

Keurig Dr Pepper

# 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](#)

▪

# Contents

## C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☒ English

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

Select from:

☒ USD

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

#### (1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☒ Publicly traded organization

#### (1.3.3) Description of organization

KDP is a leading beverage company in North America, with a portfolio of more than 125 owned, licensed and partner brands and powerful distribution capabilities to provide a beverage for every need, anytime, anywhere. Driven by a purpose to Drink Well. Do Good., our approximately 28,000 employees aim to enhance the experience of every beverage occasion and to make a positive impact for people, communities and the planet. Our ambition is to ensure our beverages make a positive impact with every drink. We focus on our greatest opportunities for impact in the environment, our supply chain, as well as for health and well-being, people and communities. We are committed to transparency of corporate responsibility strategies, programs, progress and governance. As of December 31, 2023, our operating structure consists of three operating and reportable segments: U.S. Refreshment Beverages, U.S. Coffee, and International. Cautionary statement: Certain statements contained herein are “forward-looking statements” within the meaning of applicable securities laws and regulations. These forward-looking statements can generally be identified by the use of words such as “outlook,” “guidance,” “anticipate,” “expect,” “believe,” “could,” “estimate,” “feel,” “forecast,” “intend,” “may,” “plan,” “potential,” “project,” “should,” “target,” “will,” “would” and similar words. Forward-looking statements by their nature address matters that are, to different degrees, uncertain. These statements are based on the current expectations of our management, are not predictions of actual performance, and actual results may differ materially. Forward-looking statements are subject to a number of risks and uncertainties, including the factors disclosed on our Form 10-K and subsequent filings with the SEC. We are under no obligation to update, modify or withdraw any forward-looking statements, except as required by applicable law. In this report, any use of the terms “material,” “materiality,” “immaterial,” “substantive,” “significant” and other similar terminology refers to topics that reflect important ESG-related impacts of

KDP or to topics or standards designated as “material” or “substantive” under the GHG Protocol, GRI or SASB standards. These terms as used in this report are not used, or intended to be construed, as they have been defined by or construed in accordance with the securities laws or any other laws of the United States or any other jurisdiction, or as these terms are used in the context of financial statements and financial reporting.

[Fixed row]

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2023	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

14814000000

**(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.**

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

**ISIN code - bond**

**(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?**

*Select from:*

☒ No

**ISIN code - equity**

**(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?**

*Select from:*

☒ No

**CUSIP number**

**(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?**

*Select from:*

☒ No

**Ticker symbol**

**(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

**(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier**

*KDP*

## SEDOL code

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

## LEI number

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

## D-U-N-S number

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

## Other unique identifier

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ China

☒ Luxembourg

- ☒ Canada
 ☒ Mexico
 ☒ Ireland
 ☒ Singapore
- ☒ Switzerland
 ☒ Hong Kong SAR, China
 ☒ United States of America

(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, for some facilities	Geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Facility 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.84

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-96.89

(1.8.1.4) Comment

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 3**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 7*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*34.58*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-117.37*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 4**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 3*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*30.26*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-81.6*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 5**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 4*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*25.82*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-80.31*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 6**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 9*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*20.45*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-103.43*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 7**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 6*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*34.02*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-118.2*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 8**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 5*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*38.61*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-121.43*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 9**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 1*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*29.68*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-95.39*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

**Row 10**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*Facility 10*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*19.7*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-98.94*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*

## Row 11

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*Facility 8*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*18.483*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*-97.403*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*geolocation data provided is related to facilities that are operating in areas identified as high-water risk per KDP's water risk assessment*  
*[Add row]*

**(1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure?**

## Production

### (1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

*Select from:*

☒ Value chain (excluding own land)

### (1.11.2) Primary reason emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

*Select from:*

☒ Do not own/manage land

### (1.11.3) Explain why emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

*KDP does not own or manage land where agricultural commodities are produced. All agricultural inputs are purchased.*

## Processing/ Manufacturing

### (1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

*Select from:*

☒ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

## Distribution

### (1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

*Select from:*

☒ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

## Consumption

### (1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

*[Fixed row]*

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

## Timber products

### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Retailing

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are providing the total volume

### (1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

286629

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Grams, Pounds

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

*We collect packaging component specification weight data in grams. Original units for wood pallets are pounds.*

### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Primary packaging

☒ Secondary packaging

☒ Tertiary packaging

#### (1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ 6-10%

#### (1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (1.22.19) Please explain

*Timber products are sourced for our primary, secondary and tertiary packaging. Wood pallets are used in transportation. 100% revenue dependency is an assumption based on utilization of fiber-based packaging for most of our products. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

### Palm oil

#### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are providing the total volume

### (1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

237

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☒ Pounds

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

*KDP does not source palm oil directly. The volume is estimated based on the palm oil content of the products bought in 2023. Original units for products containing palm oil are pounds.*

### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Palm kernel oil derivatives

### (1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

### (1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☒ No

### (1.22.19) Please explain

*May be included as a component in some ingredients or flavorings. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

**Soy**

### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☒ Direct soy only

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are providing the total volume

#### (1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

11

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☒ Pounds

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

*KDP does not source soy directly. The volume is estimated based on the soy content of the products bought in 2023. Original units for products containing soy are pounds.*

#### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Soybean oil

#### (1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

### (1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☒ No

### (1.22.19) Please explain

*May be included as a component in some ingredients or flavorings. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

**Cocoa**

### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Manufacturing

☒ Retailing

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are providing the total volume

#### (1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

705.3

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☒ Pounds

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

*KDP does not source cocoa directly. The volume is estimated based on the cocoa content of the cocoa powder and related products that we procured in 2023. Original units for products containing cocoa are pounds.*

#### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Cocoa powder

#### (1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

#### (1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☒ No

#### (1.22.19) Please explain

*KDP sources raw cocoa and blended powders containing cocoa for our owned, licensed and partner brands. Sourced primarily from the Ivory Coast, Ghana and Cameroon, with smaller volumes coming from other global cacao-producing countries. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

### Coffee

#### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

#### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Manufacturing

☒ Retailing

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are providing the total volume

#### (1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

133982

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (1.22.9) Original unit

Select all that apply

☒ Pounds

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

*Original units for green coffee beans are pounds.*

#### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Green bean coffee, roasted coffee, coffee ingredients

#### (1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ 6-10%

#### (1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ 21-30%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (1.22.19) Please explain

*KDP sources green coffee for own and partner brands, roasted coffee as well as coffee ingredients. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

*[Fixed row]*

### (1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?

**Cotton**

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

**Dairy & egg products**

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☒ No

**(1.23.4) Please explain**

*We source dairy products for use in some of our products. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

**Fish and seafood from aquaculture**

**(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced**

Select from:

☒ Sourced

**(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity**

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☒ No

**(1.23.4) Please explain**

*We source clam powder broth for use in our Clamato tomato juices. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

**Fruit**

**(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced**

Select from:

☒ Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☒ 11-20%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*We source fruits (directly and indirectly via concentrates and flavor components) for use in many of our products. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

## Maize/corn

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☒ 41-50%

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*In the form of high fructose corn syrup that is used in many of our beverage products. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

#### Nuts

##### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

##### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ No

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*We source flavors that contain extracts of nuts in one form or another for use in some of our products. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

#### Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

##### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

#### Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

### Poultry & hog

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

### Rice

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

### Sugar

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ No

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*We source cane sugar for several of our beverage brand products. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

### Tea

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

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

Select from:

☒ No

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*We source tea for use in some of our products such as Snapple teas. We use 10% threshold to determine significance, for the purposes of answering this question.*

### Tobacco

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

### Vegetable

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

### Wheat

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

### Other commodity

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

### (1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

### (1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☒ Upstream value chain

### (1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

#### (1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

#### (1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☒ Smallholders relevant but not included

#### (1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

*KDP's coffee supply chain is made up of importers, exporters, cooperatives, aggregators, producer groups and smallholder farmers. Portions of our coffee supply chain is mapped via our responsible sourcing certification and verification programs (e.g. Rainforest Alliance). KDP's other supply chains have less upstream visibility.*  
[Fixed row]

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

#### (1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

#### (1.24.1.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☒ Upstream value chain

☒ Downstream value chain

☒ End-of-life management

#### (1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

*Select all that apply*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Landfill         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preparation for reuse        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recycling        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Composting (industrial/home) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Incineration     |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Waste to Energy  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mismanaged waste |  |

*[Fixed row]*

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

##### Timber products

#### (1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

*Select from:*

- ☒ Yes

#### (1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

*Select from:*

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers

#### (1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

*Select from:*

- ☒ 76-99%

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ Tier 2 suppliers

## Cocoa

### (1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

### (1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

Select from:

☒ Tier 2 suppliers

## Coffee

### (1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

### (1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☒ 100%

### (1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☒ 100%

### (1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☒ 76-99%

### (1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:

☒ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

[Fixed row]

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

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

### Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

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

*These are the timeframes that our legal & internal audit function utilize when evaluating appropriate horizons over which to focus their work on risk assessment. Please note that materiality for this report differs from that used in our SEC filings – see 1.3.3 for more information*

### Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

These are the timeframes that our legal & internal audit function utilize when evaluating appropriate horizons over which to focus their work on risk assessment. Please note that materiality for this report differs from that used in our SEC filings – see 1.3.3 for more information

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

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

Select from:  
☒ Yes

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

These are the timeframes that our legal & internal audit function utilize when evaluating appropriate horizons over which to focus their work on risk assessment. Much of our sustainability-focused strategy fits in the long-term time horizon, for example in 2019 we set 2025 targets. Please note that materiality for this report differs from that used in our SEC filings – see 1.3.3 for more information  
[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both risks and opportunities	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply  
☒ Climate change

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

Select all that apply  
☒ 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

### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers
- ☒ Tier 2 suppliers
- ☒ Tier 3 suppliers

### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

*Select from:*

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

*Select from:*

- ☒ As important matters arise

### (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:*

- ☒ A specific environmental risk management process

#### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Site-specific
- ☒ Sub-national

#### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

##### **Other**

- ☒ External consultants
- ☒ Scenario analysis

#### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

##### **Acute physical**

- ☒ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- ☒ Heat waves
- ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

#### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Employees

☒ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☒ No

#### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*At KDP, a variety of approaches and processes lend themselves to identifying, assessing and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities, applied at relevant frequencies for the related topics. Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) is a periodic process designed to identify potential risk events that may significantly impact the achievement of KDP's objectives and to manage those risks to be within the company's risk tolerance (i.e., willingness and/or ability to take risks). KDP assesses whether climate change and attendant risks are significant to the company as part of its ERM process. In this report, any use of the terms "material," "materiality," "immaterial," "substantive," "significant" and other similar terminology refers to topics that reflect important ESG-related impacts of KDP or to topics or standards designated as "material" or "substantive" under the GHG Protocol, GRI or SASB standards. These terms as used in this report are not used, or intended to be construed, as they have been defined by or construed in accordance with the securities laws or any other laws of the United States or any other jurisdiction, or as these terms are used in the context of financial statements and financial reporting.*

### Row 2

#### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Water

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

Select all that apply

☒ 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

#### **(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered**

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers
- ☒ Tier 2 suppliers
- ☒ Tier 3 suppliers

#### **(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment**

*Select from:*

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

#### **(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment**

*Select from:*

- ☒ As important matters arise

#### **(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:*

- ☒ A specific environmental risk management process

### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Site-specific
- ☒ Local
- ☒ Sub-national
- ☒ National

### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

#### **Commercially/publicly available tools**

- ☒ WRI Aqueduct
- ☒ WWF Water Risk Filter

#### **Other**

- ☒ Desk-based research

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

#### **Acute physical**

- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

#### **Chronic physical**

- ☒ Rationing of municipal water supply
- ☒ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☒ Water stress

## Reputation

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

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Local communities

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*We understand the importance of focusing our efforts on the ESG issues for which we can have the greatest impact. In 2023, we performed an ESG double materiality analysis, which included an evaluation of emerging trends and internal and external stakeholder input, to identify and understand the issues that are most important to our organization and stakeholders. The outcome of this process was our materiality matrix, which outlines a total of 30 non-financial issues (including climate change & GHG emissions, water use and stewardship, deforestation, and biodiversity) ranked in relation to importance to stakeholders and most impactful to the business. Please note that materiality for this report differs from that used in our SEC filings – see 1.3.3 for more information.*

## Row 3

### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

- ☒ Forests

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Dependencies
- ☒ Impacts
- ☒ Risks

#### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Upstream value chain

#### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

*Select from:*

- ☒ Partial

#### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers

#### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

*Select from:*

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

#### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

*Select from:*

- ☒ As important matters arise

#### (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:*

- ☒ A specific environmental risk management process

#### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ National

#### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

##### **Other**

- ☒ Desk-based research
- ☒ External consultants

#### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

##### **Acute physical**

- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

##### **Chronic physical**

- ☒ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☒ Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability
- ☒ Water stress

#### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☒ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☒ No

#### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*We understand the importance of focusing our efforts on the ESG issues for which we can have the greatest impact. In 2023, we performed an ESG double materiality analysis, which included an evaluation of emerging trends and internal and external stakeholder input, to identify and understand the issues that are most important to our organization and stakeholders. The outcome of this process was our materiality matrix, which outlines a total of 30 non-financial issues (including climate change & GHG emissions, water use and stewardship, deforestation, and biodiversity) ranked in relation to importance to stakeholders and most impactful to the business. We supplement this with our up-to-date understanding of our material ESG issues through ongoing dialogue and engagement with key stakeholders as well as ongoing monitoring of evolving sustainability issues and macroeconomic events globally. Please note that materiality for this report differs from that used in our SEC filings – see 1.3.3 for more information.*

### Row 4

#### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

#### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☒ Upstream value chain

#### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

*Select from:*

☒ Partial

#### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

*Select all that apply*

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

#### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

*Select from:*

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

#### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

*Select from:*

☒ Every three years or more

#### (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

#### Other

☒ Desk-based research

☒ Materiality assessment

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

#### Chronic physical

☒ Declining ecosystem services

☒ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☒ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☒ No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*We understand the importance of focusing our efforts on the ESG issues for which we can have the greatest impact. In 2023, we performed an ESG double materiality analysis, which included an evaluation of emerging trends and internal and external stakeholder input, to identify and understand the issues that are most important to our organization and stakeholders. The outcome of this process was our materiality matrix, which outlines a total of 30 non-financial issues (including climate change & GHG emissions, water use and stewardship, deforestation, and biodiversity) ranked in relation to importance to stakeholders and most impactful to the business. We supplement this with our up-to-date understanding of our material ESG issues through ongoing dialogue and engagement with key stakeholders as*

well as continuous monitoring of evolving sustainability issues and macroeconomic events globally. Please note that materiality for this report differs from that used in our SEC filings – see 1.3.3 for more information.

[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**

We understand the importance of focusing our efforts on the ESG issues for which we can have the greatest impact. In 2023, we performed an ESG double materiality analysis, which included an evaluation of emerging trends and internal and external stakeholder input, to identify and understand the issues that are most important to our organization and stakeholders. The outcome of this process was our materiality matrix, which outlines a total of 30 non-financial issues (including climate change & GHG emissions, water use and stewardship, deforestation, and biodiversity) ranked in relation to importance to stakeholders and most impactful to the business. During this process, the interconnections between the environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are assessed. We supplement this with our up-to-date understanding of our material ESG issues through ongoing dialogue and engagement with key stakeholders as well as continuous monitoring of evolving sustainability issues and macroeconomic events globally. In this report, any use of the terms “material,” “materiality,” “immaterial,” “substantive,” “significant” and other similar terminology refers to topics that reflect important ESG-related impacts of KDP or to topics or standards designated as “material” or “substantive” under the GHG Protocol, GRI or SASB standards. These terms as used in this report are not used, or intended to be construed, as they have been defined by or construed in accordance with the securities laws or any other laws of the United States or any other jurisdiction, or as these terms are used in the context of financial statements and financial reporting.

