

1455

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

830

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

734

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

4102

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

99

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

6

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

22

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4139

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

193

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

176

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10879

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

2332

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

4583

Guam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.825

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

0.002

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

0.002

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

46

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

250

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

250

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

330

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

287

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

358

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5061

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

17234

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

17234

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10

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

78

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

78

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1216

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

834

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

1771

Israel

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27

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

84

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

84

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1603

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

583

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

810

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2762

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

26376

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

26376

Kazakhstan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.96

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

7.552

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

7.552

Kuwait

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3

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

13

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

13

Luxembourg

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

81

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

11

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

42

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

640

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

6896

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

6896

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

41886

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

27300

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

27300

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2060

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

821

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

841

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1489

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

110

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

110

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

166

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

4

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

207

Oman

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14

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

27

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

27

Panama

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27

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

2

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

2

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15

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

2

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

2

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1704

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

1631

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

217

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

126

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

72

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

97

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

117

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

52

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

78

Puerto Rico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7

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

0.06

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

0.056

Qatar

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19

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

52

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

52

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

118

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

874

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

874

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13

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

0.14

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

0.14

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

29

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

69

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

69

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

75

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

496

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

496

Slovakia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

346

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

378

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

523

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

570

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

506

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

506

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1925

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

839

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

398

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

151

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

31

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

40

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

835

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

25

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

20

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4235

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

19270

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

19270

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

51

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

1365

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

1365

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

808

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

355

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

355

Ukraine

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1

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

1

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

1

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2656

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

525

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

525

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17221

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

2896

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

5259

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

237003

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

116678

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

1229

Uruguay

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

195

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

6

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

6

Uzbekistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1

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

2

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

1

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3

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

21

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

21
[Fixed row]

(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	*Building Solutions*	*241074*
Row 2	*Global Products*	*161338*
Row 3	*Corporate*	*2774*

[Add row]

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Fugitive emissions*	*101286*
Row 2	*Mobile combustion*	*219918*

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 3	*Stationary combustion*	*84083*

[Add row]

(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	*Building Solutions*	*48363*	*29374*
Row 2	*Global Products*	*253414*	*168803*
Row 3	*Corporate*	*6907*	*2642*

[Add row]

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*fugitive emissions*	*0*	*0*
Row 2	*mobile combustion*	*0*	*0*

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 3	*Stationary combustion*	*308684*	*200819*

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

405288

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

308046

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

200819

(7.22.4) Please explain

Energy and emissions reported include facilities and fleet (entities) as defined under the GHG Protocol Corporate Reporting and Accounting Standard, Operational Control approach. The following represent the operationally controlled entities included in the inventory: • Wholly-owned entities • Leased locations - leased locations where Johnson Controls is able to significantly modify operating policies for managing the facility through recognized leasing arrangements and other contractual requirements. More than 90 percent of our leased locations have leasing arrangements which allow us to manage our site operations, and thus are included in the inventory • Consolidated joint ventures greater than 50 percent equity control and financially consolidated Our GHG emissions inventory includes scope 1, scope 2 and the categories for scope 3 that are relevant and significant to our company. Use of purchased electricity and steam are reported as indirect emission sources to avoid double counting by organizations or agencies interested in compiling national inventory data.

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

Per the above
[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

(7.26) 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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

45

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

18

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

19780

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 6

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 7

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

589

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 9

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

30

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 10

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 11

(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 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

13302

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 14

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

252

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 15

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 16

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

112353

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 18

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 19

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 20

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1041

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3846

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 26

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 27

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 28

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

940

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 30

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 31

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 32

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1343

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

234

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

104045

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 41

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

374

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 42

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 43

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

166642

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

348

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 50

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

155235

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 51

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3394

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 52

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1683

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 53

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1512228

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 54

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

514

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 55

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 56

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

228862

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 57

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 58

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 59

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3982

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 60

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

167

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 61

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 62

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

74566

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 63

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

764

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 64

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 65

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

340543

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 66

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1748

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

867

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 71

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

778858

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 73

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

18

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 74

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 75

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8097

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

45

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

19954

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 81

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2358

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 82

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1169

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 84

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1050381

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 85

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 86

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 87

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

202

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 90

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

56

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 91

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 92

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

25128

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 93

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

145

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 94

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 95

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

64400

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 97

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

131

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 98

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 99

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

58230

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 102

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 103

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 104

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1589

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 106

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

292

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 107

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 108

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

130297

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 109

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

25

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 110

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

11121

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

24

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10487

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

19

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8403

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

52

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

26

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

23273

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

857

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

381682

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 125

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 126

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 128

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

119

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 129

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 130

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

52921

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 131

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

213

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 132

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 133

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

94905

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 134

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 135

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 136

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1053

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 137

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

128

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 138

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 139

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

56818

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 140

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 141

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 142

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 143

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 144

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 145

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 146

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

75

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 147

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

37

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 148

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

33288

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 149

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

140

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 150

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

69

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 151

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

62399

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 152

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 153

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 154

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4116

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 155

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 156

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 157

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 158

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 159

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 160

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 161

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 162

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 163

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 164

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

37

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 165

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

18

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 166

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

16343

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 167

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

7

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 168

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 169

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2973

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 170

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 171

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 172

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

551

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 173

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

274

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 174

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

136

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 175

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

122158

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 176

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 177

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 178

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 179

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 180

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 181

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

700

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 182

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 183

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 184

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 185

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 186

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 187

(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 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 188

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

53

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 189

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 190

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

23815

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 191

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 192

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 193

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

231

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 194

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

161

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 195

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

80

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 196

(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 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

71586

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 197

(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

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas, propane, and fossil fuel consumption from plants and vehicle fleet; as well as from refrigerant fugitive losses at the Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 198

(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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity consumed at Buildings division plants.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.

Row 199

(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 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

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Use of sold products, product end of life, purchased goods and services, and capital goods.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

We use percentage sales to allocate emissions, assuming that the sales proportion is the same as the GHG proportion.
[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:

☑ Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We use an approach that allocates total greenhouse gas emissions based on the sales percentage. Given our extremely broad and diverse customer and product base, collecting customer greenhouse gas data for each specific sale is not feasible. The development and deployment of tracking systems of a sophistication surpassing current capabilities would alleviate this challenge.
[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

	Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*We have put together a working group to manage consolidation of sales data across multiple ERP systems*

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

14423

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1356567

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1370990

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

289765

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

398546

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

688310

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

1561

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2993

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

4553

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

0

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

0

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

305748

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1758106

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

2063854
[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:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

9595

(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

9595

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Wood pellet burner is used to generate heat at one of our manufacturing plants.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

4828

(7.30.7.8) Comment

NA

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

NA

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We don't purchase coal

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

915231

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

12459

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

902771

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Some of our manufacturing plants use back-up generators to produce electricity during construction or during power-cuts

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

441337

(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

441337

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Natural gas used for space heating

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

NA

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1370990

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

12459

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1358531

(7.30.7.8) Comment

NA
[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)

12459

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

12459

(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)

12459

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)