[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

☒ Upstream 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

### (2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

*KDP identified 9 priority raw materials and ingredients and conducted a water risk assessment to determine which key sourcing regions are experiencing the highest water risk. To complete this assessment, KDP collected data on sourcing regions for each crop as well as mass procured for each region. To identify priority sourcing regions, KDP conducted a basin-level water risk assessment using water risk valuation tools (WRI Aqueduct & WWF Water Risk Filter), spatial datasets (EARTHSTAT & MAPSPAM), and additional data from desktop research. KDP focused on water risk indicators related to water quantity (baseline water stress, water depletion, Groundwater table decline, Interannual variability, Season variability, Flood risk, Drought risk, future projects on climate change) and water quality (surface water contamination index, Coastal eutrophication potential, and future projects to climate change) to evaluate which growing regions were experiencing high or extremely high water risk. To determine high water risk regions, KDP set a threshold of more than 40% baseline water stress.*

### (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

#### (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

*The Company's processes, disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls are designed to facilitate the identification and management of risks, including risks relating to sustainability. In identifying and managing climate-related risks, the Company considers factors such as a risk's likelihood, potential impact and time horizon. A risk may be considered to have substantial financial or strategic impact for purposes of this CDP corporate questionnaire ("this report") on the basis of factors such as the potential impact on the Company's ability to achieve operational, financial, and strategic objectives, as well as the potential reputational impact. In this report, any use of the terms "material," "materiality," "immaterial," "substantive," "significant" and other similar terminology refers to topics that reflect important ESG-related impacts of KDP or to topics or standards designated as "material" or "substantive" under the GHG Protocol, GRI or SASB standards. These terms as used in this report are not used, or intended to be construed, as they have been defined by or construed in accordance with the securities laws or any other laws of the United States or any other jurisdiction, or as these terms are used in the context of financial statements and financial reporting.*

### Opportunities

#### (2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Qualitative

#### (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

*The Company's processes, disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls are designed to facilitate the identification and management of risks, including risks relating to sustainability. In identifying and managing climate-related risks, the Company considers factors such as a risk's likelihood, potential impact and time horizon. A risk may be considered to have substantial financial or strategic impact for purposes of this CDP corporate questionnaire ("this report") on the basis of factors such as the potential impact on the Company's ability to achieve operational, financial, and strategic objectives, as well as the potential reputational impact. In this report, any use of the terms "material," "materiality," "immaterial," "substantive," "significant" and other similar terminology refers to topics that reflect important ESG-related impacts of KDP or to topics or standards designated as "material" or "substantive" under the GHG Protocol, GRI or SASB standards. These terms as used in this report are not used, or intended to be construed, as they have been defined by or construed in accordance with the securities laws or any other laws of the United States or any other jurisdiction, or as these terms are used in the context of financial statements and financial reporting.*

*[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**

*Under our Environmental Policy, KDP prioritizes compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws at its manufacturing locations – including wastewater and stormwater compliance. We identify and manage potential water pollutants that could have detrimental impact on water ecosystems in planning and operating of our facilities. Our EHS staff and engineers design and implement infrastructure, management processes, and monitoring systems aimed at meeting compliance obligations. Once our facilities are operational, we implement programs to monitor wastewater quantity and composition (e.g., BOD, TSS, COD, etc.) in light of applicable limits set by jurisdictions, as required by law. KDP maintains a water safety compliance program which delivers compliance with applicable regulations. The program's scope includes public and private water sources ("Source Water") as well as water further treated onsite prior to use ("Treated Water") by KDP-owned manufacturing locations. In addition to annual federal compliance testing, KDP monitors the presence of Chemicals of Concern in water used to manufacture KDP products at owned facilities. KDP requires third-party producers to perform monitoring testing to demonstrate compliance and share results with KDP upon request.*

*[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:

☒ Nitrates

### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*KDP products require agricultural inputs. Growing these commodities can require applying nutrients to promote plant growth. Adding nutrients can cause eutrophication due to over application.*

### (2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Upstream value chain

### (2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☒ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☒ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*The KDP Supplier Code of Conduct is the foundation of our commitment to responsibly source our products, and we ask our most important and/or high-risk suppliers to review and sign the Code, which includes compliance with applicable laws and regulations. For our most important supply chains, we ask that they go beyond regulations by specifying product-specific sustainable sourcing programs with auditable standards that seek to ensure compliance such as: Fair Trade USA, Fairtrade International, Rainforest Alliance or UTZ. Each standard aims to ensure that we, through our supply chain partners, are using water wisely through sustainable irrigation, protecting soil health through crop management, and minimizing adverse impacts of pesticides and other agrochemical products on watersheds and human health. Audits are completed by a third party according to their standards and sampling protocols and aggregated anonymized results are shared to understand the program's success. KDP is committed to responsibly sourcing our priority inputs. During 2021 and 2022, a small amount of coffee was received as conventional (0.38% and 0.36%, respectively) due to COVID-19 impacts, supplier error or shipping delays. In 2023, 0.002% of coffee (a single shipment) was received as conventional per a customer requirement.*

[Add row]

## C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

### Climate change

#### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

### Forests

#### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☒ 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:

☒ Evaluation in progress

#### (3.1.3) Please explain

*Companies setting FLAG targets are required by SBTi to publicly commit to no-deforestation covering all scopes of emissions. If KDP is unable to set a no-deforestation target, this will impact KDP's ability to set a FLAG target and therefore the company may face a negative perception impacting the company's reputation.*

### Water

### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

#### Plastics

### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

#### Climate change

### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk1

### (3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

#### Chronic physical

☒ Precipitation or hydrological variability

### (3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Upstream value chain

### (3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peru        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brazil                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> China       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecuador                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ghana       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nigeria                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> India       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Colombia                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kenya       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Honduras                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indonesia   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Côte d'Ivoire               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nicaragua   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Papua New Guinea            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Costa Rica  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dominican Republic          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> El Salvador | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United Republic of Tanzania |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Philippines |   |

### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

*The principal raw materials used in our business are packaging materials and agricultural commodities including green coffee, paper products, juices, teas, fruit, sweeteners, as well as water, and other ingredients. These raw material costs can fluctuate substantially and comprise 55% of our cost of sales. According to the IPCC and the U.S. National Climate Assessment, climate change is already affecting the agricultural sector, and disruptions to crop growing conditions are expected to increase with extreme weather events, increasing temperatures, and changing water availability. This may cause changes in geographical ranges of crops, as well as weeds, diseases and pests that affect those crops. Agricultural commodity prices could increase as a result of these or other climate impacts. Please note that materiality for this report differs from that used in our SEC filings – see 1.3.3 for more information.*

### (3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☒ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ More likely than not

#### (3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium

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

*Increased direct costs*

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

105000000

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

125000000

#### (3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*This financial estimate assumes the risk of the change in agricultural commodity prices is entirely unhedged. KDP utilizes commodities derivative instruments and supplier pricing agreements to hedge the risk of movements in commodity prices for limited time periods and certain commodities. For the purpose of this response, we note that as of 2024, the impact of a 10% increase in agricultural commodities market prices for example due to drought is estimated to be approximately 115M with minimum and maximum values calculated using a +/- 10% band.*

#### (3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

## Engagement

☒ Engage with NGOs/special interest groups

### (3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1062000

### (3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost of response figure is the average annual spend on World Coffee Research (WCR) and Root Capital programs. Keurig Green Mountain was a founding member of WCR and now, as part of KDP, we are one of the organization's largest donors, having invested 4,274,000 since 2012. Between 2021 and 2023, 41 cooperatives representing nearly 27,000 smallholder growers received climate adaptation support through KDP's investment in Root Capital. Over the last three years, we have invested 2,019,500, an average of 673k per year.*

### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

*In an effort to help mitigate the risk of climate change and the implications on the cost of raw agricultural materials, KDP has launched a regenerative agriculture program within its coffee, apple and corn supply chains. Our response here highlights a key coffee initiative. For coffee, we work with farmers and industry coalitions to ensure positive impact in our supply chain via: (1) Responsible Sourcing: At KDP, responsibly sourced means that we work with our supply chain to help ensure that fundamental human rights and environmental protections are in place.; (2) Supply Chain Investments: Investing in coffee communities and in coffee R&D helps us address larger challenges like climate change, farmer profitability, regenerative agriculture and inclusive growth. For example, World Coffee Research (WCR) is an industry-backed R&D organization focused on growing, protecting and enhancing coffee as a global crop. A core element of its research is identifying and/or creating coffee varieties that will be climate resilient and disease resistant, while maintaining high productivity and quality. WCR has continued advancing its work evaluating new variety candidates, expanding access to healthy and genetically pure trees, and testing variety performance through their global network of on-farm research trials. Another example of our investment in climate resiliency in the coffee industry is through our 25-year partnership with Root Capital, a nonprofit that provides credit and capacity building to small and growing agricultural businesses across the globe. KDP has directed its funding of Root Capital to support coffee cooperatives to build climate adaptation plans and roll out services and advisory support that equip their member bases to strengthen their resilience to climate change.*

## Water

### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk3

### (3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

## Chronic physical

☒ Other chronic physical risk, please specify :Water scarcity

### (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

☒ Mexico

☒ United States of America

### (3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Panuco

☒ Santiago

☒ Papaloapan

☒ Saint John River

☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

☒ Other, please specify :**San Jacinto, Everglades, Lower American, Mojave**

### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

*Sufficient water quantity is required to produce our beverages. Some of our California facilities are in river basins with increased water scarcity. These river basins are specified by the WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool to have a range of current baseline water stress, but face continued and increasing stressors such as declining supply, groundwater contamination, and low precipitation. As water becomes scarce, we may face negative perception for operating in high water stress areas. Water scarcity may adversely affect our production capacity, resulting in increased production costs.*

### (3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ Unlikely

### (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

*Increased production costs.*

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

4000000

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

6000000

### (3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*The potential financial impact is estimated based on a hypothetical situation where water becomes so scarce that we could not maintain operations and a plant in a high water-risk region such as California where we have multiple facilities in areas with elevated water risk, would be subject to water use curtailment. For purposes of this example, we assume a plant would experience a 25% curtailment over the course of a year due to drought conditions severely limiting water supply. The impact is calculated using the fixed average cost across the three sites in California multiplied by 25%. The range is calculated using a 10% band. While other implications of decreased production to distribution or labor could come into play, we are describing the impact of fixed costs only.*

### **(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk**

#### **Nature based solutions, restoration and conservation**

- ☒ Support river basin restoration

### **(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk**

550000

### **(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation**

*This figure is based on our water stewardship work since 2011 with multiple partners (including but not limited to The Nature Conservancy, Bonneville Environmental Foundation, National Audubon Society). Since 2011, we have committed approximately 6M (approximately 550 thousand per year) to various projects across Texas, California, Florida, and Mexico, where we have production facilities. As a result of this collaboration and other active projects, we have invested in projects with the capacity to address 55% of the volume used for beverages in our highest water-risk communities. While this does not address all risk from drought and curtailment, our actions reflect our efforts to do our part to improve water resiliency in the watershed.*

### **(3.1.1.29) Description of response**

*By partnering with our highest water-risk operating communities with a goal to replenish 100% of water used for our beverages in those communities by 2030, we aim to improve the environment and our local communities. Our strategy to partner with our highest water-risk operating communities was informed by evaluating water risk in our operating footprint using the WRI Aqueduct tool and identified six operating communities with high water risk in Texas, California and Mexico. These investments will continue as KDP moves towards its 2030 goals. Note, as described elsewhere, in 2020 we updated our water risk assessment using WRI's Aqueduct 3.0 and WWF's Water Risk Filter and findings confirmed our highest water stress operating locations continue to be in California, Texas and Mexico, and additionally, based on the spatial resolution updates in the 3.0 version of the WRI tool and use of the WWF tool, geographies have been flagged for water risk that overlap with our site locations in Florida, and additional sites in California and Texas. As a result of our updated water risk analysis, we have amended our water goal since 2022 to include 10 operating sites, with a goal to replenish 100% of water used for our beverages in those communities by 2030.*

## **Plastics**

### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk2

### (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

☒ Canada

☒ Mexico

☒ United States of America

### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

*Our sustainable packaging strategies predate existing and pending legislation which we monitor and comply with. KDP is working towards the goal that all of our packaging is designed to be recyclable or compostable by 2025. KDP defines recyclable packaging as packaging for which design is not a barrier to the packaging being successfully collected, sorted and reprocessed into another material, a product component or a recycled raw material. It includes materials and formats for which recovery, sortation and end markets exist or can practically be scaled across North America, noting that many communities may not accept or sort certain materials or formats today. It includes 'recyclable with detrimental qualities' as defined by the APR. Additionally, KDP is working with specific rPET manufacturers to secure supply of high-quality food grade rPET resin that will meet the needs for our bottles.*

### (3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☒ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

- ☒ Unlikely

#### (3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Medium-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

*Increased indirect (operating) costs.*

#### (3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

##### Engagement

- ☒ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

#### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

*Our sustainable packaging strategies predate existing and pending legislation which we monitor and comply with. KDP is working towards the goal that all of our packaging is designed to be recyclable or compostable by 2025. KDP defines recyclable packaging as recyclable packaging, packaging for which design is not a barrier to the packaging being successfully collected, sorted and reprocessed into another material, a product component or a recycled raw material. It includes*

materials and formats for which recovery, sortation and end markets exist or can practically be scaled across North America, noting that many communities may not accept or sort certain materials or formats today. It Includes 'recyclable with detrimental qualities' as defined by the APR. Additionally, KDP is working with specific rPET manufacturers to secure supply of high quality food grade rPET resin that will meet the needs for our bottles. KDP supports numerous initiatives that improve recycling, such as our recent work at the beverage industry level. In October 2019, KDP together with Coca-Cola and PepsiCo launched the Every Bottle Back initiative, a breakthrough effort to reduce the industry's use of new plastic by making significant investments to improve the collection of the industry's valuable plastic bottles so they can be made into new bottles. Critically, the initiative will improve the quality and availability of recycled plastic in key regions of the country by directing investments to TRP and Closed Loop Partners through a new industry fund that will be matched three-to-one by other grants and investors. The investments will be used to improve collecting, sorting and processing of recyclables in areas with the biggest infrastructure gaps to help increase the amount of recycled plastic available to be remade into beverage bottles. It is estimated that EBB could lead to a 20% increase in the amount of PET recycling over the next ten years. The initiative has announced sev

[Add row]

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

### **Row 1**

#### **(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin**

**United States of America**

☒ Other, please specify :San Jacinto

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.*

## Row 2

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**United States of America**

☒ Trinity River (Texas)

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.*

## Row 3

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**United States of America**

☒ St. Johns River

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.*

### Row 4

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**United States of America**

☒ Other, please specify :Everglades

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.*

## Row 5

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

#### United States of America

☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

*Select from:*

☒ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.*

### Row 6

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

#### United States of America

☒ Other, please specify :Mojave

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

*Select from:*

☒ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.

## Row 7

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

#### Mexico

☒ Papaloapan

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk

Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.

## Row 8

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**Mexico**

☒ Santiago

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.

## Row 9

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

**Mexico**

☒ Panuco

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Direct operations

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

1

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

*Select from:*

☒ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

☒ 1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*Water is the main ingredient in substantially all of our products. As such, even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations could increase costs or constrain our operations. We have expanded our risk understanding further with the WRI Aqueduct tool and the WWF Water Risk Filter which provides an analysis covering physical, reputational and regulatory variables on a current and forward-looking basis, in addition to risk information for key commodities.*

*[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	Fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties	Comment
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Enforcement orders or other penalties but none that are considered as significant	<i>no comment</i>

[Fixed row]

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

*Select from:*

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

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

## Climate change

### (3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

*Select from:*

☒ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

## Forests

### (3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☒ No

### (3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☒ Evaluation in progress

### (3.6.3) Please explain

*We will be studying opportunities in this area as part of our future climate targets -- to be evaluated and approved by SBTi - that will include a no-deforestation commitment.*

## Water

### (3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

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

## Climate change

### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp1

### (3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Not applicable

### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

#### Resource efficiency

☒ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

### (3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

### (3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Canada

☒ Ireland

☒ Mexico

☒ United States of America

### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*We are focused on reducing our energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to help lessen our environmental impact. In our manufacturing facilities, we pursue efficiency by implementing lighting upgrades, using low-energy idling mode on equipment, scheduling production efficiently, conducting leak audits and other techniques. KDP uses a significant amount of energy in our business operations. For example, in 2023 KDP consumed 1,862,927 MWH of various types of energy. KDP uses electricity and natural gas in order to convert raw materials such as coffee, tea, and apples into beverages. Increased resource efficiency could result in substantial cost savings through reduced operating costs.*

### (3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☒ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ 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

#### (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

*Reduced indirect (operating) costs*

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

28000000

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

28000000

#### (3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*For our science-based target (SBT) analysis, we used a 10-year time horizon to 2030 (a common practice for SBT development) to estimate energy efficiency opportunities. These are high-level estimates that will need to be further validated. We have extrapolated from our audits that continuing and expanding current*

energy efficiency programs could deliver net savings of approximately 28M in costs for natural gas and electricity over a time horizon to 2030. The cumulative net savings total recognizes ongoing savings in future years through 2030 of prior year efficiency gains (not just one-year energy cost savings).

#### (3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

12500000

#### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

We estimate they would be in the range of 20,000 to 50,000 metric tons CO2e. The net savings for the opportunity are after estimated OPEX and CAPEX spend of approximately 12.5M (1M/year).

#### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

As part of our analysis of opportunities to set and achieve an SBT (approved SBT published in 2020), we have identified energy efficiency at our manufacturing sites as an opportunity to reduce our Scope 1 and 2 emissions. We have conducted a set of internal energy audits of our facilities and have identified opportunities including LED lighting and potential for greater efficiency in our compressed air systems. Pursuing energy efficiency will be a key strategy for our implementation of our science based target. The carbon reduction estimates from these initiatives reflect energy reduction efforts. We plan to further reduce electricity emissions through renewable energy and renewable energy certificate (REC) purchases in pursuit of our 2025 goal to purchase 100% renewable electricity.

### Water

#### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp4

#### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

##### Resilience

☒ Other resilience opportunity, please specify :Water efficiency

#### (3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

- ☒ Direct operations

#### (3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Canada
- ☒ Ireland
- ☒ Mexico
- ☒ United States of America

#### (3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

*Select all that apply*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Panuco                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Santiago              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify : <b>San Jacinto, Everglades, Lower American, Mojave</b> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Papaloapan            |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> St. Johns River       |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trinity River (Texas) |  |

#### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*We have an ambitious goal to meet 20% by 2025 water efficiency improvement target. While coffee processing is relatively dry, all of our cold beverage manufacturing processes require water for beverage production, as well as to ensure cleanliness and quality. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

#### (3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

*Select from:*

- ☒ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ 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

### (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

*Reduced operating costs*

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

20000000

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

20000000

### (3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*By improving our water use efficiency by 20% over five years, we estimated a potential cost savings figure based on our current average cost of 1 kgal of water. The figure was developed assuming our production stays flat and the efficiency projects continue to produce savings over 5 years.*

### (3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*Based on annual capital investment of 3M per year for 5 years.*

### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*We strive for operational efficiency in these areas: • Equipment cleaning: we use water to clean manufacturing equipment, both for sanitation and to maintain flavor integrity when changing from one drink flavor to another. We optimize our manufacturing schedules to reduce flavor changeovers, which saves water while meeting food safety requirements. • Ingredient water preparation: Where we use reverse osmosis to pretreat water that goes into our beverages, we are optimizing these operations to reduce waste water from this process. • Product quality: We continually work to reduce product rejected for quality reasons, which will avoid wasting water.*

*[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:

☒ More frequently than 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?

#### Climate change

#### (4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

## Forests

### (4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

### (4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

### (4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

*We are in the process of updating our climate goals, which would include a commitment to no-deforestation in primary deforestation linked commodities. While we have engaged the Board of Directors on this new commitment, we anticipate that Board oversight will take place once the new goal has been formally set and integrated into our broader responsible sourcing strategy. We engage our suppliers, farmers and business partners to ensure sustainable practices are used across our supply chain. Our previous goal of responsibly sourcing 100% of our coffee and brewers which we achieved in 2020 and have maintained since has been expanded to incorporate all of our top priority crops, including cocoa, corn and apples, as well as other priority inputs, including packaging raw materials. We will achieve our commitments by continuing to partner with industry associations, governments, NGOs and other third-party accreditation bodies to help us make informed purchasing decisions.*

## Water

### (4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

## Biodiversity

### (4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

#### (4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

#### (4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

*We are in the process of updating our climate goals, which would include a commitment to no-deforestation in primary deforestation linked commodities. We anticipate that limiting deforestation will be a key lever to reduce impacts to biodiversity. While we have engaged the Board of Directors on this new commitment to no deforestation, we anticipate that Board oversight will take place once the new goal has been formally set and integrated into our broader responsible sourcing and conservation strategies, with greater clarity on how to define, measure impact, and take action on the issue of biodiversity. We engage our suppliers, farmers and business partners to ensure sustainable practices are used across our supply chain. Our previous goal of responsibly sourcing 100% of our coffee and brewers which we achieved in 2020 and have maintained since has been expanded to incorporate all of our top priority crops, including cocoa, corn and apples, as well as other priority inputs, including packaging raw materials. We endeavor to achieve our commitments by continuing to partner with industry associations, governments, NGOs and other third-party accreditation bodies to help us make informed purchasing decisions.*

[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 chair

☒ Other C-Suite Officer

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :KDP's Corporate Governance Principles reflect our longstanding commitment to addressing ESG matters directly with the full Board.

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

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☒ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

☒ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☒ Other, please specify :Reviewing and guiding the risk management process

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*KDP's Board of Directors reviews matters of the Company's corporate sustainability efforts quarterly, including climate-related issues (but also environment including water, waste, packaging, health and wellness, philanthropy, and responsible sourcing). This process informs the Board's oversight of progress against goals and targets as well as the implementation of risk-management policies.*

## Water

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Board chair

☒ Other C-Suite Officer

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :KDP's Corporate Governance Principles reflect our longstanding commitment to addressing ESG matters directly with the full Board.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- ☒ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
- ☒ Other, please specify :reviewing and guiding the risk management process

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*KDP's Board of Directors reviews matters of the Company's corporate sustainability efforts quarterly, including climate-related issues (but also environment including water, waste, packaging, health and wellness, philanthropy, and responsible sourcing). This process informs the Board's oversight of progress against goals and targets as well as the implementation of risk-management policies.*

[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

☒ Other, please specify :The Remuneration Committee (RemCo) also reviews the collective experience of the Board and makes recommendations to the Board regarding the appropriate mix of skillsets, qualifications and attributes of the Board as a whole.

### **Forests**

#### **(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

#### **(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board**

*Select all that apply*

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

☒ Other, please specify :The Remuneration Committee (RemCo) also reviews the collective experience of the Board and makes recommendations to the Board regarding the appropriate mix of skillsets, qualifications and attributes of the Board as a whole.

### **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

☒ Other, please specify :The Remuneration Committee (RemCo) also reviews the collective experience of the Board and makes recommendations to the Board regarding the appropriate mix of skillsets, qualifications and attributes of the Board as a whole.

[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

#### Forests

#### (4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ No, but we 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

*We are in the process of updating our climate goals, which would include a commitment to no-deforestation in primary deforestation linked commodities. We anticipate that management oversight will take place once the new goal has been formally set and integrated into our broader responsible sourcing strategy.*

## 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, but we 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

*We are in the process of updating our climate goals, which would include a commitment to no-deforestation in primary deforestation linked commodities. We anticipate that management oversight will take place once the new goal has been formally set and integrated into our broader responsible sourcing and conservation strategies, with greater clarity on how to define, measure impact, and take action on the issue of biodiversity.*

[Fixed row]

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

## Climate change

#### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

##### **Committee**

- ☒ Sustainability committee

#### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

##### **Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities**

- ☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

##### **Engagement**

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

##### **Policies, commitments, and targets**

- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

##### **Strategy and financial planning**

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

#### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

*Select from:*

- ☒ Other, please specify :Head of sustainability reports to the Chief Corporate Affairs Officer who leads the sustainability team

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

Select from:

☒ Quarterly

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*The KDP Board of Directors oversees KDP's Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategy and goals, as outlined in our Corporate Governance Principles. In this role, the Board approves our commitments and monitors progress in topics including climate, water, circular economy, health and well-being, sustainable practices within our supply chain, human rights and DE&I. While the full Board is responsible for oversight of KDP's overall ESG strategy, the Remuneration and Nomination Committee of the Board, along with KDP's Executive Leadership Team, Sustainability Governance Committee, Chief Corporate Affairs Officer and cross-functional KDP teams that include leaders from all areas of the business, provide specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts.*

## Water

#### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

##### Committee

☒ Sustainability committee

#### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

##### Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- ☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

##### Engagement

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

##### Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

#### Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

#### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Other, please specify :Head of sustainability reports to the Chief Corporate Affairs Office who leads the sustainability team

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

Select from:

- ☒ Quarterly

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*The KDP Board of Directors oversees KDP's Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategy and goals, as outlined in our Corporate Governance Principles. In this role, the Board approves our commitments and monitors progress in topics including climate, water, circular economy, health and well-being, sustainable practices within our supply chain, human rights and DE&I. While the full Board is responsible for oversight of KDP's overall ESG strategy, the Remuneration and Nomination Committee of the Board, along with KDP's Executive Leadership Team, Sustainability Governance Committee, Chief Corporate Affairs Officer and cross-functional KDP teams that include leaders from all areas of the business, provide specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts.*

[Add row]

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

	Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue	Please explain
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	KDP's Chief Corporate Affairs Officer provides specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts.
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	KDP's Chief Corporate Affairs Officer provides specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts.
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	KDP's Chief Corporate Affairs Officer provides specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts.

[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

☒ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Chief Corporate Affairs Officer

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

*The KDP Board of Directors oversees KDP's Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategy and goals, as outlined in our Corporate Governance Principles. In this role, the Board approves our commitments and monitors progress in topics including climate, water, circular economy, health and well-being, sustainable practices within our supply chain, human rights and D&I. While the full Board is responsible for oversight of KDP's overall ESG strategy, the Remuneration and Nomination Committee of the Board, along with KDP's Executive Leadership Team, Sustainability Governance Committee, Chief Corporate Affairs Officer and cross-*

functional KDP teams that include leaders from all areas of the business, provide specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts.

## Forests

### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

#### Board or executive level

☒ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Chief Corporate Affairs Officer

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

*The KDP Board of Directors oversees KDP's Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategy and goals, as outlined in our Corporate Governance Principles. In this role, the Board approves our commitments and monitors progress in topics including climate, water, circular economy, health and well-being, sustainable practices within our supply chain, human rights and D&I. While the full Board is responsible for oversight of KDP's overall ESG strategy, the Remuneration and Nomination Committee of the Board, along with KDP's Executive Leadership Team, Sustainability Governance Committee, Chief Corporate Affairs Officer and cross-functional KDP teams that include leaders from all areas of the business, provide specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts*

## Water

### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

#### Board or executive level

☒ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Chief Corporate Affairs Officer

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

*The KDP Board of Directors oversees KDP's Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) strategy and goals, as outlined in our Corporate Governance Principles. In this role, the Board approves our commitments and monitors progress in topics including climate, water, circular economy, health and well-being, sustainable practices within our supply chain, human rights and D&I. While the full Board is responsible for oversight of KDP's overall ESG strategy, the Remuneration and Nomination Committee of the Board, along with KDP's Executive Leadership Team, Sustainability Governance Committee, Chief Corporate Affairs Officer and cross-*

functional KDP teams that include leaders from all areas of the business, provide specific management, advisory, accountability and collaboration capabilities in support of ESG efforts.

[Add row]

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

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

**(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.**

**Row 1**

**(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered**

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

**(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage**

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

**(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered**

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

- ☒ Upstream value chain
- ☒ Downstream value chain

#### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*KDP's climate policy covers all business activities including engagement with supply chain partners and working collaboratively with governments, other companies, and NGOs.*

#### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

##### **Environmental commitments**

- ☒ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

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

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

#### (4.6.1.7) Public availability

*Select from:*

- ☒ Publicly available

#### (4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

*KDP-Climate-Policy-2019-1.pdf*

### **Row 2**

#### (4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Water

#### (4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

#### (4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct operations
- ☒ Upstream value chain
- ☒ Downstream value chain

#### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*KDP's water policy covers business activities across the company's value chain, including supply chain partners and direct operations. The water policy includes collaboration with businesses, governments and civil society to support the development of market mechanisms that improve water stewardship and address shared water challenges across KDP's value chain.*

#### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

##### **Environmental commitments**

- ☒ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- ☒ Commitment to engage in integrated, multi-stakeholder landscape (including river basin) initiatives to promote shared sustainability goals

##### **Water-specific commitments**

- ☒ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

#### (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 Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

#### (4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☒ Publicly available

#### (4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

*KDP-Water-Policy-2019-2.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

☒ CEO Water Mandate

☒ RE100

☒ Sustainable Agriculture Initiative (SAI)

☒ UN Global Compact

☒ Other, please specify :WWF Climate Business Network, The Recycling Partnership, the American Beverage Association, and Circular Plastics Taskforce in Canada, Sustainable Coffee Challenge and Global Coffee Platform

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

*KDP plays various roles within each framework or initiative. For more information, please see KDP's 2023 Corporate Responsibility Report*

*<https://keurigdrpepper.com/Keurig-Dr-Pepper-Corporate-Responsibility-Report-2023.pdf>*

[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

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

*Select from:*

☒ Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Paris Agreement

☒ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

#### **(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement**

*KDP-Climate-Policy-2019-1.pdf*

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

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ Mandatory government register

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

#### **(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**

*Keurig Dr Pepper's climate policy combines three primary approaches—namely, mitigation, adaptation and engagement. These approaches and associated commitments support the United Nations' related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for Affordable and Clean Energy and Climate Action: SDGs 7 and 13. These SDGs call for “affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all,” and “urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts,” respectively. Engagement. Working collaboratively with others is the only way to have significant and lasting impact on climate change. We commit to: Engaging with governments to support healthy economies, encourage significant reductions in GHG emissions, and improve resilience and support adaptation. Collaborating directly with other companies in the food and beverage sector and via multi-stakeholder platforms and collaborations to align efforts to maximize our collective positive impact and scale climate change mitigation and adaptation practices. Collaborating with NGOs, leveraging their expertise and providing them with the resources they need to do their work. Communicating openly with stakeholders about progress and challenges.*

*[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**

*In 2023, KDP actively engaged in advocating for Extended Producer Responsibility programs at the state and federal level within the U.S. and at the provincial level in Canada. In addition, KDP supported enhanced recycling-related federal funding for collection and education as part of the implementation of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, the Recycling and Composting Accountability Act and The Recycling Infrastructure and Accessibility Act.*

##### **(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**

**Low-impact production and innovation**

☒ Circular economy

☒ Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

#### (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

☒ Canada

☒ 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

☒ Other, please specify :Our public-policy activities include direct engagement with public officials as well as participation in trade associations, coalitions and stakeholder convenings.

#### (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

*This law is relevant as it pertains to KDP's 2025 sustainable packaging goals. In 2023, we continued to support a circular economy, achieving a 15% virgin plastic reduction across our packaging portfolio relative to 2019. KDP is committed to engagements that are geared towards collaborating on, advocating for and investing in*

circularity models so that packaging can be kept in the economy and continue to be reused. We advocate for policies at all levels of government to accelerate the development of a circular economy for packaging materials, particularly for the modernization and standardization of recycling and industrial composting infrastructure. Across North America, a patchwork of regulations, inadequate investment and lack of minimum performance standards are preventing economies of scale in our recycling system and confusing consumers. That is why we support smart policy solutions focused on efficient and equitable ways to increase material recovery, while reducing the economic and environmental costs of disposal.

#### **(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:

☒ No, we have not evaluated

#### **Row 2**

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

*KDP has supported the UN's efforts to develop a binding global treaty to end plastic pollution.*

#### **(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**

##### **Low-impact production and innovation**

☒ Circular economy

☒ Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

☒ Recycling and recyclability

#### **(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

☒ Regular meetings

☒ Discussion in public forums

☒ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

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

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**

*This law is relevant as it pertains to KDP's 2025 sustainable packaging goals. In 2023, we continued to support a circular economy, achieving a 15% virgin plastic reduction across our packaging portfolio relative to 2019. KDP is committed to engagements that are geared towards collaborating on, advocating for and investing in circularity models so that packaging can be kept in the economy and continue to be reused. We advocate for policies at all levels of government to accelerate the development of a circular economy for packaging materials, particularly for the modernization and standardization of recycling and industrial composting infrastructure. Across North America, a patchwork of regulations, inadequate investment and lack of minimum performance standards are preventing economies of scale in our recycling system and confusing consumers. That is why we support smart policy solutions focused on efficient and equitable ways to increase material recovery, while reducing the economic and environmental costs of disposal.*

#### **(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*

☒ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :The United Nations Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Plastic Pollution  
*[Add row]*

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

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

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

##### **Row 1**

#### **(4.12.1.1) Publication**

*Select from:*

☒ In voluntary sustainability reports

#### **(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication**

*Select all that apply*

☒ Climate change

☒ Forests

☒ Water

☒ 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

☒ Water pollution indicators

☒ Content of environmental policies

☒ Value chain engagement

☒ Dependencies & Impacts

☒ Biodiversity indicators

☒ Public policy engagement

☒ Water accounting figures

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

*Emissions: Environment, pages 7-18. Data Summary, pages 54-59. Water: Environment, pages 7-18. Data Summary, pages 54-59. Biodiversity: Environment, pages 7-18. Supply Chain, pages 19-27. Data summary, pages 54-59*

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

*Keurig-Dr-Pepper-Corporate-Responsibility-Report-2023.pdf*

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*At KDP, our environmental sustainability strategy focuses on the areas of climate, water and packaging in an effort to reduce environmental impact, help to mitigate climate change risks and to build climate resiliency.*

*[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:

☒ Not defined

#### Forests

##### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

##### (5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

##### (5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

*Our company has not utilized scenario analysis to assess deforestation risk primarily because our current strategic priorities and risk management efforts are concentrated on other pressing issues (priority inputs such as coffee, and water, for example). Given the nature of our industry, we have allocated our resources towards addressing physical and transition risks that have a more direct impact on our business continuity and growth. While we recognize the importance of*

*understanding and mitigating deforestation risks, our focus has been on areas that align more closely with our core strategic objectives and stakeholder expectations. As we continue to evolve, we remain open to integrating scenario analysis into our risk assessment framework when it becomes more feasible and aligned with our overall strategic direction.*

## Water

### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☒ Not defined

[Fixed row]

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

## Climate change

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

**Climate transition scenarios**

☒ IEA NZE 2050

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Policy

☒ Market

☒ Reputation

☒ Technology

☒ Liability

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 1.5°C or lower

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

**Direct interaction with climate**

☒ On asset values, on the corporate

## Macro and microeconomy

☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify :Economic growth, CO2 price, Coffee Price, Sugar Price, Plastics Price, Electricity and Natural Gas Price

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*KDP assumes carbon prices will be fully passed through, with minimal impact on PP/PET prices. Oil prices are key predictors for PET/PP prices, expected to remain stable. rPET prices will rise due to demand. Packaging will decarbonize, as minimum legal recycled content rates increase....*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*IEA NZE 2050- KDP has selected two scenarios against which to assess and analyze climate transition risks to the business over the medium-term (2030) and long-term (2050). The business has selected to analyze a 1.5 C scenario in order to better understand how transition risks attributed to aggressive climate policy and government regulation will impact the business. KDP has also analyzed a 2.5 C scenario in order to understand how transition risks attributed to existing policies and stated policy ambitions will impact the business.*

## Water

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

#### Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 2.6

### (5.1.1.2) Scenario used    SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP1

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

**Direct interaction with climate**

☒ On asset values, on the corporate

**Macro and microeconomy**

☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Assumptions related to the impact of droughts on KDP's coffee and corn syrup supply chains: For coffee, droughts in Brazil lead to price hikes, with increased drought frequency expected to raise average coffee prices. For corn syrup, droughts in the US corn belt are assumed to cause price spikes, with more frequent droughts anticipated to increase average corn prices. Both scenarios assume that climate change-induced reductions in global yields won't reduce KDP's purchases due to inventory, hedging, and market dynamics.*

#### **(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario**

*KDP's qualitative climate scenario risk analysis has selected two scenarios against which to assess and analyze potential climate change impacts to the business over the medium-term (2030) and long-term (2050). The business has selected to analyze a 1.5 C scenario in order to better understand how transition risks attributed to aggressive climate policy and government regulation may impact the business. KDP has also analyzed a 4 C scenario in order to understand physical risks attributed to climate change may impact our supply chain and own operations. KDP's quantitative climate scenario risk analysis considers two different temperate scenarios (SSP 1-2.6, 2 C temperature increase; SSP 5-8.5, 4.5 C temperature increase). These scenarios were applied to climate physical hazard risks, agricultural risks, and operational risks.*

### **Climate change**

#### **(5.1.1.1) Scenario used**

##### **Physical climate scenarios**

☒ RCP 2.6

#### **(5.1.1.2) Scenario used    SSPs used in conjunction with scenario**

Select from:

☒ SSP1

#### **(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario**

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

#### **(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage**

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Acute physical
- ☒ Chronic physical

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

- ☒ 2.5°C - 2.9°C

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

##### **Direct interaction with climate**

- ☒ On asset values, on the corporate

##### **Macro and microeconomy**

- ☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Keurig Dr Pepper (KDP) outlines how climate change may impact their coffee and corn syrup volumes. For coffee, growth scenarios range from 0% to 6%, with droughts in Brazil driving price hikes that affect K-Cup costs. For corn syrup, decline scenarios range from 0% to -4%, with droughts in the US corn belt raising corn*

prices, impacting Dr Pepper bottle costs. Both models assume constant packaging and labor costs, no inflation, and that climate change won't reduce purchase volumes due to inventory and market dynamics.