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

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

61074

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2009

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

115.25

(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:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Solar, Biomas, Landfill Gas, Geothermal, or Hydroelectric

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4071.89

(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:

☑ Spain

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Wind, Solar, Biomas, Landfill Gas, Geothermal, or Hydroelectric

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1986.5

(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:
☑ Philippines

(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

NA

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Sweden

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Solar, Biomas, Landfill Gas, Geothermal, or Hydroelectric

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1778.29

(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:

☑ Sweden

(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

NA

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(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:

☑ Steam

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1560.52

(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:

☑ Sweden

(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

NA

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

11123

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2007

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 8

(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:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4214

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2015

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

50000

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2018

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

13708

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 11

(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:

☑ Sustainable biomass

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

108753

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2013

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 12

(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:
☑ Other biomass

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1247

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Solar, Biomas, Landfill Gas, Geothermal, or Hydroelectric

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

402

(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:

☑ Italy

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

NA
[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)

441

(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)

441.00

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2002

(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)

2002.00

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

680

(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)

680.00

Bahrain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11

(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)

11.00

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

725

(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)

725.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7354

(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)

7354.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13540

(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)

13540.00

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1725

(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)

1725.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

111019

(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)

111019.00

China, Macao Special Administrative Region

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

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)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

18.00

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

141

(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)

141.00

Costa Rica

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

815

(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)

815.00

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2630

(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)

2630.00

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7770

(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)

7770.00

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

77

(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)

77.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3439

(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)

3439.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6838

(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)

6838.00

Guam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4

(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)

4.00

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

77

(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)

77.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1288

(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)

1288.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

23582

(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)

23582.00

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

87

(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)

87.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4271

(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)

4271.00

Israel

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

164

(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)

164.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1955

(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)

1955.00

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

54982

(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)

54982.00

Kazakhstan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12

(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)

12.00

Kuwait

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20

(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)

20.00

Luxembourg

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

85

(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)

85.00

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10510

(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)

10510.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

67761

(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)

67761.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2602

(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)

2602.00

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

703

(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)

703.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

472

(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)

472.00

Oman

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

70

(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)

70.00

Panama

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

7.00

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

9.00

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2262

(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)

2262.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2262

(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)

2262.00

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

108

(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)

108.00

Qatar

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

265

(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)

265.00

Puerto Rico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

41

(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)

41.00

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

101

(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)

101.00

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1

(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)

1.00

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

181

(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)

181.00

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1040

(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)

1040.00

Slovakia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2356

(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)

2356.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

545

(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)

545.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5309

(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)

5309.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3747

(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)

3747.00

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

916

(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)

916.00

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

34949

(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)

34949.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2826

(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)

2826.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

845

(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)

845.00

Ukraine

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3.00

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

962

(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)

962.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4551

(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)

4551.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

283596

(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)

283596.00

Uruguay

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

157

(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)

157.00

Uzbekistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4

(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)

4.00

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

28

(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)

28.00
[Fixed row]

(7.34) Does your organization measure the efficiency of any of its products or services?

	Measurement of product/service efficiency	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*NA*

[Fixed row]

(7.34.1) Provide details of the metrics used to measure the efficiency of your organization's products or services.

Row 1

(7.34.1.1) Category of product or service

Select from:
☑ Heating & cooling systems

(7.34.1.2) Product or service (optional)

Direct Expansion (DX) Residential & Commercial Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps, Applied Commercial & Industrial Chillers and Heat Pumps

(7.34.1.3) % of revenue from this product or service in the reporting year

65

(7.34.1.4) Efficiency figure in the reporting year

8

(7.34.1.5) Metric numerator

Select from:

☑ watt-hour

(7.34.1.6) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ watt-hour

(7.34.1.7) Comment

We have the world's largest portfolio of applied air-to-water and water-to-water chillers and heat pumps. These systems are used to heat and cool buildings, data centers, district systems, industrial and food processes, and more. Our industry-leading technologies enable ultra-high efficiencies, the use of low and ultra-low global warming potential refrigerants at reduced charge, oil-free magnetic bearing compressors, and high temperature-high lift applications. Taken together our applied chillers and heat pumps enable our customers to dramatically cut their energy use, efficiently shift heating end uses from fossil fuel combustion to electricity, and reduce their carbon emissions.Our DX residential and commercial portfolio includes ducted and ductless, split and packaged, air conditioners and heat pumps. Products are commonly available at efficiencies that significantly exceed those required by mandatory regulations globally, and launched in advance of regulatory compliance deadlines. Through this portfolio we enable residential and light commercial buildings to efficiently meet their comfort heating and cooling needs, as well as shift heating loads from fossil fuel combustion to electricity.Every heating and cooling product is rated for energy efficiency per industry standards or regulatory requirements. While methodologies and rating requirements vary globally, they can generally be converted to watt/watt efficiency and expressed as a coefficient of performance (COP). COP ratings are dependent on both the technology and application and can reach as high as 8.0.
[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

22.6

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

606105

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

26793

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

8.2

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply
☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

We achieved an emission reduction of 2.78% despite the company growing with an increase in revenue of nearly 6% year over year.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

277.3

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

7,429,875

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

26,793

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

5.4

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

We achieved an energy reduction of nearly 1% despite the company growing with an increase in revenue of nearly 6% year over 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

JOHC-IRE-001-OFF Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

04/02/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ 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

09/30/2017

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

682761

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

396612

(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)

1079373.000

(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

09/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

55

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

485717.850

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

405288

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

200819

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

606107.000

(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

79.72

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Emissions and energy reported include facilities and fleet (entities) as defined under the GHG Protocol Corporate Reporting and Accounting Standard, Operational Control approach. The following represent the operationally controlled entities included in the inventory: • Wholly owned entities • Leased-locations - leased entities where Johnson Controls is able to significantly modify operating policies for managing the facility through recognized leasing arrangements and other contractual requirements. More than 90 percent of our leased locations have leasing arrangements which allow us to manage our site operations, thus are included in the

inventory • Joint venture entities greater than 50 percent equity and financially consolidated The GHG inventory accounts for owned and leased manufacturing sites. For office space, this inventory considers and estimates direct and indirect emissions. For estimated emissions, we use a Johnson Controls-specific value based on actual usage from a sample of facilities. We use this energy density value to estimate emissions for all sites. Our GHG emissions inventory includes scope 1, scope 2 and the categories for scope 3 that are relevant and significant to our company. Use of purchased electricity and steam are reported as indirect emission sources to avoid double counting by organizations or agencies interested in compiling national inventory data. Scope 1 refrigerant losses are calculated using the Material Balance Method outlined in Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance and include losses from charging air conditioning products after we build them from all relevant manufacturing facilities, which are the facilities that use refrigerants in a production setting to mass-produce HVAC equipment. Scope 1 mobile combustion includes corporate jet and more than 90 percent of our company-owned vehicles. Scope 1 emissions sources include stationary combustion, mobile combustion and fugitive emissions including natural gas, propane, diesel, heavy fuel oil, gasoline, jet fuel, butane, wood pellets, heptane and refrigerant losses. We compute both location- and market-based indirect emissions. We use market-based emissions to track our progress towards our reduction targets. Gases used to calculate scope 2 include CO2, CH4, and N2O.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