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*KDP's qualitative climate scenario risk analysis has selected two scenarios against which to assess and analyze potential climate change impacts to the business over the medium-term (2030) and long-term (2050). The business has selected to analyze a 1.5 C scenario in order to better understand how transition risks attributed to aggressive climate policy and government regulation may impact the business. KDP has also analyzed a 4 C scenario in order to understand physical risks attributed to climate change may impact our supply chain and own operations. KDP's quantitative climate scenario risk analysis considers two different temperate scenarios (SSP 1-2.6, 2 C temperature increase; SSP 5-8.5, 4.5 C temperature increase). These scenarios were applied to climate physical hazard risks, agricultural risks, and operational risks.*

### Climate change

#### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

##### Climate transition scenarios

☒ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

#### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

#### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Policy

☒ Market

- ☒ Reputation
- ☒ Technology
- ☒ Liability

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

##### Direct interaction with climate

- ☒ On asset values, on the corporate

##### Macro and microeconomy

- ☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*KDP assumes carbon prices will be fully passed through, with minimal impact on PP/PET prices. Oil prices are key predictors for PET/PP prices, expected to remain stable. rPET prices will rise due to demand. Packaging will decarbonize, with legal recycled content rates. Penalties for non-compliance are based on Californian standards. Extended producer responsibility regulations will require recycling strategies. KDP will use compostable content in K-Cups by 2050.*

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

IEA STEPS - KDP's has selected two scenarios against which to assess and analyze climate transition risks to the business over the medium-term (2030) and long-term (2050). The business has selected to analyze a 1.5 C scenario in order to better understand how transition risks attributed to aggressive climate policy and government regulation may impact the business. KDP has also analyzed a 2.5 C scenario in order to understand how transition risks attributed to existing policies and stated policy ambitions may impact the business.

## 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:

☒ SSP5

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 4.0°C and above

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

##### Direct interaction with climate

☒ On asset values, on the corporate

##### Macro and microeconomy

☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Keurig Dr Pepper (KDP) outlines how climate change impacts their coffee and corn syrup volumes. For coffee, growth scenarios range from 0% to 6%, with droughts in Brazil driving price hikes that affect K-Cup costs. For corn syrup, decline scenarios range from 0% to -4%, with droughts in the US corn belt raising corn prices, impacting Dr Pepper bottle costs. Both models assume constant packaging and labor costs, no inflation, and that climate change won't reduce purchase volumes due to inventory and market dynamics.*

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*KDP's qualitative climate scenario risk analysis has selected two scenarios against which to assess and analyze potential climate change impacts to the business over the medium-term (2030) and long-term (2050). The business has selected to analyze a 1.5 C scenario in order to better understand how transition risks attributed to aggressive climate policy and government regulation may impact the business. KDP has also analyzed a 4 C scenario in order to understand physical risks attributed to climate change may impact our supply chain and own operations. KDP's quantitative climate scenario risk analysis considers two different*

temperate scenarios (SSP 1-2.6, 2 C temperature increase; SSP 5-8.5, 4.5 C temperature increase). These scenarios were applied to climate physical hazard risks, agricultural risks, and operational risks.

## 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:

☒ SSP5

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 4.0°C and above

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

☒ 2030

☒ 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

##### **Direct interaction with climate**

☒ On asset values, on the corporate

##### **Macro and microeconomy**

☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify :Economic growth, CO2 price, Coffee Price, Sugar Price, Plastics Price, Electricity and Natural Gas Price.

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Assumptions related to the impact of droughts on KDP's coffee and corn syrup supply chains: For coffee, droughts in Brazil lead to price hikes, with increased drought frequency expected to raise average coffee prices. For corn syrup, droughts in the US corn belt cause price spikes, with more frequent droughts anticipated to increase average corn prices. Both scenarios assume that climate change-induced reductions in global yields won't reduce KDP's purchases due to inventory, hedging, and market dynamics.*

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*KDP's qualitative climate scenario risk analysis has selected two scenarios against which to assess and analyze potential climate change impacts to the business over the medium-term (2030) and long-term (2050). The business has selected to analyze a 1.5 C scenario in order to better understand how transition risks attributed to aggressive climate policy and government regulation may impact the business. KDP has also analyzed a 4 C scenario in order to understand physical risks attributed to climate change may impact our supply chain and own operations. KDP's quantitative climate scenario risk analysis considers two different*

temperate scenarios (SSP 1-2.6, 2 C temperature increase; SSP 5-8.5, 4.5 C temperature increase). These scenarios were applied to climate physical hazard risks, agricultural risks, and operational risks.  
[Add row]

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

### **Climate change**

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

Select all that apply

☒ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

#### **(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**

KDP's analysis of both 1.5 C and 2.5 C scenarios identifies potential risks associated with accelerated decarbonization of energy resources which could impact sourcing costs for energy intensive agricultural commodities and low carbon forms of energy, including transportation fuels, on a 2030 time horizon. Over the long-term (2050), further decarbonization requirements may impact carbon pricing as well as investments in low carbon transportation. As a result, KDP took action to perform a fleet electrification analysis in 2022, which considered the technical and economic feasibility of both zero emissions electric delivery trucks, as well as associated electric vehicle charging infrastructure. This analysis will help KDP to identify near-term and long-term opportunities for fleet decarbonization, as well as geographic prioritization of infrastructure investments. Additionally, KDP's transition risk analysis identified the potential risk of new or increasing carbon prices which could increase the price of key packaging materials such as plastics. Likewise, new or increasing plastics regulations (bans on plastic or recycled content requirements) could potentially impact the availability of post consumer plastic resins, thus further increasing the price of packaging materials. KDP's analysis of both 2.0 C 4.5 C scenarios identifies potential risks associated with agricultural commodity sourcing, manufacturing, and distribution attributed to changing weather patterns and extreme weather events on a 2030 time horizon. Over the long-term (2050) these risks are likely to increase as extreme weather events become more common, exacerbating impacts to manufacturing, upstream and downstream value chains. For example, future droughts under higher temperature scenarios may harm coffee and corn production and thereby drive up prices for these key ingredients.

### **Water**

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

### (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

*KDPs qualitative analysis of a 4 C scenario identifies potential risks associated with agricultural commodity sourcing, manufacturing, and distribution attributed to changing weather patterns and extreme weather events, including drought, which could impact our operations in California, Texas, Florida, and Mexico, on a 2030-time horizon. Over the long-term (2050) these risks are likely to increase as extreme weather events become more common, exacerbating impacts to manufacturing, up-stream and down-stream value chains. KDPs quantitative scenario analysis identified specific operational risks associated with increase drought risks, as well as agricultural risks associated with a subset of coffee and corn growing regions*

[Fixed row]

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

### (5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

### (5.2.2) Temperature alignment of transition plan

Select from:

- ☒ Well-below 2°C aligned

### (5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

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

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

*Shifting away from fossil fuels may require time to develop alternative cost models that support sustainable practices, avoiding operational and financial disruptions. Technological and infrastructure limitations may necessitate continued investment in fossil fuels while integrating sustainable technologies. Continued market demand for fossil fuels could make divestment challenging without losing competitive advantage. Balancing stakeholder interests, including those of investors, employees, and customers, may influence the need to balance financial performance against sustainability goals.*

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

Select from:

☒ We do not have a feedback mechanism in place, and we do not plan to introduce one within the next two years

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

*No assumptions or dependencies*

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

*In 2023, KDP made progress against our environmental goals that support progress towards our climate transition plan. For example, we've achieved 83% of our goal to obtain 100% of electricity from renewable sources by 2025. Additionally, we have achieved 21% of our goal to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 30% by 2030.*

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

*Keurig-Dr-Pepper-Corporate-Responsibility-Report-2023.pdf*

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Forests
- ☒ Plastics
- ☒ Water
- ☒ Biodiversity

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

*KDP has set near, and long-term goals related to forests, water, plastics, and biodiversity that are aligned with our climate transition plan. Below are the goals that KDP has set to achieve by 2025 related to other environmental issues: • Improve our water use efficiency by 20% • Convert 100% of packaging to be recyclable or compostable\* • Use 30% post-consumer recycled content across our packaging portfolio • Use 25% post-consumer recycled content in our plastic packaging • Achieve a 20% virgin plastic reduction across our plastic packaging portfolio Below are the goals that KDP has set to achieve by 2030 related to other environmental issues: • Partner with our highest water-risk operating communities to replenish 100% of water used in our beverages in those communities • Support regenerative agriculture and conservation on 250,000 acres of land.*

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

Select from:

- ☒ Other, please specify :In process of updating Science Based Target

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

*Our current 2030 emissions-reduction targets, validated by the Science Based Target initiative (SBTi), are aligned to levels required to meet the Paris Agreement climate change goal of limiting global warming to well below 2C. Looking ahead, we aim to make progress toward our existing emissions reduction goals with the tools and technologies available to us today and explore ways to accelerate our reductions in the future as technology, policy and investment opportunities develop. We will continue to use science-based targets (SBTs) that are aimed at reducing GHG emissions across our value chain, remaining mindful of evolving science and guidance, such as SBTi's 1.5C guidance pathway. We are committed to continually assessing the risks climate change poses to our business and identifying near-term and long-term strategies to help mitigate climate-related risks.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☒ Products and services

☒ Upstream/downstream value chain

☒ Investment in R&D

☒ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

#### Products and services

#### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

*KDP acknowledges that demonstrating continued improvement and delivering on opportunities to reduce emissions associated with our products and services is important to our stakeholders, including consumers. Climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced several key environmental sustainability strategies and goals set by the company over multi-year time horizons, including those related to product and packaging design. Our sustainable packaging strategy responds to the identified opportunity to reduce emissions from packaging representing 21% of KDP's Scope 3 emissions. Three examples of strategic decisions KDP has made with regard to our products and packaging include: (1) reduced packaging material impact by changing the material in our K-Cup pods from a multi-layer plastic to*

polypropylene which we accomplished over the time horizon 2014 to 2020 when 100% of our pods were converted; (2) Sourced rPET to complete the transition of Core Hydration, 16 oz. Snapple and Aquafiel varieties to bottles made of 100% recycled plastic. Bottles made with rPET produce about 30% less GHG emissions compared to bottles made of virgin plastic, in addition to reducing our use of virgin plastic.; and (3) helping our customers to reduce their energy usage and greenhouse gas emissions through our coffee brewer default settings that save energy.

## Upstream/downstream value chain

### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

Climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced KDP's strategy as it relates to our supply chain. Coffee is a significant agricultural raw material for our U.S. Coffee segment (which contributed 27% of 2023 net sales and 36% of 2023 income from operations for KDP) and climate change has obvious impacts on the success of coffee cultivation and thus on the livelihoods of coffee farmers. For example, KDP purchases supply chain risk data that includes climate impact and resilience data for the countries of origin of our key raw materials. This data helps us to understand where we have supply chains that operate in high-risk environments. For coffee, the data show that the risk of quality and supply disruptions is high within most countries of origin over the next 20-50 years. An example of a substantial strategic decision in this area is our commitment to responsibly sourced coffee, a goal we met over the time horizon of 2014 to 2020, and an achievement that we have maintained ongoing. We use third-party certification or verification programs to safeguard fundamental social, environmental, and economic protections. At the end of 2023, our accepted third-party partner programs were Fairtrade International, Fair Trade USA, Rainforest Alliance, 4C, ofi AtSource and Great Lakes Coffee MaxTRACE. In 2023, 0.002% of coffee (a single shipment) was received as conventional per a customer requirement. KDP recognizes that regenerative agriculture and conservation actions are key drivers for protecting, restoring, and managing natural resources to support the resilience of supply chains. Smart agricultural practices contribute to soil health, water quality and quantity improvements, biodiversity, and farmer resilience, while also reducing carbon impacts. In 2021, we committed to a new goal of supporting conservation and regenerative agriculture on 250,000 acres of land by 2030, which represents approximately 50% of the land used to grow KDP's coffee, corn (for high-fructose corn syrup) and apple. Our supplier engagement strategy reflects the need for value chain alignment to science-based emissions reduction targets. We are working to engage suppliers and bottlers representing 50% of our Scope 3 emissions to set their own SBTs and, in 2023, our engagement was at 46%.

## Investment in R&D

### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

*KDP acknowledges that demonstrating continued improvement and delivering on opportunities to increase climate resiliency is important to our stakeholders and can potentially contribute business benefit. One example of a strategic decision influenced by climate scenario analysis is our investment in agricultural R&D for coffee. To help farmers better adapt to the growing stressors of climate change and declining productivity, World Coffee Research (WCR) is conducting research and accelerating new approaches to grow, protect and enhance supplies of quality coffee. KDP is a co-founder and long-term supporter of WCR and in 2021 committed 1 million over the next four years in funding to make coffee farming more profitable and resilient to climate change. The grant supports developing and testing future coffee tree varieties on a global scale for field performance and quality. It will also support improving the seed and nursery infrastructure to get healthy, new trees into the hands of farmers that need them.*

## Operations

### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

Climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced KDP's strategy as it relates to our operations. For example, as we invest in infrastructure, we have focused on sustainably built facilities. Our K-cup pod manufacturing site in Spartanburg, South Carolina, is the largest industrial manufacturing facility certified under the LEEDv4 BDC rating system in North America, and it includes a separation room that moves all waste from production to be recycled, reused, repurposed or converted to energy. Additionally, our high-speed cold beverage production facility in Allentown, Pennsylvania, incorporates sustainability focused design, including a central room with magnetic bearing chillers that provide cooling for air conditioning as well as chilled water for production processes, a highly energy-efficient approach. Our Frisco, Texas headquarters location is LEED v4 IDC Gold certified, and our Newbridge, Ireland manufacturing facility is focused on renewable energy sources, with 100% of its energy sourced from wind in 2023. Additionally, in 2023 we expanded renewable electricity procurement activities to source 83% of our electricity needs from renewable resources, a 9-point improvement versus 2022. As part of the analysis supporting our science-based target, we have modeled fleet efficiency as a long-term strategy to 2030. Emissions from our combined fleet were about 48% of our Scope 1 and 2 emissions in 2023. Converting to more fuel-efficient technologies may provide an opportunity to reduce emissions. An example of a substantial strategic decision in this area is that as we closed a two-year pilot of electric forklifts in our Jacksonville, Florida, and Dallas, Texas, distribution centers, which reduced each facility's forklift fleet emissions by 67%. While this action is important first step, forklifts are just one portion of our larger inventory of scope 1 mobile emissions. We committed to phase in electric forklifts across all distribution centers and warehouses by 2026, while exploring new and emerging technologies for broader fleet decarbonization at scale, including the heavy-duty trucks that distribute our beverages. At year-end 2023, our electric vehicle representation within our Canadian fleet totaled more than 8%, which is a 1.2% reduction in Scope 1 emissions for KDP Canada. KDP intends to learn from these early deployments to help accelerate broader electric vehicle implementation in pursuit of lowering transportation emissions.