JohnsonControlsInternationalplccommitstoreduceabsolutescope1and2GHGemissions55%by2030froma2017baseyear.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Our scope 1 and 2 carbon reduction strategy is driven by four key strategies: 1. Facility decarbonization 2. Refrigerant loss reduction in manufacturing 3. Fleet emission reduction through efficiency and electrification 4. Transition to renewable electricity globally

(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

JOHC-IRE-001-OFF Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

04/02/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

09/30/2017

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

238338000

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

238338000.000

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

238338000.000

(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)

100

(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)

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

09/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

16

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

200203920.000

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

173772000

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

173772000.000

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

173772000.000

(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

169.31

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target is company-wide and covers more than 90% of reported emissions in relevant scope 3 categories. Our GHG emissions inventory includes scope 1, scope 2 and the categories for scope 3 that are relevant and significant to our company. Data is tracked using templates consistent with the listed standards. • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions • The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 3 Evaluator tool. Scope 3, Category 11, Use of Sold Products considers emissions from finished HVACR products, including Ducted Systems, Commercial Chillers, Air Handlers (first year of operation) and Industrial Refrigeration Equipment. Product attributes include heating and cooling capacity, heating and cooling efficiency, refrigerant charge, and refrigerant GWP. Data center cooling, residential chillers and our Johnson Controls Hitachi products are not included but will be considered for future Scope 3 emissions re-baseline calculations. Category excludes Controls, Fire, Security and sourced products without Johnson Controls branding.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

16% reduction in Scope 3 emissions from use of sold products in 2030

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Johnson Controls has significantly reduced its Scope 3 emissions by deploying low-carbon and energy-efficient products, as well as digital technologies that drive deeper decarbonization through optimization. Our climate transition plan for product development focus can be broken down into three strategies: energy efficiency, electrification, and low GWP refrigerants, which to date have delivered a 27% reduction in Scope 3, Category 11 emissions. This reduction exceeds our 2030 target, but our development and deployment of solutions to reduce our Scope 3 emissions will not stop there. In addition to driving the product improvements listed above, we have rapidly deployed digital solutions such as our Connected Chillers platform to further drive cooling efficiency and thus reduce its carbon footprint. Finally, we will drive upstream Scope 3 emissions reductions through initiatives to reduce our embodied carbon, including supplier engagement. To date, we have increased the weight of supplier sustainability metrics in their scorecards to be equal with other KPIs and have a goal for 80% of our procurement spend to be with suppliers that undergo third party sustainability assessments by 2028.. We aim to reduce our scope 3 emissions by 16 percent and have reduced emissions by 27 percent in FY23 from our 2017 baseline.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

07/31/2017

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons CO2e per USD($) value-added

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

09/30/2017

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

23.8

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

23.8

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

47.6000000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

09/29/2025

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

35.7000000000

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

45

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

11.3

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

11.3

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

22.6000000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

210.08

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

100% coverage of scope 1 and 2 emissions for entities wholly-owned and in operational control.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

25 percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions intensity in 2025 Progress: We set out to reduce emissions intensity by a quarter, a target we have more than doubled, reducing emissions intensity by 52.4% percent to date

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.2.89) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

The three primary contributors of our scope 1 and 2 emissions are energy usage at our global facilities, refrigerant loss in manufacturing and our global fleet. We measure emissions monthly, applying continuous improvement throughout the year, and have teams organized under our climate workstream to drive our carbon transition. These teams develop strategies to achieve net zero, as well as three-year executable roadmaps to ensure organizational alignment on the improvement measures, timing and investments needed.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

☑ Net-zero targets

☑ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

09/30/2021

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

09/29/2017

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

730004

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

0

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

09/29/2040

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

42.1

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

42.10

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes. It is part of our Net Zero target.

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covers all electricity consumption globally.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Meet or match 100% renewable electricity globally by 2040

(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We continuously seek lower carbon, renewable electricity. In 2023, 42.1 percent of the electricity we purchased globally was met or matched by renewable sources of energy. To complement this, we have invested around the world to deliver renewable electricity directly to our facilities.
[Add row]

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

09/30/2018

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Intensity

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy consumption or efficiency

☑ GJ

(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Select from:

☑ unit revenue

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

09/29/2017

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

358

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

09/29/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

25

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

277

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

24.3243243243

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

In 2018, we announced Sustainability Goals for 2025 related to greenhouse gas emissions, energy, water, waste, safety and social impact from a 2017 baseline. As part of this strategy, we committed to reducing energy and greenhouse gas intensity by 25% by 2025. Our energy intensity target supports our greenhouse gas emissions intensity target as energy is a critical component of our emissions profile.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ EP100

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target is company-wide and represents our goal to achieve 25% reduction in energy intensity by 2025 from a 2017 baseline. Emissions and energy reported include facilities and fleet (entities) as defined under the GHG Protocol Corporate Reporting and Accounting Standard, Operational Control approach. Operationally controlled entities include: • Wholly owned entities • Leased-locations - leased entities where Johnson Controls is able to significantly modify operating policies for managing the facility through recognized leasing arrangements and other contractual requirements. More than 90 percent of our leased locations have leasing arrangements which allow us to manage our site operations, thus are included in the inventory • Joint venture entities greater than 50 percent equity and financially consolidated The GHG inventory accounts for owned and leased manufacturing sites. For office space, this inventory considers and estimates direct and indirect emissions. For estimated emissions, we use a Johnson Controls-specific value based on actual usage from a sample of facilities. We use this energy density value to estimate emissions for all sites. Our GHG emissions inventory includes scope 1, scope 2 and the categories for scope 3 that are relevant and significant to our company. Use of purchased electricity and steam are reported as indirect emission sources to avoid double counting by organizations or agencies interested in compiling national inventory data. Scope 1 refrigerant losses are calculated using the Material Balance Method outlined in Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance and include losses from charging air conditioning products after we build them from all relevant manufacturing facilities, which are the facilities that use refrigerants in a production setting to mass-produce HVAC equipment. Scope 1 mobile combustion includes our corporate jet and more than 90 percent of our company-owned vehicles. Scope 1 emissions sources include stationary combustion, mobile combustion and fugitive emissions including natural gas, propane, diesel, heavy fuel oil, gasoline, jet fuel, butane, wood pellets, heptane and refrigerant losses. We compute both location- and market-based indirect emissions. We use market-based emissions to track our progress towards our reduction targets. Gases used to calculate scope 2 include CO2, CH4, and N2O.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

25% reduction of energy intensity in 2025

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Our scope 1 and 2 carbon reduction strategy is driven by four key strategies: 1. Facility decarbonization 2. Refrigerant loss reduction in manufacturing 3. Fleet emission reduction through efficiency and electrification 4. Transition to renewable electricity globally
[Add row]