[Add row]

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

### Row 1

#### (5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- ☒ Revenues
- ☒ Direct costs
- ☒ Capital expenditures
- ☒ Capital allocation

#### (5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

*Climate change may increase the frequency or severity of natural disasters and other extreme weather conditions, which could pose physical risks to our facilities, impair our production capabilities, disrupt our supply chain or impact demand for our products. Climate change is already affecting the agricultural sector, and disruptions to crop growing conditions are expected to increase with extreme weather events, increasing temperatures and changing water availability. Disruptions to crop growing conditions can cause changes in geographical ranges of crops, as well as weeds, diseases and pests that affect those crops. These impacts have in the past and may in the future limit availability or increase the price volatility of key agricultural commodities, such as coffee, corn, citrus, cocoa, and apples, which are important sources of ingredients for our products. Concern over climate change, including global warming, has led to legislative and regulatory initiatives limiting greenhouse gas emissions and increasing disclosure obligations. Increased compliance costs due to legal or regulatory requirements, along with initiatives to meet our sustainability goals, may cause higher costs associated with, or disruptions in, the manufacturing and distribution of our beverage products. As a result, the effects of climate change and legal or regulatory initiatives to address climate change could have an adverse impact on our business and results of operations. In addition, any failure to achieve or properly report on our goals with respect to reducing our impact on the environment or perception of a failure to act responsibly with respect to the environment or to effectively respond to regulatory requirements concerning climate change can lead to adverse publicity, which could result in reduced demand for our products, damage to our reputation or increase the risk of litigation. Any of the foregoing can adversely affect our business.*

## Row 2

### (5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☒ Revenues

☒ Direct costs

### (5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☒ Water

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

*Water is the primary ingredient in many of our products and is used across our operations. The competition for water among domestic, agricultural and manufacturing users is increasing in the countries where we operate. Even where water is widely available, water purification and waste treatment infrastructure limitations and regulations could increase costs or constrain our operations. As water becomes scarcer, the quality of the water deteriorates, including due to the effects of climate change, or requirements on water purification or filtration increase, we may experience increased production costs; manufacturing constraints; supply chain disruption; higher compliance costs; increased capital expenditures; the interruption or cessation of operations at, or relocation of, our facilities or the facilities of our business partners; challenges to efficiency gains due to higher water usage in compliance with more stringent water quality standards; failure to achieve our water efficiency and conservation goals; perception of our failure to act responsibly with respect to water use or to effectively respond to legal or regulatory requirements concerning water scarcity and quality; or damage to our reputation, any of which can adversely affect our business.*

[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
	<p>Select from:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to in the next two years</p>

[Fixed row]

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

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

#### (5.9.5) Please explain

*Water-related CAPEX and OPEX are related to the installation and maintenance of water infrastructure such as advanced metering, water treatment technologies, water efficient manufacturing equipment, and wastewater treatment technologies. Change in water-related CAPEX and OPEX reflects the ongoing continuous improvements identified and implemented by the cross functional water optimization team. Financial performance including prior year comparisons / changes, are reported to investors in annual reports and SEC filings. Please see financial filings at <https://investors.keurigdrpepper.com/sec-filings>. Water OPEX and CAPEX are driven by multiple factors including the age of infrastructure and systems, and product mix.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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*

- ☒ Conduct cost-benefit analysis
- ☒ Drive energy efficiency
- ☒ Drive low-carbon investment
- ☒ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
- ☒ Setting and/or achieving of climate-related policies and targets

#### (5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Benchmarking against peers
- ☒ Cost of required measures to achieve climate-related targets

- ☒ Price with substantive impact on business decisions
- ☒ Price/cost of renewable energy procurement

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

*The implicit price is determined to be the marginal dollars spent per metric ton of greenhouse gas emission reduction, within the cap of KDP's annual sustainability capital allocation. Our calculation considers the greenhouse gas reductions available against the capital required and simple payback that can be achieved.*

#### (5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Scope 1

#### (5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

*Select from:*

- ☒ Differentiated

#### (5.10.1.7) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

*The price varies for each capital project evaluated and fall under the cap of the annual capital allocation*

#### (5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

*Select from:*

- ☒ Other, please specify :variable

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

0

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

2000

#### (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

#### (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

*The pricing approach is used to determine the most cost-effective options to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through capital investments. Annual investments and aggregated reductions are across all investments are compared against long-term carbon reduction plans in order to gauge overall progress against goals and targets. 100% of scope 1 emissions are in scope for this pricing approach.*

[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	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forests <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water
Smallholders	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i>
Customers	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water
Investors and shareholders	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water
Other value chain stakeholders	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:*

☒ 100%

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

*KDP's threshold for classifying suppliers is through our SBT Scope 3 Supplier Engagement target where we assess 1000 suppliers and identify the highest emitting 200 tier 1 suppliers as having the most substantive impact on the target.*

#### **(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**

200

### **Forests**

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

*Select from:*

☒ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

## Water

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

Select from:

☒ No, we do not assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, and have no plans to do so within two years

[Fixed row]

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

## Climate change

### (5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☒ Reputation management

### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*KDP engages bottlers and select suppliers representing a significant portion of our Scope 3 emissions to set science-based targets. This helps in aligning our sustainability goals with supplier climate actions and objectives.*

## Forests

### (5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☒ Reputation management

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*KDP focuses on responsible sourcing actions in key supply chains. KDP works closely with suppliers and innovative partners globally to help improve livelihoods and support regenerative agriculture and conservation in portions of our supply chain.*

### 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

☒ Reputation management

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*KDP focuses on responsible sourcing actions in key supply chains. KDP works closely with suppliers and innovative partners globally to help improve livelihoods and support regenerative agriculture and conservation in portions of our supply chain*

*[Fixed row]*

#### (5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?

	Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process	Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance	Comment
Climate change	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance	<i>Key suppliers are subject to environmental requirements through our Supplier Code of Conduct</i>
Forests	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance	<i>Key suppliers are subject to environmental requirements through our Supplier Code of Conduct</i>
Water	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance	<i>Key suppliers are subject to environmental requirements through our Supplier Code of Conduct</i>

[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:*

☒ Other, please specify :Compliance with a Responsible Sourcing certification or verification program, per KDP's list of accepted programs that are explained as part of our Supplier Code of Conduct (see the product-specific standards section) and in the comment section.

### (5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Certification
- ☒ Off-site third-party audit
- ☒ On-site third-party audit
- ☒ Other, please specify :Verification programs also employed

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ 1-25%

#### **(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:*

- ☒ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ Retain and engage

#### **(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged**

Select from:

☒ Unknown

#### (5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☒ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

#### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*KDP maintains a commitment to responsibly source coffee and cocoa through accepted certification and verification programs. During 2021 and 2022, a small amount of coffee was received as conventional (0.38% and 0.36%, respectively) due to COVID-19 impacts, supplier error or shipping delays. In 2023, 0.002% of coffee (a single shipment) was received as conventional per a customer requirement. Environmental requirements provided by certification and verification programs in scope are at the farm level, not directly via Tier 1 suppliers. % of Procurement Spend is calculated using our annual spend on green coffee and cocoa powder products divided by total procurement spend. KDP's approved coffee responsible sourcing programs in 2023 were: Fairtrade International, Fair Trade USA, the Rainforest Alliance, 4C, AtSource Entry Verified by ofi, NKG Verified, RSP Advanced by Louis Dreyfus Company, Volcafe Verified, Volcafe Excellence, Sucafina, RGC Coffee 3E, Guaxupe Planet, ECOM SMS. KDP's approved cocoa responsible sourcing programs in 2023 were Rainforest Alliance, Fair Trade USA and Fairtrade International*

### Forests

#### (5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Verification programs also employed

#### (5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Certification

☒ Off-site third-party audit

☒ On-site third-party audit

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ Retain and engage

#### (5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☒ Unknown

#### (5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

#### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*KDP maintains a commitment to responsibly source coffee and cocoa purchases through accepted certification and verification programs. During 2021 and 2022, a small amount of coffee was received as conventional (0.38% and 0.36%, respectively) due to COVID-19 impacts, supplier error or shipping delays. In 2023, 0.002% of coffee (a single shipment) was received as conventional per a customer requirement. Environmental requirements provided by certification and verification programs in scope are at the farm level, not directly via Tier 1 suppliers. % of Procurement Spend is calculated using our annual spend on green coffee and cocoa powder products divided by total procurement spend. KDP's approved coffee responsible sourcing programs in 2023 were: Fairtrade International, Fair Trade USA, the Rainforest Alliance, 4C, AtSource Entry Verified by ofi, NKG Verified, RSP Advanced by Louis Dreyfus Company, Volcafe Verified, Volcafe Excellence, Sucafina, RGC Coffee 3E, Guaxupe Planet, ECOM SMS. KDP's approved cocoa responsible sourcing programs in 2023 were Rainforest Alliance, Fair Trade USA and Fairtrade International.*

## Water

#### **(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement**

*Select from:*

☒ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :Fairtrade International, Fair Trade USA, the Rainforest Alliance, 4C, AtSource Entry Verified by ofi, NKG Verified, RSP Advanced by Louis Dreyfus Company, Volcafe Verified, Volcafe Excellence, Sucafina, RGC Coffee 3E, Guaxupe Planet, ECOM SMS.

#### **(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement**

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Certification
- ☒ Off-site third-party audit
- ☒ On-site third-party audit
- ☒ Other, please specify :Verification programs are also employed

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ Retain and engage

#### **(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged**

*Select from:*

- ☒ Unknown

### (5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- ☒ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*KDP maintains a commitment to responsibly source coffee and cocoa purchases through accepted certification and verification programs. During 2021 and 2022, a small amount of coffee was received as conventional (0.38% and 0.36%, respectively) due to COVID-19 impacts, supplier error or shipping delays. In 2023, 0.002% of coffee (a single shipment) was received as conventional per a customer requirement. Environmental requirements provided by certification and verification programs in scope are at the farm level, not directly via Tier 1 suppliers. % of Procurement Spend is calculated using our annual spend on green coffee and cocoa powder products divided by total procurement spend. KDP's approved coffee responsible sourcing programs in 2023 were: Fairtrade International, Fair Trade USA, the Rainforest Alliance, 4C, AtSource Entry Verified by ofi, NKG Verified, RSP Advanced by Louis Dreyfus Company, Volcafe Verified, Volcafe Excellence, Sucafina, RGC Coffee 3E, Guaxupe Planet, ECOM SMS. KDP's approved cocoa responsible sourcing programs in 2023 were Rainforest Alliance, Fair Trade USA and Fairtrade International.*

[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:

- ☒ Adaptation to climate change

### (5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

#### Information collection

- ☒ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

### (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:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

*World Coffee Research (WCR) is an industry-backed agricultural Research & Development organization focused on growing, protecting and enhancing coffee as a global crop. KDP was a founding member of WCR and is one of the organization's largest donors, having invested more than 4.2 million since 2012. KDP not only invests in WCR's work, but also contributes to its strategic direction by serving on the Board of Directors. Due to WCR's extensive, global network of partners, the impact of WCR's coffee agricultural research covers the majority of our green coffee origins. A core element of WCR's research strategy is to drive research that dramatically improves coffee productivity, coffee quality, climate resilience, and farmer livelihoods. A key piece of their approach is applying modern breeding approaches to create improved coffee varieties that will be climate resilient and disease resistant, while maintaining high productivity and quality. WCR also conducts the field work to test these varieties (for example, farmer field and quality trials), addresses systemic barriers to adoption (for example, nursery and seed distribution infrastructure), and brings scientific rigor to other critical research (for example, climate change mitigation and pest and disease). During 2023, WCR continued its work to help preserve origin diversity by accelerating innovation for coffee agriculture and launching a breeding network in multiple strategically targeted geographies. KDP's support enables the long-term WCR research strategy to continue so that new knowledge and technologies can be delivered to coffee producers around the world.*

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ No

## Forests

### (5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☒ Coffee

### (5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☒ Upstream value chain transparency and human rights

### (5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

#### Capacity building

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

### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

### (5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

0

## Water

### (5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☒ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

### (5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

## Capacity building

- ☒ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions

### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers
- ☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

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

Select from:

- ☒ Unknown

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

Select from:

- ☒ 1-25%

### (5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

0

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

*Water is a crucial component in growing and brewing coffee. That's why we are committed to being a water steward in our operations, in coffee communities, and in our local communities. Within the supply chain, we support projects that teach coffee farmers to be good water stewards, which can improve water quality and quantity, and reduce the impact of climate change on their farms and in their communities. KDP has invested more than 7.8 million in the Blue Harvest program over the last 10 years to promote sustainable farming practices and increase access to clean water for coffee farmers and communities in Central America. We measure success of this program through a set of impact indicators including: # of farmers adopting water-smart practices, # of acres supported for regenerative agriculture and conservation, and # of people benefiting from improved drinking water sources (among others). Since 2022, the beginning of the latest phase of the Blue Harvest program, more than 2,800 farmers were trained to apply water-smart practices on their coffee farms, over 84,000 acres were supported for regenerative agriculture and conservation, and drinking water access was improved for more than 38,000 people.*

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

Select from:

- ☒ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

[Add row]

### (5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

#### Row 1

##### (5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

- ☒ Coffee

##### (5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

###### Capacity building

- ☒ Provide training, support and best practices on sustainable agriculture practices and nutrient management
- ☒ Support smallholders to adhere to regenerative agriculture principles
- ☒ Support smallholders to adhere to standards in upstream value chain

###### Financial incentives

- ☒ Living income for smallholders and other individual producers
- ☒ Pay higher prices linked to best agricultural practices
- ☒ Provide financial incentives for certified products

### (5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

0

### (5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*We are committed to supporting the economic resilience of farmers and workers in our supply chains. Decades of working with smallholder coffee communities have propelled us to focus on advancing inclusion by addressing barriers to entry and prosperity in these supply chains. Farmers and workers are better positioned to contribute to positive outcomes, such as preserving biodiversity, mitigating and adapting to climate change, improving water stewardship and boosting personal and community well-being, when they have economic stability and access to financial opportunities and prosperity. We are continuing to build out an updated approach in support of our Livelihood ambition, taking learnings from our key impact investments to shape a refreshed approach.*

[Add row]

## (5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

### Climate change

#### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Customers

#### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

##### Education/Information sharing

☒ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

#### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ Unknown

#### (5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

*Walmart is an important customer and has led a charge to reduce supply chain emissions via its Project Gigaton. We joined the campaign as Keurig Green Mountain in FY17 and have retained “Giga-Guru” status as listed on their site: Supplier Recognition (walmart.com). We regularly share sustainability information including our GHG footprint and efforts to reduce it during business meetings.*

#### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*The engagement has strengthened internal awareness of Walmart’s campaigns and the importance of our emissions work. In 2020, we won Walmart’s Sustainability Award in the Packaged Goods category, for the second year in a row, one of just a few awards given among thousands of global suppliers, for our joint efforts on end-to-end supply chain, decreasing emissions by reducing the number of trucks on the road, responsible sourcing and product stewardship. We have been happy to be listed as a “Giga-Guru” on their site since 2017: Supplier Recognition (walmart.com). Together, these represent two of the metrics of success we aimed for: both internal and external recognition. This strategic initiative has had a positive impact on our reputation with our customers.*

### Water

#### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Customers

#### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

##### Innovation and collaboration

☒ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

#### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ Unknown

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

Water is a shared resource that is important to the health of communities and ecosystems. KDP has a goal to partner with our highest water-risk operating communities, so that by 2030 we are annually replenishing 100% of water used in our beverages in those communities. Through collaborations with local partners, KDP has conducted on-the-ground conservation projects that have enhanced watersheds, protected habitats and conserved water. This, in turn, is leading to long-term impact in watersheds that are critical to sustaining healthy ecosystems and strengthening climate resilience, as long as conservation efforts in watersheds are sustained over time.

#### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Following a re-baseline for our water replenishment goal to reflect the expansion from six to 10 production facilities as announced in 2022, we continue to improve our water replenishment performance. Through various partnerships and collaborations with nonprofits and industry partners, we achieved 55 percent replenishment for high water-risk operating communities through the end of 2023. Key to driving progress were additional investments and implementation of projects in Florida, Texas and Mexico that improved hydrological capacity through interventions such as forest management, conservation, agroforestry and flow restoration. While our investments in water replenishment have been anchored in improving the capacity for water availability, there are many co-benefits to this work, including positive impacts to aquatic habitats, biodiversity, protection of native species, and improved surface water quality.

[Add row]

### (5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

#### Row 1

#### (5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

#### (5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☒ Water

#### (5.12.4) Initiative category and type

##### Promote collective action

☒ Invite customer to collaborate with other users in their river basins to reduce impact

### (5.12.5) Details of initiative

*KDP supports various collective action efforts to improve water availability, quality, and access in which water risk basins where we operate. Collective action has the potential to scale the impact of projects of these projects, delivery greater impact in water availability, access, and quality.*

### (5.12.6) Expected benefits

*Select all that apply*

☒ Improved water stewardship

### (5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

*Select from:*

☒ 1-3 years

### (5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

*Select from:*

☒ No

### (5.12.11) Please explain

*Outcomes are basin specific and focus on net positive water impacts as defined by the Water Resilience Coalition*

## Row 2

### (5.12.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

### (5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

*Select all that apply*

☒ Water

#### (5.12.4) Initiative category and type

##### Promote collective action

- ☒ Invite customer to collaborate with other users in their river basins to reduce impact

#### (5.12.5) Details of initiative

*KDP supports various collective action efforts to improve water availability, quality, and access in which water risk basins where we operate. Collective action has the potential to scale the impact of projects of these projects, delivery greater impact in water availability, access, and quality.*

#### (5.12.6) Expected benefits

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Improved water stewardship

#### (5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

*Select from:*

- ☒ 1-3 years

#### (5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

*Select from:*

- ☒ No

#### (5.12.11) Please explain

*Outcomes are basin specific and focus on net positive water impacts as defined by the Water Resilience Coalition. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition.*

### Row 3

#### (5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

### (5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☒ Water

### (5.12.4) Initiative category and type

#### Promote collective action

☒ Invite customer to collaborate with other users in their river basins to reduce impact

### (5.12.5) Details of initiative

*KDP supports various collective action efforts to improve water availability, quality, and access in which water risk basins where we operate. Collective action has the potential to scale the impact of projects of these projects, delivery greater impact in water availability, access, and quality.*

### (5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☒ Improved water stewardship

### (5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

### (5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☒ No

### (5.12.11) Please explain

*Outcomes are basin specific and focus on net positive water impacts as defined by the Water Resilience Coalition. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition.*

## Row 4

### (5.12.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

### (5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

*Select all that apply*

☒ Water

### (5.12.4) Initiative category and type

#### **Promote collective action**

☒ Invite customer to collaborate with other users in their river basins to reduce impact

### (5.12.5) Details of initiative

*KDP supports various collective action efforts to improve water availability, quality, and access in which water risk basins where we operate. Collective action has the potential to scale the impact of projects of these projects, delivery greater impact in water availability, access, and quality.*

### (5.12.6) Expected benefits

*Select all that apply*

☒ Improved water stewardship

### (5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

*Select from:*

☒ 1-3 years

### (5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☒ No

### (5.12.11) Please explain

*Outcomes are basin specific and focus on net positive water impacts as defined by the Water Resilience Coalition. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition.*

[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	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify :Mutually beneficial initiatives are being pursued through other collective actions.	We have not participated in any environmental initiatives as a result of CDP supply chain.

[Fixed row]

## C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>The operational control approach aligns best with the organization emissions KDP is responsible for.</i>
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>The operational control approach aligns best with the organization emissions KDP is responsible for.</i>
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>The operational control approach aligns best with the organization emissions KDP is responsible for.</i>
Plastics	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>The operational control approach aligns best with the organization emissions KDP is responsible for.</i>
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>The operational control approach aligns best with the organization emissions KDP is responsible for.</i>

[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:

☒ No

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

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	N/A

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

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

**Scope 1**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2018

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

273576.0

#### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Scope 1 Emissions reflect primarily natural gas consumption at our manufacturing plants and diesel consumption by our fleet.*

#### **Scope 2 (location-based)**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2018

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

166484.0

#### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Scope 2 emissions reflect primarily electricity consumption at our manufacturing plants.*

#### **Scope 2 (market-based)**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2018

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

137560.0

#### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

Scope 2 emissions reflect primarily electricity consumption at our manufacturing plants. Market based close 2 emissions reflect renewable electricity procured via market instruments and green tariff contracts.

## Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3963399.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*For procured packaging materials and ingredients (e.g. green coffee, High-fructose corn syrup, etc.) LCA factors are used, applied to specific types of ingredient/materials where available. EEIO factors are used for indirect spend.*

## Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35627.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*EEIO factors are used for spend on capital goods.*

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

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

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

97291.0

#### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Upstream emissions from purchased fuels and electricity include generation and T&D emissions, and any other losses in this category. Emissions were calculated using activity data (electricity consumed and fuel consumption by fuel type) multiplied by country or region-specific emissions factors from UK Defra 2021 Guidelines for GHG Reporting and IEA 2022 factors, Green-e, and Government of Canada. FERA calculation is market-based.*

### **Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2018

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

481603.0

#### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*This category includes emissions associated with inbound raw materials and outbound transportation of finished products via third-party carriers. For U.S. domestic road transport EPA's Smartway tool is used to calculate GHG impact. We apply CO2 uplift for other gases and WTT. GHG emissions associated with inbound green coffee shipments are estimated using volumes, origin and destination locations. GHG emission from inbound brewers and beverage concentrates come from a vendor's emission report.*

### **Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2018

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

797.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Supplier-reported operations waste total tonnages for various waste streams were multiplied by relevant emission factors per the GHG Protocol. Includes emissions associated with transportation to waste sites.*

## Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8324.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Air travel: Emissions from air travel are calculated using data on distance travelled categorized into long, medium and short haul. Miles by haul (short (0, 300) miles, medium [300, 2300) miles, and long [2300, above] miles) were multiplied by the relevant EPA emissions factors. Car rental and rail: Emissions from rail and car travel are calculated using total distance travelled by mode of transport. Miles were multiplied by the relevant EPA emissions factors. Emission factors selected from US EPA, "Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories," Table 10 Business Travel Emission Factors, March 26, 2020.*

## Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

52644.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Employee Commute: Total number of days for employees working on-site in 2023 was multiplied by and an average distance of 11.8 miles per one-way trip (Source: 2017 National Household Travel Survey). It was assumed that 87% of the total trips made were by car (Source: 2020 National Household Travel Survey). Emission factors applied were adopted from US EPA 2023. Remote/Work-from-home emissions: Total number of days for employees working remotely in 2023 (245 days) was multiplied by natural gas and electricity intensities to estimate energy consumption. Emission factors applied to natural gas were taken from US EPA 2023 while emissions associated with electricity use were calculated using IEA 2023, Green-e 2023, and eGRID2020 factors.*

## **Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets**

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2018

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

0

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*KDP does not lease upstream assets.*

## **Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution**

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2018

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

1007135.0

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*This category includes GHG emissions associated with retailer chilling and distribution of all goods, including distribution via 3rd party bottlers and Allied brands. Emission factors are estimated from studies of representative products based on actual sales data.*

## **Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products**

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2632469.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*This category includes emissions associated with product processing by third-party bottlers, including packaging and manufacturing waste. Emission factors are estimated from studies of representative products multiplied by sales figures.*

## Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

390703.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Brewer electricity use was estimated from technical data about power ratings and estimates of lifetime hours in use for each brewer type multiplied by actual sales figures by brewer type. Relevant country electricity emission factors were applied to the total electricity use in kWh. Proxy technical data was used for some brewer types.*

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

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*All Brewers produced are assumed to be landfilled after use apart from those returned to the company, which are recycled. EOL impact is derived from brewer LCA. Actual quantities of returned brewers used. For coffee and coffee packaging, assumptions are applied for rate by destination for EOL stream, multiplied by actual quantities of coffee and coffee packaging. For cold beverages, packaging EOL treatment has been estimated from the weight of purchases multiplied by the EOL EFs of the representative products of those materials and estimates of the EOL destination.*

## Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

700.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Emissions associated with leased burned jet fuel are calculated in Downstream Leased Assets. Includes KDP jet fuel consumption (KDP and lessee fuel consumption; KDP fuel consumption is Scope 1 and lessee fuel consumption is Scope 3). WTT is included. The applicable US EPA 2023 jet fuel emission factors were used.*

## Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*KDP does not have franchises.*

## Scope 3 category 15: Investments

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Investments are not a material contribution to our Scope 3 emissions. KDP holds non-controlling investments in certain privately held entities which are accounted for as equity method investments, equity securities with readily determinable fair value, or equity securities without readily determinable value. KDP ownership interests for investments in unconsolidated affiliates are less than 50 percent.*

## Scope 3: Other (upstream)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*not applicable*

## Scope 3: Other (downstream)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

not applicable  
[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Methodological details
Reporting year	286787	Scope 1 Emissions reflect primarily natural gas consumption at our manufacturing plants and diesel consumption by our fleet.

[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)

174778

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

36721

#### (7.7.4) Methodological details

*Scope 2 emissions reflect primarily electricity consumption at our manufacturing plants. Market based close 2 emissions reflect renewable electricity procured via market instruments and green tariff contracts.*

*[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)

4966238

##### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

*Select all that apply*

☒ Average data method

☒ 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

*For procured packaging materials and ingredients (e.g. green coffee, High-fructose corn syrup, etc.) LCA factors are used, applied to specific types of ingredient/materials where available. EEIO factors are used for indirect spend.*

## Capital goods

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

51623

### (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

EEIO factors are used for spend on capital goods.

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

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

78273

### (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

100

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Upstream emissions from purchased fuels and electricity include generation and T&D emissions, and any other losses in this category. Emissions were calculated using activity data (electricity consumed and fuel consumption by fuel type) multiplied by country or region-specific emissions factors from UK Defra 2021 Guidelines for GHG Reporting and IEA 2022 factors, Green-e, and Government of Canada. FERA calculation is market-based.*

## Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

### (7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

408034

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

☒ Distance-based method

☒ Site-specific method

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

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*This category includes emissions associated with inbound raw materials and outbound transportation of finished products via third-party carriers. For U.S. domestic road transport EPA's Smartway tool is used to calculate GHG impact. We apply CO2 uplift for other gases and WTT. GHG emissions associated with inbound green coffee shipments are estimated using volumes, origin and destination locations. GHG emission from inbound brewers and beverage concentrates come from a vendor's emission report.*

## Waste generated in operations

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

9771

### (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

100

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Supplier-reported operations waste total tonnages for various waste streams were multiplied by relevant emission factors per the GHG Protocol. Includes emissions associated with transportation to waste sites.*

## Business travel

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

9474

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

☒ 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: Emissions from air travel are calculated using data on distance travelled categorized into long, medium and short haul. Miles by haul (short (0, 300) miles, medium [300, 2300) miles, and long [2300, above] miles) were multiplied by the relevant EPA emissions factors. Car rental and rail: Emissions from rail and car travel are calculated using total distance travelled by mode of transport. Miles were multiplied by the relevant EPA emissions factors. Emission factors selected from US EPA, "Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories," Table 10 Business Travel Emission Factors, March 26, 2020*

## Employee commuting

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Employee Commute: Total number of days for employees working on-site in 2023 was multiplied by and an average distance of 11.8 miles per one-way trip (Source: 2017 National Household Travel Survey). It was assumed that 87% of the total trips made were by car (Source: 2020 National Household Travel Survey). Emission factors applied were adopted from US EPA 2023. Remote/Work-from-home emissions: Total number of days for employees working remotely in 2023 (245 days) was multiplied by natural gas and electricity intensities to estimate energy consumption. Emission factors applied to natural gas were taken from US EPA 2023 while emissions associated with electricity use were calculated using IEA 2023, Green-e 2023, and eGRID2020 factors.*

## Upstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*No upstream leased assets*

## Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

1081598

### (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

*This category includes GHG emissions associated with retailer chilling and distribution of all goods, including distribution via 3rd party bottlers and Allied brands. Emission factors are estimated from studies of representative products based on actual sales data.*

## Processing of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

2772831

### (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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*This category includes emissions associated with product processing by third-party bottlers, including packaging and manufacturing waste. Emission factors are estimated from studies of representative products multiplied by sales figures.*

## Use of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

### (7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

479915

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Products that directly consume energy (fuels or electricity) during use; indirect use phase emissions: average product method applied for products that indirectly consume energy (fuels or electricity) during use.

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Brewer electricity use was estimated from technical data about power ratings and estimates of lifetime hours in use for each brewer type multiplied by actual sales figures by brewer type. Relevant country electricity emission factors were applied to the total electricity use in kWh. Proxy technical data was used for some brewer types.*

## 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)

143524

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average product method

☒ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*All Brewers produced are assumed to be landfilled after use apart from those returned to the company, which are recycled. EOL impact is derived from brewer LCA. Actual quantities of returned brewers used. For coffee and coffee packaging, assumptions are applied for rate by destination for EOL stream, multiplied by actual quantities of coffee and coffee packaging. For cold beverages, packaging EOL treatment has been estimated from the weight of purchases multiplied by the EOL EFs of the representative products of those materials and estimates of the EOL destination.*

## Downstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Distance-based method

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

100

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Emissions associated with leased burned jet fuel are calculated in Downstream Leased Assets. Includes KDP jet fuel consumption (KDP and lessee fuel consumption; KDP fuel consumption is Scope 1 and lessee fuel consumption is Scope 3). WTT is included. The applicable US EPA 2023 jet fuel emission factors were used.*

## Franchises

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*KDP does not have franchises*

## Investments

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Investments are not a material contribution to our Scope 3 emissions. KDP holds non-controlling investments in certain privately held entities which are accounted for as equity method investments, equity securities with readily determinable fair value, or equity securities without readily determinable value. KDP ownership interests for investments in unconsolidated affiliates are less than 50 percent.*

### Other (upstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Not relevant*

### Other (downstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Not relevant*

*[Fixed row]*

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

#### (7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

*page 1*

#### (7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

*Select from:*

☒ ISAE3000

#### (7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

*100*

*[Add row]*

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

#### **Row 1**

#### (7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

*Select from:*

☒ Scope 2 location-based

#### (7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

*Select from:*

☒ Annual process

#### (7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

#### (7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

#### (7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

#### (7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

*page 1*

#### (7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

#### (7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

*100*

### Row 2

#### (7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 market-based

#### (7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

page 1

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

(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: Employee commuting

### (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

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

### (7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

*page 1*

### (7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

### (7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

Row 2

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 3: Use of sold products

(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

ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

page 1

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

#### (7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

### Row 3

#### (7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

*Select all that apply*

☒ 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

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

#### (7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

*page 1*

### (7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

### (7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ Decreased

**(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.**

**Change in renewable energy consumption**

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20959

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

5.89

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We increased our renewable electricity purchases by more than 80,000 Megawatt-hours (MWhs), resulting in 83% of our electricity needs being sourced from renewable sources, up from 74% in 2022.*

### Other emissions reduction activities

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

700

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.2

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We held energy optimization events at 21 plants to identify energy and GHG emissions savings and to create cultures of energy management. These efforts resulted in over 700 metric tons of avoided GHG emissions.*

### 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

*no change*

### Acquisitions

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

*Select from:*

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*no change*

### Mergers

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

*Select from:*

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*no change*

### Change in output

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

*Select from:*

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*no change*

### Change in methodology

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*no change*

#### Change in boundary

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*no change*

#### Change in physical operating conditions

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*no change*

### Unidentified

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*no change*

### Other

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

no change

[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

**(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?**

Select from:

☒ No

**(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?**

**Coffee**

#### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☒ Unit of production

#### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

674648

#### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☒ Kilograms

#### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (7.14.6) Please explain

*The boundaries used for the coffee calculations are organization-wide. There are no exclusions. Coffee weights purchased are multiplied by LCA impacts using the applicable emission factors from WFLDB 3.5 and Ecoinvent 3.10 with FLAG disaggregation to obtain annual emissions in kgCO2e. The appropriate conversions are applied to convert KgCO2e/kg to tCO2e.*

### Fruit

#### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☒ Unit of production

#### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

13133

#### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☒ Kilograms

#### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (7.14.6) Please explain

*The boundaries used for the Apple emissions calculations are organization-wide. There are no exclusions. Apple weights (Kg) purchased are multiplied by LCA impacts using the applicable emission factors from WFLDB 3.5 and Ecoinvent 3.10 with FLAG disaggregation to obtain annual emissions in kgCO<sub>2</sub>e. The appropriate conversions are applied to convert KgCO<sub>2</sub>e/kg to tCO<sub>2</sub>e.*

### Maize/corn

#### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☒ Unit of production

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1253919

### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☒ Kilograms

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*The boundaries used for the Maize/Corn (High Fructose Corn Syrup) emissions calculations are organization-wide. There are no exclusions. HFCS weights (Kg) purchased are multiplied by LCA impacts using the applicable emission factors from WFLDB 3.5 and Ecoinvent 3.10 with FLAG disaggregation to obtain annual emissions in kgCO2e. The appropriate conversions are applied to convert KgCO2e/kg to tCO2e.*

## Timber products

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☒ Unit of production

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

204729

### (7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☒ Kilograms

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*The boundaries used for the timber (fiber-based packaging) emissions calculations are organization-wide. There are no exclusions. Fiber-based packaging weights (Kg) are multiplied by LCA impacts using the applicable emission factors from WFLDB 3.5 and Ecoinvent 3.10 with FLAG disaggregation to obtain annual emissions in kgCO2e. The appropriate conversions are applied to convert KgCO2e/kg to tCO2e.*

[Fixed row]

### (7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Row 1

#### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ CO2

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

283869

#### (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)

247

#### (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)

1547

(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)

1125

(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.

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10340

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

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

0

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

122

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

122

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

2

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

2

Ireland

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1593

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

1786

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

0

**Luxembourg**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

1

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

3

**Mexico**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

13170.59

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

31792

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

31792

**Singapore**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

3

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

3

**Switzerland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

1

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

0

**United States of America**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

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

138674

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

4798  
[Fixed row]

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

- Select all that apply
- ☒ By business division
  - ☒ By activity

(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	U.S. Coffee	14986
Row 2	U.S. Refreshment Beverages	246693
Row 3	International	25104

[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	<i>Manufacturing and Distribution (Stationary)</i>	128976
Row 3	<i>Transportation and Distribution (Mobile)</i>	156686

[Add row]

**(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.**

**Row 1**

#### **(7.18.2.1) Activity**

Select from:

☒ Processing/Manufacturing

#### **(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

117109.58

#### **(7.18.2.4) Methodology**

Select all that apply

☒ Default emissions factor

#### (7.18.2.5) Please explain

*Manufacturing plants – natural gas consumption.*

#### Row 2

#### (7.18.2.1) Activity

*Select from:*

☒ Distribution

#### (7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

156686

#### (7.18.2.4) Methodology

*Select all that apply*

☒ Default emissions factor

#### (7.18.2.5) Please explain

*Fuel used by Direct Store Delivery and Supply Chain fleets in our operations.*

*[Add row]*

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

*Select all that apply*

☒ By business division

☒ By activity

#### (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	<i>U.S. Coffee</i>	<i>30005</i>	<i>371</i>
Row 2	<i>U.S. Refreshment Beverages</i>	<i>108669</i>	<i>4428</i>
Row 3	<i>International</i>	<i>36107</i>	<i>31922</i>

[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	<i>Manufacturing and Distribution (Stationary Sources)</i>	<i>174778</i>	<i>36721</i>
Row 2	<i>Transportation and Distribution (Mobile Sources)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

[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)

286787

#### (7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

174778

#### (7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36721

#### (7.22.4) Please explain

*KDP's Scope 1 and 2 emissions associated with its consolidated accounting group are comprised of the parent organization and its subsidiaries.*

#### All other entities

#### (7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.22.4) Please explain

*Our response does not include any other entities.*

*[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.**

	Requesting member
Row 1	Select from:
Row 2	Select from:
Row 3	Select from:
Row 4	Select from:

[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**

Guidelines as to the most acceptable approximations of emissions associated with different customers.