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

09/30/2021

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply
☑ Abs1

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

09/29/2040

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Johnson Controls has a global, enterprise-wide commitment to achieving net zero scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2040, 10 years ahead of the goals set out in the Paris Agreement. Climate action is urgent and the time to act is now. We're ahead of schedule toward achieving this commitment, having already reached a reduction of 43.8 percent in scope 1 and 2 emissions, saving over 473,000 metric tons of absolute greenhouse gas emissions across our global operations since 2017.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Achieve net zero scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2040

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Unsure

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

☑ No, we do not plan to mitigate emissions beyond our value chain

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Johnson Controls reviews our progress toward targets on a quarterly basis with the Board of Directors. Meanwhile Johnson COntrols continually keeps abreast of new legislation globally, industry and market trends, progress against climate change in the community and discusses these insights with a view to ensuring our targets are appropriate and relevant.
[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	*0*	*`Numeric input*

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
To be implemented	*11*	*18827*
Implementation commenced	*0*	*0*
Implemented	*5*	*5633*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Fugitive emissions reductions

☑ Refrigerant leakage reduction

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

36272

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

150000

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

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

23 of our manufacturing plants use refrigerants in the production of finished goods. Each facility is required to carry out regular maintenance including leak detection to reduce emissions from refrigerant leakage as much as possible. In FY2023 we saw a reduction in refrigerant emissions as a result of these efforts.
[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:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

At Johnson Controls, we believe that climate action is not only a moral imperative, but also a business opportunity. We are determined to lead by example and demonstrate how our solutions can help our customers and partners reduce their environmental impact and achieve their sustainability goals. To ensure that we align our actions with our ambitions, we have established a robust governance framework that integrates emissions reductions into our leadership incentives. We set annual targets to reduce emissions across scope 1, 2, and 3. These annual targets are approved at the start of the year and then reviewed monthly by the executive committee and quarterly by the board of directors. The targets are built into functional scorecards and performance plans, with a review mid-year and at the end of the year to rate performance against plan which then drives the annual short-term incentive plan. Johnson Controls is committed to achieving net zero scope 1 and 2 carbon emissions by 2040, ten years ahead of the goal set out in the Paris Climate Agreement. We have near-term goals approved by Science-Based Targets initiative (SBTi) to reduce scope 1 and 2 emissions by 55% and Scope 3 emissions by 16% by 2030 vs. our baseline year of 2017. We are currently ahead of schedule having achieved 43% reduction in scope 1&2 emissions and 27% of scope 3 emissions in fiscal year 2023. By linking our emissions reductions to our leadership incentives, we aim to foster a culture of accountability and innovation across our organization. We believe that this approach will not only help us achieve our climate commitments, but also enhance our competitive advantage, strengthen our stakeholder relationships, and create long-term value for our shareholders.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We are committed to investing a minimum of 75 percent of new product research and development (R&D) annually in climate-related innovation to develop sustainable products and services In fiscal year 2023, we allocated about 90 percent of new product R&D to climate-related innovation to create sustainable products and services. We incorporate sustainability key performance indicators in product design during the stage gate review of our innovation process. Our sustainable products and solutions save customers carbon emissions and costs. Examples of our emissions savings products as a result of the R&D investment: • Products that enable beneficial electrification of heating • Products that exceed minimum energy efficiency regulations for cooling or heating • Products that use low-GWP refrigerants • Products that enable greater energy efficiency in buildings, including energy recovery, building control and automation systems, and other connected products • Digital solutions, such as OpenBlue, our complete ecosystem of connected technologies, expertise and services • Products that are manufactured with recycled or reground materials
[Add row]

(7.71) Does your organization assess the life cycle emissions of any of its products or services?

(7.71.1) Assessment of life cycle emissions

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.71.2) Comment

We assess life cycle emissions using a sample of products today. Over the next two years, we plan to integrate additional design for sustainability principles into our product development process so that new products will be assessed for life cycle emissions.
[Fixed row]

(7.71.1) Provide details of how your organization assesses the life cycle emissions of its products or services.

(7.71.1.1) Products/services assessed

Select from:

☑ Representative selection of products/services

(7.71.1.2) Life cycle stage(s) most commonly covered

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.71.1.3) Methodologies/standards/tools applied

Select all that apply

☑ ISO 14025

(7.71.1.4) Comment

We follow the CIBSE TM65 Standard to assess the life cycle impact of our products. This process directs us to account for the embodied impact of sourced materials and components, as well as energy, used in the manufacturing process to complete the cradle-to-gate stage. Product end of life is also addressed by assessing component and material reuse and recyclability potential. Use phase energy consumption remains the majority of our product-related emissions today, and while this is addressed in the TM65 Standard, we also assess this impact with more precision on a per-product basis.
[Fixed row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:
☑ No, I am not providing data

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:
☑ 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 **:**Corporate Knights taxonomy for Green Revenue, with modifications as needed to align with specific JCI product definitions

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

Heat
☑ Other, please specify **:**High-efficiency cooling and heat pumps, building automation and controls, smart building systems, digital systems

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

Reducing our customers' emissions through state-of-the-art heating, cooling, and refrigeration technology and smart, connected, digital systems is integral to our product strategy. Our portfolio includes the world's largest set of chillers and heat pumps, available at ultra-high efficiencies ultra-low global warming potential refrigerants, and are integrated with additional technologies such as thermal energy storage. We connect these systems through our digital solutions to further reduce energy consumption and operating expenses to achieve carbon reduction objectives without sacrificing asset functionality. For example:The York CYK and Sabroe DualPAC and other applied water-to-water heat pumps can replace fossil fuel combustion boilers in buildings and industrial applications with high-efficiency heat pump heating. Our OpenBlue suite of digital solutions enable customers to fully optimize for desired outcomes, such as delivering necessary levels of indoor air quality at the lowest possible level of energy consumption;Energy Savings Performance Contracting and other services that deliver guaranteed reductions allow users to make capital improvements, reduce energy, water, emissions, address tight budgets and use the expected utility and operational savings to offset the cost of the upgrades. To date, this work has helped avoid more than 37 million MT CO2 e and is set to save nearly 8 billion for our customers through energy & operational savings over the projects.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**We use guaranteed energy savings data from each performance contracting project and apply appropriate emission factors for each energy source to compute the GHG value associated with the guaranteed savings.

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

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Reducing our customers' emissions through state-of-the-art heating, cooling, and refrigeration technology and smart, connected, digital systems is integral to our product strategy. Our portfolio includes the world's largest set of chillers and heat pumps, available at ultra-high efficiencies ultra-low global warming potential refrigerants, and are integrated with additional technologies such as thermal energy storage. We connect these systems through our digital solutions to further reduce energ

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Customer energy consumption prior to project implementation.

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

Select from:

☑ Use stage

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

38800000

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

This figure represents our customers' avoided emissions from the execution of Energy Savings Performance Contracts through 2023, using the methodology described above. Avoided emissions from the sale of all low-carbon products would be significantly higher. JCI does not publish avoided emissions from the sale of products, and instead opts to demonstrate its reduction in customer emissions through the use of sold products using Scope 3, Category 11 emissions per the GHG Protocol.

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

57
[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

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:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Calculated and tracked data from manufacturing sites. Estimated data from all remaining sites.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track water withdrawals globally and data is collected centrally for all manufacturing, three HQ locations, and significant R&D facilities. We track greater than 90% of global water withdrawals. Water withdrawals are annually verified by independent auditor Apex LLC. For the remaining locations, we estimate water withdrawals from using average water usage rates for like facility use and guidance on water use from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Lean & Water Toolkit: Appendix C. Our ESG council reviews this data and it will be reported in future Sustainability Reports.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Calculated and tracked data from manufacturing sites. Estimated data from all remaining sites.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track water withdrawals globally and data is collected centrally for all manufacturing, three HQ locations, and significant R&D facilities. We track greater than 90% of global water withdrawals. Water withdrawals are annually verified by independent auditor Apex LLC. For the remaining locations, we estimate water withdrawals from using average water usage rates for like facility use and guidance on water use from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Lean & Water Toolkit: Appendix C. Our ESG council reviews this data and it will be reported in future Sustainability Reports.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water quality data comes from local municipality monitoring.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water quality is monitored locally according to the regional regulatory standard. Purchased water quality data is publicly available from our municipal water suppliers.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Calculated and tracked data from manufacturing sites. Estimated data from all remaining sites.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations, where data is available. Since we collect water discharge data through our billing systems, some data gaps exist in jurisdictions where wastewater discharge services are not billed. For the remaining sites, we determined which facilities use process water that would not be discharged via a survey and remaining sites are assumed to fully discharge water due to sanitary use. Our ESG council reviews this data and it will be reported in future Sustainability Reports.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Calculated and tracked data from manufacturing sites. Estimated data from all remaining sites.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track and estimate water discharge destination at the plant level and in alignment with all local laws and regulation. The majority of our discharge is going to municipality. A corporate assessment of water discharge destination occurs centrally when there is a major change in operations, processing, management, or any other reason.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge treatment data available from local municipality monitoring for site-based tracking

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track and estimate water discharge at the plant level and ensure alignment to all local laws and regulation. Site with treatment technologies are tracked and measured to determine progress year-over-year to help track progress and updates related to our water reduction goals for water-stressed locations.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge treatment data available from national monitoring, such as the Integrated Compliance Information System - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (ICIS-NPDES)

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track and estimate water discharge at the plant level and ensure alignment to all local laws and regulation. Discharge allowances and thresholds are specific to the municipality, country and local thresholds. Some of our sites in water-stressed locations also include treatment operations which allow us to monitor discharge aspects such as water quality.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Johnson Controls is not exposed to risks from these water pollutants and does not use nitrates, phosphates, and other priority substances in its manufacturing or other business. We do not expect this to change in the future.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track and estimate water discharge at the plant level and ensure alignment to all local laws and regulation. This data is collected to comply with local permit and/or other regulatory requirements. Some of our sites in water-stressed locations also include treatment operations which allow us to monitor discharge aspects such as water quality. A formal mechanism for tracking temperature across all sites is not yet planned, but may be implemented after tracking and estimating data across all sites.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Calculated and tracked data from manufacturing sites. Estimated data from all remaining sites.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water consumption is calculated as the difference between water withdrawals and water discharge. We track water withdrawals globally and data is collected centrally for all manufacturing, three HQ locations, and significant R&D facilities. Water withdrawals are annually verified by independent auditor Apex LLC. Estimated water withdrawals are estimated following a standardized methodology, using average water usage rates for like facility use and guidance on water use from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Lean & Water Toolkit: Appendix C. We track water discharge at global manufacturing locations, where data is available.

Since we collect water discharge data through our billing systems, some data gaps exist in jurisdictions where wastewater discharge services are not billed. For the remaining sites, we determined which facilities use process water that would not be discharged via a survey and remaining sites are assumed to fully discharge water due to sanitary use.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We track recycling/reuse and other metrics at our manufacturing sites to ensure continued progress towards our goals.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track water reuse and recycling data at the plant level. As part of our work to reduce water consumption at water stressed locations, we are working to expand our reporting of water reductions, including water reuse and recycling. Across the enterprise, we continuously work on water recycling and maintain records of projects that feature this technology.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Johnson Controls ensures these services are available at all locations and is laid out in our Human Rights and Sustainability Policy.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All Johnson Controls employees have access to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) services. Our Human Rights and Sustainability Policy establishes our commitment to operating in accordance with the Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact and related global standards. Johnson Controls provides clean toilet facilities, and access to potable water. We strive to continuously improve health and safety performance in all of our operations.
[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)

4241

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(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

We are committed to reducing water usage at water-stressed locations by 10% in 2025, from our 2017 baseline and are on-track to exceed the goal with a recorded 18.4% reduction in water use in FY23 compared to the 2017 baseline and a 7.7% decrease compared to FY22. In FY23, our organization reported 3,196 megaliters per year of total withdrawals for tracked sites as reported in our billing systems. This value is based on our validated and reported Corporate Sustainability Report and reflects a decrease in water withdrawals of 3.8% compared to FY22. For remaining estimated locations, we estimated water withdrawals from using average water usage rates for like facility use and guidance on water use from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Lean & Water Toolkit: Appendix C. Our FY23 estimate of remaining site water withdrawals is 1,225 megaliters. We identify our water stressed locations in alignment with the WRI Aqueduct Tool 3.0 with classification of High or Extremely High water stress. We have 22 water-stressed locations, including facilities in Mexico, India, Brazil, Thailand, and Arizona in the United States. Our forecast of water withdrawals is continued reductions as we focus on investing in improving our efficiency of water use in manufacturing as well as new systems to reduce withdrawals through increased metering and shut-off systems. In FY 23 we realized significant water conservation opportunities at several facilities, including rainwater collection, sanitary water recycling, and water-smart equipment. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

2664

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(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

We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations, where data is available. Water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption. We are working with our facilities management team to improve our discharge tracking, closing all data gaps, especially in locations where sewer and other discharge data is not tracked or billed. In FY23, our organization reported 1,439 megaliters per year of total discharges for tracked sites as reported in our billing systems. This value reflects an increase in water withdrawals of 16.9% compared to FY22 as less water is consumed in our operations. For remaining estimated locations, we estimated water discharges from using average water usage rates for like facility use and guidance on water use from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s Lean & Water Toolkit: Appendix C. Sanitary water use at these locations is assumed to be discharged. Our FY23 estimate of remaining site water withdrawals is 1,225 megaliters. We identify our water stressed locations in alignment with the WRI Aqueduct Tool 3.0 with classification of High or Extremely High water stress. We have 22 water-stressed locations, including facilities in Mexico, India, Brazil, Thailand, and Arizona in the United States. Our forecast of water withdrawals is continued reductions as we focus on investing in improving our efficiency of water use in manufacturing as well as new systems to reduce withdrawals through increased metering and shut-off systems. In FY 23 we realized significant water conservation opportunities at several facilities, including rainwater collection, sanitary water recycling, and water-smart equipment. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

1757

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Divestment from water intensive technology/process

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water consumption is calculated as the difference between water withdrawals and water discharge. We track water withdrawals globally and data is collected centrally for all manufacturing, three HQ locations, and significant R&D facilities. Tracked water withdrawals are annually verified by independent auditor Apex LLC. We track water discharge at global manufacturing locations, where data is available. Since we collect water discharge data through our billing systems, some data gaps exist in jurisdictions where wastewater discharge services are not billed. We are continuing to close these gaps and have incorporated tools to improve our data fidelity, such as water surveys at our tracked facilities. Sanitary water use at remaining estimated locations is assumed to be discharged and does not impact consumption. Our forecast of water consumption is continued reductions as we focus on decreasing water consumption, as described in the previous section, and increasing water recycling systems across our portfolio. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above
[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)

272.46

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

6.42

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location. The proportion of water withdrawn from sites in areas of water stress is calculated as follows: total water use at water stress sites / total water use. The 2023 water withdrawals from water-stressed locations was 272,457 cubic meters (m3) / 3,196,517 cubic meters (m3), or 8.5% of our total water withdrawals in tracked locations and reflected a 7.33% reduction over FY22 withdrawals. Reductions over 5% are considered much lower in our tracking. FY23 reductions are a result of site-specific reduction efforts including water recycling & reuse and rainwater collection. Our largest withdrawer of water implemented significant decreases in water withdrawals through these investments and delivering robust year-over-year savings. The practice is foundational for building a fulsome water reduction strategy across all water stressed locations. To accelerate the adoption of best water management practices, we formed a consortium of facility managers who manage these water-stressed locations to share best practices and ensure that these facilities continue to reduce water withdrawals. Water-stressed locations are tracked monthly and each facility's reductions are mapped. Our forecast of water withdrawals is continued reductions as we focus on improving our efficiency of water use in manufacturing as well as new systems to reduce withdrawals through increased metering, reuse, and shut-off systems.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Collected rainwater and domestic sewage are excluded from water withdrawal/discharge volumes because they account for less than 5% of our water balance.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our municipal sources do not supply brackish water.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our municipal sources do not supply renewable groundwater.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our municipal sources do not supply non-renewable groundwater.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our municipal sources do not supply produced water.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

4421

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We track and estimate water withdrawals globally per the methodology described in question 9.2. Our municipal withdrawals are lower because year-over-year change reflects a reduction in withdrawals less than 5%.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We do not discharge to freshwater sources. Collected rainwater and domestic sewage are excluded from water withdrawal/discharge volumes because they account for less than 5% of our water balance.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We do not discharge to brackish sources.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We do not discharge to groundwater sources.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2664

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We track and estimate water discharge globally per the methodology described in question 9.2. Our municipal discharge are lower because year-over-year change reflects a reduction in discharge less than 5%.
[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 but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We track and treat wastewater at all relevant sites, to include features such as water reuse and recycling. Johnson Controls uses Industrial Effluent Treatment Stations (IETS) and has seen improvements of 50% reductions in water discharge, for example, in some sites.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We track and treat wastewater at all relevant sites, to include features such as water reuse and recycling. Johnson Controls uses Industrial Effluent Treatment Stations (IETS) and has seen improvements of 50% reductions in water discharge, for example, in some sites.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We track and treat wastewater at all relevant sites, to include features such as water reuse and recycling. Johnson Controls uses Industrial Effluent Treatment Stations (IETS) and has seen improvements of 50% reductions in water discharge, for example, in some sites.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Our facilities do not discharge to the natural environment.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

In locations where a risk assessment determined treatment is not needed, water may be discharged to a third party.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Some locations with water discharge do not require treatment and are not relevant.
[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

22

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

We updated our water stressed locations in alignment with the WRI Aqueduct Tool 3.0 with classification of High or Extremely High water stress in 2021. We have identified 22 water stressed locations, including facilities in Mexico, India, Brazil, Thailand, and Arizona in the United States. In FY23, we formed an internal water council to help identify water withdrawal reduction opportunities and drive investment in facility improvements.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.4) Please explain

We assess our upstream value chain for water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities through the use of EcoVadis and questions incorporated into our supplier contacts and training materials. We have not identified any facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities and more details can be found question 2.3.
[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)

13769

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Afghanistan

☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

22.05304

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.12351

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

84.46

(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

84.46

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13386, 13387, 13464 Three co-located facilities

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.691

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-106.452

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

48.95

(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

48.95

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

25.47

(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

24.47

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

24.47

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

05344

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.7867

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-100.151

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

27.33

(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

27.33

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13400

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.6904

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-106.425

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

28.2

(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

28.2

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of

accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13381

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :North Atlantic Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.5151

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-79.2134

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

9.24

(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

9.24

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

9.24

(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

9.24

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility maintained its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices while increasing production. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13804

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Uruguay

☑ Uruguay

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-23.4607

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-46.4322

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

13.38

(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

13.38

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility increased its water draw due to increased production and consolidation of site manufacturing. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

27989

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.8815

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-100.221

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

15.3

(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

15.3

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility increased its water draw due to increased production and consolidation of site manufacturing. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

14431A

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.9174

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-97.5993

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

11.11

(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

11.11

(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:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility increased its water draw due to increased production and consolidation of site manufacturing. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13396

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Santa Ana

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.0168

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-117.512

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

5.08

(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

5.08

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

5.08

(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

5.08

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13479

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Tapti River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.7524

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.0228

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3.46

(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

3.46

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility increased its water draw due to increased production and consolidation of site manufacturing. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

00484

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

26.01

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-98.1921

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3.41

(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

3.41

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

3.41

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

3.41

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility increased its water draw due to increased production and consolidation of site manufacturing. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13378

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States Virgin Islands

☑ Other, please specify **:**Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.6734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-106.196

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

21.98

(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

21.98

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

21.98

(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

21.98

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility increased its water draw due to increased production and consolidation of site manufacturing. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13379

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify :Upper Santa Cruz

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.2546

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-110.992

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3.04

(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

3.04

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

3.04

(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

3.04

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13407

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Thailand

☑ Other, please specify **:**Sa Keo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

14.0757

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

101.831

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.3

(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

2.3

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.84

(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

1.84

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.46

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

04214

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey
☑ Kizilirmak

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.3428

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

27.1317

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3.08

(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

3.08

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

14278

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

☑ Elbe River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

52.8927

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

12.7952

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.18

(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

2.18

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.79

(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

1.79

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.39

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

14408

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Republic of Korea

☑ Other, please specify **:**Cahaba

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.4423

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

127.177

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.1

(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

2.1

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility maintained its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices while increasing production. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

14395A

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data available for this site.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Italy

☑ Other, please specify **:**Tronto

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

42.8234

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

13.8397

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1.13

(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

1.13

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Discharge data is not available for this facility. Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

13384

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Santa Ana

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.0059

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-117.51

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.57

(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

0.57

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.57

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.57

(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:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility improved its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above

Row 20

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

14687

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Sabine River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

29.9275

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-94.0358

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.32

(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

0.32

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.32

(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

0.32

(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:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water volume data is sourced from direct measurements associated with municipal third parties (Consumption data is calculated as described below). This facility depends on water sourced from a water-stressed location, defined by the World Resource Institute (WRI)'s aqueduct tool. We track wastewater data at global manufacturing locations and water discharge data is sourced through our water billing systems. We understand the importance of accurate water discharge information to fully calculate total consumption which is calculated by subtracting discharges from withdrawals. We have an active working group focused on conserving water in water stressed locations and are executing several projects at these sites, including rainwater collection, sanitary water reuse, and water recycling. This facility maintained its water conservation volumetric data due to these practices while increasing production. We have defined the comparison threshold as: Much lower: 5% below Lower: 3 -4.9% below About the same: 0-2.9% Higher: 3 - 4.9% above Much higher: 5% above
[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

International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. Reporting Protocols against which verification was reported: CDP Water Disclosure Reporting Guidelines – Total Water Withdrawal Only GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines Verification from Apex Companies, LLC.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. Reporting Protocols against which verification was reported: CDP Water Disclosure Reporting Guidelines – Total Water Withdrawal Only GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines Verification from Apex Companies, LLC.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

This data is not verified.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

This data is not verified.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

This data is not verified.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

This data is not verified.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

This data is not verified.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

This data is not verified.
[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:

☑ No, CDP supply chain members do not buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

26793

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

6.32

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

We anticipate a continued increase in efficiency as we implement more water efficiency measures, such as new systems to reduce withdrawals through increased metering and shut-off systems and increased water recycling measures. Our revenue data can also be tracked in concert with our water data in our annual Sustainability Report and is reported here in million USD.
[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

N/A

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**N/A

(9.12.4) Denominator

N/A

(9.12.5) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Annex XVII of EU REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Less than 10%

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

This Annex has very limited applicability to our products because we meet the Annex XVII exemptions.

Row 3

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern (UK 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

A limited portion of some of our fire protection products such as sprinklers, valves, piping, etc. can contain lead which is a Substance of Very High Concern mentioned on the Candidate List. We meet all reporting obligations to the UK for this list. We have taken several actions to reduce the use of these substances in our products, including requesting both a Full Material Disclosure – FMD and a Supplier Declaration from our suppliers to ensure the phase-out of substances of very high concern. We have also taken steps in our manufacturing processes such as eliminating lead in our circuit boards produced in Mexico.

Row 4

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Restriction of Hazardous Substances (RoHS)

(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

Some electrical equipment contains plasticizers and insulator chemicals on wiring and other aspects. We have taken several actions to reduce the use of these substances in our products, including requesting both a Full Material Disclosure – FMD and a Supplier Declaration from our suppliers to ensure the phase-out of RoHS-listed substances. This revenue estimate is a conservative value based on proportion of products that could contain RoHS-listed substances as a proportion of JCI's total revenue.

Row 5

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Annex XIV of UK REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Less than 10%

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

This Annex has very limited applicability to our products.

Row 6

(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

A limited portion of some of our fire protection products such as sprinklers, valves, piping, etc. can contain lead which is a Substance of Very High Concern mentioned on the Candidate List. We meet all reporting obligations to the EU for this list. We have taken several actions to reduce the use of these substances in our products, including requesting both a Full Material Disclosure – FMD and a Supplier Declaration from our suppliers to ensure the phase-out of substances of very high concern. We have also taken steps in our manufacturing processes such as eliminating lead in our circuit boards produced in Mexico.
[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

Johnson Controls measures water conservation in both absolute terms and water efficiency (WUE). WUE was specifically developed to help data centers measure how much water a facility uses for cooling and other needs.Our measurement of low water impact for our customers, includes a comparison to the existing solution in a retrofit situation. For new buildings, we compare the water saved vs. the product installation that exists in a comparable building. Examples of low water impact: 1 - In our Industry / Commercial segment, water efficiency is a focus in high water intensity manufacturing processes. We are able to lower water impact through our heat pump technology, leveraging wastewater systems as a primary source of energy, cooling tower optimization, smart water controls. An example of our work is with a large, global beverage producer. With the installation of two heat pumps, the manufacturing facility saved 70,600 tons of water annually.2 - BlueStream hybrid cooling enabling options for both air- and water-cooling dependent on environmental conditions. The Johnson Controls BlueStream hybrid cooling system combines water- and air-cooling technologies to reduce water consumption by up to 80 percent while maintaining energy performance, allowing our customers to optimize performance for energy and water objectives. We have partnered with two national laboratories - the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colorado, and Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque, New Mexico - to test the BlueStream in data center cooling applications. NREL's high-performance computing datacenter saved 1.16 million gallons of water in its first year of incorporating BlueStream and 2.10 million gallons during a two-year period, while also maintaining a power usage efficiency (PUE) below NREL's threshold of 1.06, allowing the datacenter to retain the title of one of the most efficient in the world. 3 - Water is a key consideration for data center site selection. Our acquisition of Silent Aire enabled a full portfolio of data center cooling solutions to address the energy-water nexus, optimizing the usage of energy and water across all geographies. Our portfolio offers air cooling, water cooling, and direct evaporative cooling. In Denmark, our solution enabled a customer to utilize heat pumps as a cooling solution, saving 132,000 tons of water annually. The design also enabled waste heat generated from the data center to be reused to heat 6,900 homes. 4 - Our Municipal water conservation portfolio offers smart metering, advanced metering infrastructure, high efficiency fixtures, water reclamation and reuse systems, leak detection, among many other services. In the City of Toledo, Ohio 126,000 mechanical water meters that will lose their accuracy over time are being upgraded to new static water meters, which maintain their accuracy over their useful life and can also identify leaks at the customer's property. These new water meters will be read through an Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) system to fully automate meter readings and virtually eliminate vehicle emissions from the meter reading process. The project also includes a customer engagement web portal that informs account holders about leaks on their property and provides them with useful information about finding and repairing leaks on domestic plumbing and offers useful tips for conserving water5 - In Higher Education, Stanford University cut its water use by 15 percent and projected to save 420 million in operational costs. The savings are a result of ultra-efficient building technologies, hot and cold water thermal energy storage, and a patented smart technology system that uses weather and electricity pricing forecasts to optimize operations. We classify low water impact by comparing these metrics to our customers current data to determine where we can deliver savings.

(9.14.4) Please explain

For customers, we have a holistic approach to both energy and water efficiency, working to simultaneously optimize both given the specific environment, or managing the water - energy nexus. Buildings account for almost 40 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions, as well as provide critical access to clean water and sanitation. Water is used for human consumption as well as the operational processes, including the heating and cooling of the facility. This means that optimizing and modernizing building technologies can drive sustainability directly and have a positive impact on both climate change and water use.
[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

We do not currently have plans to set a water pollution target and are not exposed to significant risk due to pollution in our operations.

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:

☑ Yes

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 are exploring biodiversity in the context of water through our engagement with TNFD, but do not currently have any plans or targets related to it.
[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 total water withdrawals

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

10/01/2017

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

09/30/2017

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

334

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

09/30/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

300

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

272

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets for Nature

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location. We exclude facilities that were not classified as High or Extremely High water stress in 2021

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Reductions are a result of site-specific reduction efforts including water recycling & reuse and rainwater collection. Our largest withdrawer of water implemented significant decreases in water withdrawals through these investments and delivering robust year-over-year savings. The practice is foundational for building a fulsome water reduction strategy across all water stressed locations. To accelerate the adoption of best water management practices, we formed a consortium of facility managers who manage these water-stressed locations to share best practices and ensure that these facilities continue to reduce water withdrawals.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Progress against targets is reviewed monthly and metrics are tracked and weighted during budget allocation.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Other WASH, please specify **:**Maintain WASH services at all facilities, according to our health and safety policy

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

10/01/2017

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

09/30/2017

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

100

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2099

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

☑ Other, please specify **:**UN Global Compact

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Through our water policies and company implementation, 100% of Johnson Controls employees have access to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) services. Our Human Rights and Sustainability Policy establishes our commitment to operating in accordance with the Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact and related global standards. Johnson Controls provides clean toilet facilities, and access to potable water. We strive to continuously improve health and safety performance in all of our operations.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

We provide clean toilet facilities and access to potable water. Some facilities also feature water treatment, such as osmosis, to ensure access to potable water.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

More details can be found here: https://www.johnsoncontrols.com/-/media/project/jci-global/johnson-controls/us-region/united-states-johnson-controls/corporate-sustainability/documents/human-rights-policy102017.pdf
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

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

(10.1.3) Please explain

We conduct materiality assessments to understand the most impactful environmental, social and governance (ESG) topics for our business and to ensure we're building robust strategies to manage our strategic impacts, risks and opportunities. In 2023, we surveyed over 100 internal Johnson Controls leaders and 50 external stakeholders, including customers, suppliers, partners, NGOs and trade associations. The results of the ESG materiality assessment did not identify plastics as a material topic but did identify nine highest priority topics, which we then aligned under three material topics: sustainable products and solutions, greenhouse gas emissions, and social impact and employee experience. In 2024, we updated our materiality assessment and conducted a double materiality assessment guided by ESRS 1: General Requirements and EFRAG's IG 1: Materiality Assessment Implementation Guidance. This assessment did not find plastics to be a material risk to our company. This process was led by a third-party auditing firm in order to ensure accuracy and completeness and involved a cross-functional team of stakeholders from across the business. However, Johnson Controls is registered with the Circular Action Alliance and we are prepared to comply with state plastics regulations. [Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

	Activity applies
Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

	Activity applies
Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(10.3) Provide the total weight of plastic polymers sold and indicate the raw material content.

(10.3.1) Total weight of plastic polymers sold during the reporting year (Metric tons)

909

(10.3.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ % virgin fossil-based content

(10.3.7) Please explain

We're committed to increasing the recycled content in all paper-based packaging used, while also reducing our overall packaging material use, including the elimination of single-use plastics in the manufacturing and shipping of our products.
[Fixed row]

(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content.

Durable goods and durable components used

(10.4.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

593.79

(10.4.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ % virgin fossil-based content

(10.4.7) Please explain

We’re committed to increasing the recycled content in all packaging used, while also reducing our overall packaging material use, including the elimination of single-use plastics in the manufacturing and shipping of our products. We don't currently have complete data for percentage of virgin fossil-based content, but we are working to obtain this information. We implemented returnable containers, replacing the single-use wood crates used to ship products between our factories. This project reduced the number of trailers used to ship products by an estimated 400 trailers per year, leading to a 30MT reduction in CO2 emissions, while eliminating an estimated 41,000 pounds of wood material from landfill disposal. We reduced the amount of single-use plastic needed to stretch-wrap and ship products to our customers by optimizing the stretch-film material and wrap pattern. This project reduced the amount of single-use plastic used annually by an estimated 55 percent, or 14,163 pounds.
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

315.21

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ % virgin fossil-based content

(10.5.7) Please explain

We’re committed to increasing the recycled content in packaging used, while also reducing our overall packaging material use, including the elimination of single-use plastics in the manufacturing and shipping of our products. We don't currently have complete data for percentage of virgin fossil-based content, but we are working to obtain this information. As an example that demonstrates our commitment to reducing our overall packaging material use, while eliminating the use of single-use plastics, we replaced the single-use expanded polystyrene (EPS) plastic insert used to cushion our product with a more sustainable, paper-based honeycomb insert, eliminating 18,186 pounds of single-use plastic annually.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

Select all that apply
☑ % technically recyclable

(10.5.1.3) % of plastic packaging that is technically recyclable

98

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

We’re committed to increasing the recycled content in packaging used, while also reducing our overall packaging material use, including the elimination of single-use plastics in the manufacturing and shipping of our products. In the last year, we have eliminated 18,186 pounds of single use plastic annually.
[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 protection

☑ Land/water management

[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 ☑ Response indicators

[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:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

We have not yet screened our facility locations against these biodiversity areas, but plan to do so in the next two years.

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:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

We have not yet screened our facility locations against these biodiversity areas, but plan to do so in the next two years.

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:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

We have not yet screened our facility locations against these biodiversity areas, but plan to do so in the next two years.

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:
☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

We have not yet screened our facility locations against these biodiversity areas, but plan to do so in the next two years.

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:
☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

We have not yet screened our facility locations against these biodiversity areas, but plan to do so in the next two years.

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 (partial assessment)

(11.4.2) Comment

Our water stress analysis with the WRI Aqueduct 3.0 tool identifies the JCI facilities globally that operate in water stressed locations. Across our operation, we have identified 22 sites that operate in a water stressed location.
[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
☑ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Paraiba do Sul 2

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 2

(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:
☑ China

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Songliao Basin

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 3

(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:
☑ China

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

North China Plain Aquifer System

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

5

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Manufacturing and R&D

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 4

(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:
☑ China

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Xinfengjiang Shiku

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 5

(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:

☑ India

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Krishna

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 6

(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:

☑ India

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Sabarmati

(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

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 7

(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:

☑ Mexico

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

San Pedro

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 8

(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:
☑ Philippines

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Philippines West Coast

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA

Row 9

(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:
☑ Thailand

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Gulf of Thailand Coast

(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

Manufacturing

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

NA
[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

☑ Plastics

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Plastics

☑ End-of-life management pathways

☑ Waste generated

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ASAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Since 2011, Apex, an independent third-party assurance provider recognized by CDP, has verified our greenhouse gas emissions data per ISO 14064-3: Second Edition 2019-04: Greenhouse Gases -- Part 3: Specification with Guidance for the Verification and Validation of Greenhouse Gas Statements. Apex also assured our water data per the International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000, having assured our waste data per this same standard since 2014. The objective of the assurance is to provide further confidence that our reported energy, GHG emissions, water and waste data has a low margin of error and is consistent with externally or internally defined sustainability accounting principles. The certificates for these most recent assurance engagements are linked as verification statements in the GRI Content Index.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Waste JCI FY23 Verification Statement.PDF
[Add row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

(13.2.1) Additional information

[Supplementary information to question 2.2.2] We would like to select "Tier 1 Suppliers" under the column "Supplier tiers covered". The upload "Attachment (optional)" is not working.
[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chairman and CEO

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
[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