[Add row]

## (7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

### (7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

Select from:

☒ No

### (7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track or allocate emissions to the customer level.

### (7.28.4) Explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

*Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track or allocate emissions to the customer level.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

### (7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

#### Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

##### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

##### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

##### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1337084

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1337084

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

436450

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

89393

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

525843

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

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

436450

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1426477

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1862927  
[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	<div>Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</div>

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

### Sustainable biomass

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

*Select from:*

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

0

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

n/a

**Other biomass**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

Select from:

☒ HHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

0

**(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

0

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

0

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

n/a

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

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

n/a

## Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

n/a

### Oil

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

#### (7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

n/a

### Gas

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

707919.57

**(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

0

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

0

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

*Natural gas, LNG, LPG*

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

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

*Select from:*

☒ HHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

629164.19

**(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

0

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

0

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

*Diesel*

## Total fuel

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1337083.77

### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

### (7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

n/a

[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)

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

## **Heat**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

707945

**(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

707945

**(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]*

**(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.**

## **Canada**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

20969.49

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

☒ No

**(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)**

20969.49

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

*none excluded*

**China**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

198.76

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

☒ No

**(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)**

198.76

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

*none excluded*

**Hong Kong SAR, China**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

2.78

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(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)**

2.78

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

*none excluded*

**Ireland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

5136.15

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

*Select from:*

☒ No

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

5136.15

**(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)

10272.30

(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded

*none excluded*

## Luxembourg

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7.95

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

0

(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(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)

7.95

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

*none excluded*

**Mexico**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

77960.68

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

☒ No

**(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)**

77960.68

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

*none excluded*

**Singapore**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

6.69

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(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)**

6.69

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

*none excluded*

**Switzerland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

44

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(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)**

44.00

**(7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded**

*none excluded*

**United States of America**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

42517

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

0

**(7.30.16.3) Is some or all of this electricity consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?**

Select from:

☒ No

#### (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)

42517.00

#### (7.30.16.7) Provide details of the electricity consumption excluded

*none excluded*  
*[Fixed row]*

### (7.30.17) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity purchases in the reporting year by country/area.

#### Row 1

#### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

*Select from:*

☒ United States of America

#### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

*Select from:*

☒ Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable electricity mix, please specify

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

364031

#### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ US-REC

#### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ United States of America

#### (7.30.17.7) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

2008

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

Select from:

☒ 2023

#### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2023

### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ Green-e Certified(R) Renewable Energy

### (7.30.17.12) Comment

*RECs purchased are Green-e Certified under the Renewable Energy Standard for Canada and the United States v3.5 as published by Center for Resource Solutions. RECs qualifying under the Renewable Energy Standard come from generation facilities that first began commercial operation within the past 15 years. Therefore, the commissioning year of assets generating qualified RECs has been conservatively estimated as 2008 or later, although actual dates may vary as RECs are purchased from a mix of assets. Eligible hydroelectric facilities are defined in the Green-e Renewable Energy Standard For Canada and the United States ([www.green-e.org/standard](http://www.green-e.org/standard)) and include facilities certified by the Low Impact Hydropower Institute (LIHI) ([www.lowimpacthydro.org](http://www.lowimpacthydro.org)) or EcoLogo ([www.ecologo.org](http://www.ecologo.org)); and facilities comprised of a turbine in a pipeline or a turbine in an irrigation canal.*

## Row 2

### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ Canada

### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

☒ Wind

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

20969

#### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ US-REC

#### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ United States of America

#### (7.30.17.7) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

2008

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

Select from:

☒ 2023

#### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2023

#### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ Green-e Certified(R) Renewable Energy

#### (7.30.17.12) Comment

RECs purchased are Green-e Certified under the Renewable Energy Standard for Canada and the United States v3.5 as published by Center for Resource Solutions. RECs qualifying under the Renewable Energy Standard come from generation facilities that first began commercial operation within the past 15 years. Therefore, the commissioning year of assets generating qualified RECs has been conservatively estimated as 2008 or later, although actual dates may vary as RECs are purchased from a mix of assets. Eligible hydroelectric facilities are defined in the Green-e Renewable Energy Standard For Canada and the United States ([www.green-e.org/standard](http://www.green-e.org/standard)) and include facilities certified by the Low Impact Hydropower Institute (LIHI) ([www.lowimpacthydro.org](http://www.lowimpacthydro.org)) or EcoLogo ([www.ecologo.org](http://www.ecologo.org)); and facilities comprised of a turbine in a pipeline or a turbine in an irrigation canal.

### Row 3

#### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ United States of America

#### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

#### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

☒ Wind

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

45869

#### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Contract

#### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ United States of America

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

2008

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

Select from:

☒ 2023

**(7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year**

2022

**(7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity**

Select from:

☒ Green-e Certified(R) Renewable Energy

**(7.30.17.12) Comment**

*RECs purchased are Green-e Certified under the Renewable Energy Standard for Canada and the United States v3.5 as published by Center for Resource Solutions. RECs qualifying under the Renewable Energy Standard come from generation facilities that first began commercial operation within the past 15 years. Therefore, the commissioning year of assets generating qualified RECs has been conservatively estimated as 2008 or later, although actual dates may vary as RECs are purchased from a mix of assets. Eligible hydroelectric facilities are defined in the Green-e Renewable Energy Standard For Canada and the United States ([www.green-e.org/standard](http://www.green-e.org/standard)) and include facilities certified by the Low Impact Hydropower Institute (LIHI) ([www.lowimpacthydro.org](http://www.lowimpacthydro.org)) or EcoLogo ([www.ecologo.org](http://www.ecologo.org)); and facilities comprised of a turbine in a pipeline or a turbine in an irrigation canal.*

**Row 4**

#### (7.30.17.1) Country/area of consumption of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ Ireland

#### (7.30.17.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

#### (7.30.17.3) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

☒ Wind

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

5136

#### (7.30.17.5) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Contract

#### (7.30.17.6) Country/area of origin (generation) of purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ Ireland

#### (7.30.17.7) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ No

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

2008

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

Select from:

☒ 2023

#### (7.30.17.10) Supply arrangement start year

2021

#### (7.30.17.11) Ecolabel associated with purchased renewable electricity

Select from:

☒ No additional, voluntary label

#### (7.30.17.12) Comment

*Renewable electricity delivered through utility contract*  
[Add row]

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

#### Row 1

#### (7.30.19.1) Country/area of generation

Select from:

☒ United States of America

#### (7.30.19.2) Renewable electricity technology type

Select from:

☒ Solar

### (7.30.19.3) Facility capacity (MW)

0

### (7.30.19.4) Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)

0

### (7.30.19.5) Renewable electricity consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year (MWh)

0

### (7.30.19.6) Energy attribute certificates issued for this generation

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (7.30.19.7) Type of energy attribute certificate

Select from:

☒ US-REC

### (7.30.19.8) Comment

KDP does not retain the RECs  
[Add row]

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

100% of KDP's unbundled energy attribute certificate purchases for North America (renewable energy certificates, or RECs) are Green-e certified, indicating that the seller is required to disclose the quantity, type, and geographic source of each certificate, in addition to other Green-e requirements regarding vintage and asset age. Our purchase of RECs helps to build a market for renewable electricity by increasing demand for, and generation of, renewable electricity in the region where the generator is located.

(7.30.21) In the reporting year, has your organization faced barriers or challenges to sourcing renewable electricity?

	Challenges to sourcing renewable electricity
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0000218

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

323508

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

14814000000

#### (7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Market-based

#### (7.45.6) % change from previous year

13.68

#### (7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

#### (7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☒ Change in renewable energy consumption

#### (7.45.9) Please explain

From 2022 to 2023, total Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions decreased from 355,868 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e to 323,508 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e. From 2022 to 2023, total revenue (net sales) increased from 14,057,000,000 to 14,814,000,000. From 2022 to 2023, total Scope 1 and 2 intensity per unit total revenue decreased from 0.000253 to 0.0000218, a decrease of -13.68%.

[Add row]

### (7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

#### Row 1

#### (7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☒ Waste

### (7.52.2) Metric value

93

### (7.52.3) Metric numerator

*Tons of waste diverted from landfill*

### (7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

*Tons of waste generated*

### (7.52.5) % change from previous year

1

### (7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

### (7.52.7) Please explain

*Achieving zero waste to landfill from our manufacturing facilities is an important part of our circular economy ambitions. This commitment involves reducing, reusing, repurposing, and recycling our waste in creative ways. In 2023, KDP kept 93% of our manufacturing waste out of landfills and we remain on track to meet our 2025 goal. We value the site champions we have in many of our locations who are working hard to get employees actively engaged in waste diversion. In our hot beverage manufacturing network, more than 99% of our waste is kept from landfills by composting coffee grounds, recycling filter paper scrap and burlap coffee bean bags and dispositioning through waste to energy. Looking ahead, we will continue to pursue a range of inventive waste reduction strategies and collaborations across our operations.*

*[Add row]*

## (7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☒ Absolute 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

*Decision Letter - Keurig Dr Pepper.pdf*

#### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☒ Well-below 2°C aligned

#### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

*05/30/2020*

#### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

#### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- ☒ Methane (CH4)
- ☒ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

#### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- ☒ Scope 1
- ☒ Scope 2

#### (7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

- ☒ Market-based

#### (7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

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

273576

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

137560

#### (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)

411136.000

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

100

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

100

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

100

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

12/31/2030

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

30

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

287795.200

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

297815

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

62200

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

360015.000

### (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

41.45

### (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*The reductions targeted are against all KDP energy use from owned and operated assets and purchased electricity. This target excludes refrigerant leaks from HVAC systems in facilities.*

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*The strategic objective of this target is to mitigate climate change risks and to build climate resiliency.*

### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*As outlined in KDPs 2023 annual Corporate Responsibility Report: Pursuing energy efficiency and energy reduction for our operations and products; Decarbonizing our fleet; Continuing our transition to low carbon energy.*

### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

**Row 2**

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Abs 2

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

*Decision Letter - Keurig Dr Pepper.pdf*

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☒ 2°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

*05/30/2020*

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)

☒ Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)

### **(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 1 – Purchased goods and services

☒ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

☒ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☒ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

### **(7.53.1.11) End date of base year**

12/31/2018

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

1020442

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

97291

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

481603

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

754900

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

2354236.000

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

2354236.000

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

25.747

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

100

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

100

**(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)**

27.96

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

40.336

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

12/31/2030

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

15

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

2001100.600

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

786057

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

83121

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

488178

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

529557

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

1886913.000

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

1886913.000

#### (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

132.34

#### (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

#### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Our Scope 3 Science based target was approved by SBTi in the spring of 2020: KDP commits to reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions 15% by 2030 from a 2018 base year, covering purchased goods and services (PET and glass packaging), fuel and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution and the use of sold products.*

#### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*The strategic objective of this target is to mitigate climate change risks and to build climate resiliency.*

#### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*As outlined in our 2023 Corporate Responsibility Report: Engaging with our value chain partners on our shared climate journey (Sourced rPET to complete the transition of Core Hydration, 16 oz. Snapple and Aguafiel varieties to bottles made of 100% recycled plastic, excluding caps and lids. Bottles made with rPET produce*

*about 30% less GHG emissions compared to bottles made of virgin plastic, in addition to reducing our use of virgin plastic.); Investing in infrastructure development and consumer behavior change (Continued investment in recycling access, education and infrastructure, which provides the opportunity for emissions reductions from recycling versus landfill); Building climate resilience into our operations and supply chain (Continued investment in World Coffee Research, driving agricultural innovation to enhance productivity of climate resilient farming to support farmer profitability.)*

#### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

#### (7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☒ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

☒ Other climate-related targets

#### (7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

##### Row 1

#### (7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Low 1

#### (7.54.1.2) Date target was set

12/31/2019

#### (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

12/31/2018

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

426297

#### (7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

28

#### (7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2025

#### (7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

#### (7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

83

#### (7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

76.39

#### (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

#### (7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☒ RE100

#### (7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Coverage includes: all KDP owned and operated facilities' electricity consumption is included. Consumption is estimated for some small sites. No exclusions.

#### (7.54.1.20) Target objective

The objective of this target is to pursue energy efficiency in our operations and products and working to decarbonize portions of our fleet and manufacturing operations through renewable and low carbon energy sources and technologies to align with our climate transition plan and achieve our 2025 goals.

#### (7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Looking ahead, we aim to build a portfolio of additional, long-term renewable energy opportunities to achieve our 100% goal across our operations, which may include on-site solar, retail renewable electricity products, power purchase agreements, investments in infrastructure and green tariffs.

[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**

12/31/2020

**(7.54.2.3) Target coverage**

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

**(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity**

Select from:

☒ Absolute

**(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)**

**Engagement with suppliers**

☒ Percentage of suppliers (by emissions) disclosing their GHG emissions

**(7.54.2.7) End date of base year**

12/31/2018

#### (7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

17.6

#### (7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2024

#### (7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

50

#### (7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

46

#### (7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

87.6543209877

#### (7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

#### (7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

*Yes. It is part of our approved science-based Target: KDP also commits that 50% of its suppliers by emissions covering purchased goods and services, downstream transportation and distribution, processing of sold products and the end-of-life treatment of sold products will have science-based targets by 2024.*

#### (7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☒ Science Based Targets initiative – approved supplier engagement target

#### (7.54.2.17) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

#### **(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*As part of our science-based emissions reduction target approved by the Science Based Targets Initiative, KDP has committed that 50% of its suppliers by emissions covering purchased goods and services, downstream transportation and distribution, processing of sold products and the end-of-life treatment of sold products will have science-based targets by 2024.*

#### **(7.54.2.19) Target objective**

*The objective of this target is to continue to make progress toward our climate transition plan through continuous engagement with our bottlers and select suppliers that represent 50% of our Scope 3 emissions to set a science-based target.*

#### **(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*As members of CDP Supply Chain, we are collaborating to deliver resources for suppliers setting SBTs and navigating the transition to a low-carbon future. KDP is also part of the EPA SmartWay program focused on documenting and improving transport emissions, and we partner with the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and CDP to advance supplier engagement.*

*[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	5	`Numeric input
To be implemented	12	129
Implementation commenced	27	721
Implemented	167	2858
Not to be implemented	20	`Numeric input

[Fixed row]

**(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.**

## Row 1

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

#### Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Compressed air

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

678

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

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

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

373500

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

97000

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

#### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Optimization of compressed air systems*

### Row 2

#### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

**Energy efficiency in production processes**

☒ Process optimization

#### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1890

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

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Scope 1
- ☒ Scope 2 (location-based)
- ☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

*Select from:*

- ☒ Voluntary

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

820000

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

73000

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

*Select from:*

- ☒ <1 year

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

*Select from:*

- ☒ 11-15 years

#### (7.55.2.9) Comment

### Row 3

#### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

##### Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

#### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

147

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

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

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

75000

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

34000

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

#### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*HVAC optimization*

### Row 4

#### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

**Energy efficiency in buildings**

☒ Lighting

#### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

144

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

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

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

100000

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

43000

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

#### (7.55.2.9) Comment

Lighting upgrades, equipment and controls  
[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:

☒ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

#### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*We annually budget for the purchase of RECs.*

## Row 2

### (7.55.3.1) Method

*Select from:*

☒ Financial optimization calculations

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Internal teams conduct annual energy treasure hunts to identify and prioritize initiatives with the highest return on investment.*

*[Add row]*

**(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

**(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.**

## Row 1

### (7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

*Select from:*

☒ MP1

### (7.68.1.2) Management practice

*Select from:*

☒ Other, please specify

### (7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

*Agroforestry – Managing shade trees and improving number and variety of tree stocks on coffee farms. Diversifying farmer income – Encouraging household food production for consumption and sale. Encouraging diverse income sources. Fertilizer Management – Conducting soil analysis to determine fertilization plan. Using organic compost. Implementing practices to reduce runoff. Integrated Pest management – Preventing, monitoring and responding early to pest and disease outbreaks. Implementing IPM strategies. Seed variety selection – Understanding seed varietal characteristics and selecting varieties that will perform according to the micro-climate of the farm and the market of the farmer. Waste Management – minimizing waste from coffee process and treating wastewater before it is released back into ecosystem. Conservation - activities that help bring non-agricultural land into greater conservation protection or supporting an increased level of protection and/or stewardship actions on already conserved lands. Cover cropping – utilizing cover crops between the traditional cash crop cultivation to ensure the ground is covered throughout the year. Pollinator habitat support – Bolstering the habitat for native pollinators on/around the farm.*

### (7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

*Select all that apply*

☒ Financial

☒ Procurement

### (7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

*Financial: Funder of climate-change programs. Procurement: Buyer of certified or verified coffees.*

### (7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

*Select all that apply*

☒ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☒ Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

☒ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

☒ Reduced demand for fossil fuel (adaptation)

☒ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☒ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

### (7.68.1.7) Comment

*KDP purchases coffee that is managed under certification and verification schemes such as Fair Trade, Rainforest Alliance, UTZ Certified which encourage practices with climate change mitigation or adaptation benefits. In addition, KDP funds projects with specific suppliers to support the implementation of these practices. Example: Blue Harvest program. For Procurement, we capture the % of coffee responsibly sourced. For Financial, we capture the number of farmers who have adopted climate or water-smart agricultural practices as a result of our project. This is a measure of increasing resilience.*

[Add row]

**(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.**

**Row 1**

**(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number**

Select from:

☒ MP1

**(7.70.1.2) Overall effect**

Select from:

☒ Positive

### (7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

- ☒ Biodiversity
- ☒ Soil
- ☒ Water
- ☒ Yield

### (7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

*In 2021, KDP set a new goal to support regenerative agriculture and conservation on 250,000 acres of land by 2030. KDP is partnering with key suppliers and farmers to achieve the goal, which represents 50 percent of the land used to grow the coffee, corn and apples used in our products. In addition to the climate change mitigation/adaptation impacts, this goal will accelerate the Company's efforts to protect water resources within its supply chain, as regenerative agriculture practices contribute to improved water quality and quantity, while also supporting biodiversity and strengthening farmer economic resilience. Nearly all the management practices implemented by our suppliers and supported by our supply chain investments (including agroforestry, fertilizer management, conservation, cover cropping, integrated pest management, and pollinator habitat support) have multiple intended outcomes such as improving yield, soil health, and preserving biodiversity.*

### (7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

### (7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

*Our investments in key supplier regions are enabling research, infrastructure, support tools, training in good agronomic practices, and more. Many of the management practices we support inherently result in better water management, which improved not only the environment, but also the livelihoods of our coffee farmers and their neighbors downstream. Water is an essential input across our value chain, from coffee trees to bean processing to brewing beverages. It is also critical to the resilience of coffee farmers and their communities. In fact, upwards of 9 million people in Central America depend on coffee lands for their water supply. Because coffee grows optimally at high altitudes in agroforestry systems, farmers have the opportunity and ability to be stewards of vital water resources for the entire watershed. Well-managed coffee systems can protect and restore watersheds that provide potable water for rural and urban communities downstream. This is the aim of the Blue Harvest program, an ongoing partnership coordinated by Catholic Relief Services (CRS), to which Keurig Dr Pepper, a founding funder, has invested more than 6.4 million over the last nine years to promote sustainable farming practices and increase access to clean water for coffee farmers and communities in Central America. This program has trained more than 4,500 farmers to apply water- and climate-smart practices on their coffee farms, protected more than 73,000 hectares of critical watersheds, and improved drinking water for more than 145,000 people.*

[Add row]

**(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?**

Select from:

☒ No, I am not providing data

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

**Row 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 :GaBi software used to inform and estimate

**(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)**

**Other**

☒ Other, please specify :Recyclable K-Cup pods

**(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)**

*Polypropylene recyclable K-Cup pods (Check locally - not recycled in many communities)*

**(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 :LCA

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

Select from:

☒ Cradle-to-grave

#### (7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

*Providing 64 ounces of consumed regular black bean coffee to a consumer in the United States in 2018.*

#### (7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

*Batch brew of 112 grams of ground coffee to produce 64 ounces of consumable coffee.*

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

Select from:

☒ Cradle-to-grave

#### (7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

0.000016

#### (7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

*Cradle-to-grave life cycle stages include coffee cultivation, processing, packaging, and distribution, in addition to energy use and end-of-life. Assumptions for baseline scenarios include brewing behavior, quantity of coffee grounds for brew, brewing energy, brewed coffee wasted, coffee grounds disposal, and packaging disposal.*

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

34

[Add row]

### (7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits canceled by your organization in the reporting year.

##### Row 1

#### (7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☒ Reforestation

#### (7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☒ Carbon removal

#### (7.79.1.3) Project description

*Project Forestier Pivot aims to foster sustainable forestry practices and reduce emissions from deforestation due to commercial logging and forest degradation in the Hereford Forest region of eastern Quebec, and promotes the conservation and even enhancement of forest carbon by financially compensating owners of protected sites. This Quebec forest carbon project, developed under the VCS standard by Ecotierra, is unique in Canada and the first of its kind in Quebec. Its activities include log to protected forest (LtPF), Extended Rotation Age (ERA), and Afforestation, Reforestation & Revegetation (ARR), and cover over 300 hectares of forest.*

#### (7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

2999

#### **(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation**

*Select from:*

☒ Voluntary offsetting

#### **(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

#### **(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation**

2018

#### **(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?**

*Select from:*

☒ Purchased

#### **(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued**

*Select from:*

☒ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

#### **(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project**

*Select all that apply*

☒ Consideration of legal requirements

☒ Investment analysis

#### **(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk**

*Select all that apply*

☒ Monitoring and compensation

### (7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

- ☒ Activity-shifting
- ☒ Market leakage

### (7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

*As part of the verification process, Project Forestier Pivot needs to address issues related to land ownership and rights over carbon credits, participation under other GHG programs, sustainable development contribution and project safeguards (including no net harm analysis and local stakeholders consultations) for each included case.*

### (7.79.1.14) Please explain

*See details.*

## Row 2

### (7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

- ☒ Community projects

### (7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

- ☒ Emissions reduction

### (7.79.1.3) Project description

*Carbone Scol'ERE creates and trades Educational Carbon Credits (ECCs), which come from the education sector and represent GHG emissions avoided through measured and verified behavior changes and aims to ensure long-term maintenance of new eco-responsible lifestyle habits. Educational carbon credits are intended to lasting effect and a dual value: they offset GHG emissions through the purchase of CO2 equivalents avoided, while helping to finance an innovative project that promotes environmental education and action among young Quebecers in the fight against climate change. The funds collected through the sale of the credits finance environmental education classes provided to schools located throughout the province of Quebec. Carbone Scol'ERE's educational carbon offsetting is the result of a unique approach recognized by an advisory committee headed by the Centre de recherche industrielle du Québec (CRIQ)*

#### **(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)**

381

#### **(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation**

*Select from:*

☒ Voluntary offsetting

#### **(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

#### **(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation**

2018

#### **(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?**

*Select from:*

☒ Purchased

#### **(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued**

*Select from:*

☒ Other regulatory carbon crediting program, please specify

#### **(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project**

*Select all that apply*

☒ Consideration of legal requirements

☒ Investment analysis

☒ Market penetration assessment

☒ Other, please specify :Positive lists

#### (7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☒ No risk of reversal

#### (7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :No leakage anticipated

#### (7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

*Educational carbon credits are intended to lasting effect and a dual value: they offset GHG emissions through the purchase of CO2 equivalents avoided, while helping to finance an innovative project that promotes environmental education and action among young Quebecers in the fight against climate change.*

#### (7.79.1.14) Please explain

See details.

[Add row]

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Cocoa	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Coffee	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Timber products

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :filter paper, aseptic packaging, and corrugated displays sourced through our subsidiary in Mexico

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Current exclusions are labels, filter paper, aseptic packaging, corrugated displays and timber sourced through our subsidiary in Mexico.

### (8.1.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

### (8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Our goal is to initially focus efforts on the most significant categories of timber products that include paperboard/corrugated packaging sourced via centralized procurement function and brewer packaging that together total >90% of all timber sourced

### (8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are providing the volume excluded

### (8.1.1.9) Volume excluded (metric tons)

12637

### (8.1.1.10) Please explain

*Exclusions include labels, filter paper, corrugated displays, aseptic packaging and timber sourced via the subsidiary in Mexico. Exclusions from disclosure represent less than 5% of the total volume.*

## Coffee

### (8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☒ Business activities

### (8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

*We are excluding green coffee sourced by partner brands and provided to KDP for packaging into K-cup pods. We are also excluding coffee that is a processed ingredient within multi-ingredient beverages (e.g. freeze dried or soluble coffee).*

### **(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select from:*

☒ Upstream value chain

### **(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion**

*Select from:*

☒ Other, please specify :KDP has no control or influence over green coffee sourced by Partner brands. The coffee within processed ingredients makes up <1% of our total coffee volume.

### **(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes, we are providing the volume excluded

### **(8.1.1.9) Volume excluded (metric tons)**

13828

### **(8.1.1.10) Please explain**

*Excluded volumes contain green and roasted coffee sourced from partners as well as coffee ingredients contained in other products.*

*[Add row]*

## **(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.**

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Timber products	273992	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	273992
Cocoa	705.3	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	705.3
Coffee	116326	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	116326

[Fixed row]

## (8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

### Timber products

#### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☒ United States of America

#### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☒ Unknown

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

252379

#### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*We do not publish information on our supplier locations. We know the origins for paperboard and corrugate as we source that directly ourselves from American and Canadian forests. However, the packaging used by our brewers is sourced by our contract manufactures in Asia and we have less insight and visibility into countries they are sourcing from. Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.*

## Cocoa

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☒ Unknown origin

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

705.3

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*We do not publish information on supplier locations.*

## Coffee

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☒ Unknown origin

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

116326

#### (8.5.5) Source

*Select all that apply*

☒ Trader/broker/commodity market

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

*We do not publish information on supplier locations.*

### Timber products

#### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

*Select from:*

☒ Unknown origin

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

86

#### (8.5.5) Source

*Select all that apply*

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.*

### Timber products

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☒ Canada

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☒ Unknown

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

7413

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.*

## Timber products

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☒ Indonesia

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☒ Unknown

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

4273

#### (8.5.5) Source

*Select all that apply*

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.*

### Timber products

#### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

*Select from:*

☒ Malaysia

#### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

*Select from:*

☒ Unknown

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3567

#### (8.5.5) Source

*Select all that apply*

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.*

## **Timber products**

### **(8.5.1) Country/area of origin**

*Select from:*

☒ Brazil

### **(8.5.2) First level administrative division**

*Select from:*

☒ Unknown

### **(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)**

653

### **(8.5.5) Source**

*Select all that apply*

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

### **(8.5.7) Please explain**

*Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.*

## **Timber products**

### **(8.5.1) Country/area of origin**

*Select from:*

☒ Thailand

### **(8.5.2) First level administrative division**

Select from:

☒ Unknown

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2574

#### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.

### Timber products

#### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☒ China

#### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☒ Unknown

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1604

#### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Country of origin determination is based on supplier questionnaire and includes some assumptions.*

### Timber products

#### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

*Select from:*

☒ Japan

#### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

*Select from:*

☒ Unknown

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1478

#### (8.5.5) Source

*Select all that apply*

☒ Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

*packaging for appliances produced by contract manufacturers*

*[Add row]*

**(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?**

## Timber products

### (8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

### (8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

### (8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

*The bulk of our buy comes from lower-risk sources from American and Canadian forests*

### (8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

## Cocoa

### (8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

### (8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Managing for deforestation risk is included within our Responsible Sourcing commitment

#### (8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

*Historically, some of our deforestation-linked commodities have been addressed through our Commitment to purchases through certification or verification programs, where some programs may have addressed deforestation. We anticipate that future science-based targets will encompass no-deforestation commitments.*

#### (8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

### Coffee

#### (8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

#### (8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Managing for deforestation risk is included within our Responsible Sourcing commitment

#### (8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

*Historically, some of our deforestation-linked commodities have been addressed through our Commitment to purchases through certification or verification programs, where some programs may have addressed deforestation. We anticipate that future science-based targets will encompass no-deforestation commitments.*

#### (8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

**(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.**

### **Timber products**

#### **(8.7.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

☒ Target 4

#### **(8.7.2.3) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

☒ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

#### **(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)**

*Select from:*

☒ Other volume, please specify :Packaging portfolio, inclusive of fiber

#### **(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

##### **Resource use and efficiency**

☒ % of recycled content used in paper and packaging products

#### **(8.7.2.8) Date target was set**

12/31/2019

#### **(8.7.2.9) End date of base year**

12/31/2019

#### (8.7.2.10) Base year figure

20

#### (8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

#### (8.7.2.12) Target year figure

30

#### (8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

27

#### (8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

#### (8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

70.00

#### (8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☒ None, no alignment after assessment

#### (8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Coverage includes primary, secondary and tertiary packaging from KDP-owned and operated food and beverage manufacturing facilities as well as packaging used for brewers. Exclusions include packaging from third party bottlers, plastic strapping, adhesives, tapes, wood pallets, brewers, brewer components and brewer accessory packaging.

## (8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*In 2023, we continued to work toward our 2025 sustainable packaging goals, which include the use of 30% post-consumer recycled content across our packaging portfolio by 2025. The goal includes primary, secondary and tertiary packaging from KDP-owned and operated food and beverage manufacturing facilities as well as packaging used for brewers. Our goal includes multiple packaging material types and is not limited to, but is inclusive of, fiber-based packaging.*

## (8.7.2.20) Further details of target

*Ongoing projects to incorporate PCR in coffee brewers are additional to this goal*

### Cocoa

## (8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Target 1

## (8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

## (8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☒ Total commodity volume

## (8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

### Third-party certification

☒ % of volume third-party certified

## (8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

## Chain-of-custody certification

☒ RA Sustainable Agriculture standard: Supply chain certificate – Mass balance

### (8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2021

### (8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2022

### (8.7.2.10) Base year figure

81

### (8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2022

### (8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

### (8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

### (8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved and maintained

### (8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☒ None, no alignment after assessment

#### (8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Includes all cocoa purchased by KDP, including if sourced as a standalone ingredient or within a blended powder finished product; including if sourced directly or from a co-manufacturer or processor. Excludes cocoa purchased by partners.*

#### (8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

*In 2023 100% of cocoa purchases were via accepted certification and verification programs.*

#### (8.7.2.20) Further details of target

*Accepted verification or third-party certification programs. Purchased volumes validated by the Rainforest Alliance, Fair Trade USA and Fairtrade International. KDP's evaluation tool to accept partner programs was independently reviewed by Conservation International and WWF.*

### Coffee

#### (8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Target 1

#### (8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

#### (8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☒ Disclosure volume

#### (8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

### Third-party certification

☒ % of volume third-party certified

#### (8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

##### Forest management unit/Producer certification

☒ RA Sustainable Agriculture standard: Farm certificate

#### (8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2014

#### (8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2022

#### (8.7.2.10) Base year figure

23

#### (8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2020

#### (8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

#### (8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

#### (8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved and maintained

#### (8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Global Coffee Platform Equivalence Mechanism 2.0

#### (8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Includes all green coffee purchased by KDP for owned and partner brands. Excludes soluble and freeze-dried coffee; other coffee-based ingredients; green coffee extract; green coffee or other coffee inputs purchased by partners*

#### (8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

*100% of purchases were via accepted certification and verification programs. In 2023, 0.002% of coffee (a single shipment) was received as conventional per a customer requirement.*

#### (8.7.2.20) Further details of target

*Accepted verification or third party certification programs: Fairtrade International, Fair Trade USA, the Rainforest Alliance, 4C, AtSource Entry Verified by ofi, NKG Verified, RSP Advanced by Louis Dreyfus Company, Volcafe Verified, Volcafe Excellence, Sucafina, RGC Coffee 3E, Guaxupe Planet, ECOM SMS.*

*[Add row]*

**(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.**

### Timber products

#### (8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to establish one within the next two years

#### (8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

#### (8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

*We have not had a public goal for this raw material and the bulk of our purchases are from low risk forest in the US and Canada.*

### Cocoa

#### (8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to establish one within the next two years

#### (8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :We purchase 100% of cocoa via a mass balance certification (Rainforest Alliance)

#### (8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

*We source 100% of our cocoa via a mass balance certification (Rainforest Alliance)*

### Coffee

#### (8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chain-of-custody certification
- ☒ Value chain mapping
- ☒ Supplier engagement/communication

### (8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

*We purchase 100% of green coffee via accepted certification and verification programs.  
[Fixed row]*

### (8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

#### Coffee

#### (8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

80

#### (8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

9

#### (8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

#### (8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

11

#### (8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

#### (8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00

[Fixed row]

**(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.**

#### Timber products

##### (8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

##### (8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☒ No

##### (8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☒ No standardized procedure

##### (8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

*Most of our supply is from the US and is not perceived as high risk*

#### Cocoa

##### (8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

#### (8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☒ No

#### (8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :We are a relatively small cocoa buyer and have prioritized 100% mass balance purchases.

#### (8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

*We are a relatively small cocoa buyer and have prioritized 100% mass balance purchases.*

### Coffee

#### (8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

#### (8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

45

#### (8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

45

#### (8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

#### (8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

0

#### (8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

#### (8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.

	Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance	% of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance	Comment
Coffee	<b>Chain-of-custody certification</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RA Sustainable Agriculture standard: Supply chain certificate – Identity preserved	39.7	<i>We purchase green coffee via multiple accepted certification and verification programs.</i>
Coffee	<b>Chain-of-custody certification</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RA Sustainable Agriculture standard: Supply chain certificate – Segregated	5.3	<i>We purchase green coffee via multiple accepted certification and verification programs.</i>

[Add row]

#### (8.9.2) Provide details of third-party certification schemes not providing full DF/DCF assurance.

Coffee

#### (8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

##### Chain-of-custody certification

☒ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :Fair Trade USA

#### (8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

19.4

#### (8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

*Select all that apply*

☒ No

#### (8.9.2.4) Comment

*no comment*

### Coffee

#### (8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

##### Chain-of-custody certification

☒ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :Fair Trade International

#### (8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

8.3

#### (8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☒ No

#### (8.9.2.4) Comment

no comment

### Coffee

#### (8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

##### Chain-of-custody certification

☒ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :4C

#### (8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

19.3

#### (8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☒ No

#### (8.9.2.4) Comment

no comment

### Coffee

#### (8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

##### Chain-of-custody certification

☒ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :Olam Food Ingredients (OFI)

#### (8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

6.5

#### (8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

*Select all that apply*

☒ No

#### (8.9.2.4) Comment

*no comment*

### Coffee

#### (8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

##### Chain-of-custody certification

☒ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :LIFT by Mercon

#### (8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

1.1

#### (8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

*Select all that apply*

☒ No

#### (8.9.2.4) Comment

no comment

## Coffee

### (8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

#### Chain-of-custody certification

☒ Other chain-of-custody certification, please specify :NKG Verified

### (8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

0.2

### (8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☒ No

### (8.9.2.4) Comment

no comment

[Add row]

**(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.**

## Timber products

### (8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

### (8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :We have a preference for recycled content in line with our commitment to recycled content across our packaging portfolio, inclusive of fiber packaging

### (8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

*We will likely continue to rely on 3rd party certification or verification programs to provide assurance given our position in the supply chain. This means we are unlikely to calculate a footprint.*

## Cocoa

### (8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

### (8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :We utilize certification and verification

### (8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

*We will likely continue to rely on 3rd party certification or verification programs to provide assurance given our position in the supply chain. This means we are unlikely to calculate a footprint.*

## Coffee

### (8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

### (8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :We utilize certification and verification

### (8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

*We will likely continue to rely on 3rd party certification or verification programs to provide assurance given our position in the supply chain. This means we are unlikely to calculate a footprint.*

[Fixed row]

**(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.**

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Timber products	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to within the next two years
Cocoa	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to within the next two years
Coffee	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

**(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes.**

**Coffee**

### (8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☒ Increasing traceability

### (8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

55

### (8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ No

### (8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☒ Greater enforcement of regulations

☒ Greater supplier awareness/engagement

☒ Investment in monitoring tools and traceability systems

### (8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

*KDP is committed to responsible sourcing of our priority inputs, including coffee and cocoa. We have also been engaging with many stakeholders in the coffee industry to prepare for EUDR. All of certification and verification partners we source from are working to ensure they can meet the deadline. We have also been participating in industry forums like the Global Coffee Platform to engage the EU to ensure implementation. As such, we expect the coffee we source – which is either certified or verified to a credible responsible sourcing standard that is approved by the Global Coffee Platform – will be deemed as DCF produced and sourced.*  
[Add row]

**(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.**

## Timber products

### (8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years

### (8.12.5) Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

### (8.12.6) Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted

*Third party certification schemes under review*

## Cocoa

### (8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (8.12.2) Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

Select from:

☒ No

### (8.12.3) Primary reason certification details are not available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :[placeholder]

#### **(8.12.4) Explain why certification details are not available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members**

*We purchase cocoa as mass balance, which means we cannot share details beyond the fact that we have utilized the mass balance system.*

### **Coffee**

#### **(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

#### **(8.12.2) Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

*[Fixed row]*

**(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?**

### **Timber products**

#### **(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated**

*Select from:*

☒ No, but plan to do so in the next two years

#### **(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*Select from:*

☒ No standardized procedure

### **(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*While the data exists, currently it is not embedded in KDP's GHG inventory. The intent is to bring the data into the inventory going forward to allocate emissions and/or reductions from our Regenerative Agriculture program in the future.*

## **Cocoa**

### **(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated**

*Select from:*

☒ No, but plan to do so in the next two years

### **(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*Select from:*

☒ No standardized procedure

### **(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*While the data exists, currently it is not embedded in KDP's GHG inventory. The intent is to bring the data into the inventory going forward to allocate emissions and/or reductions from our Regenerative Agriculture program in the future.*

## **Coffee**

### **(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated**

*Select from:*

☒ No, but plan to do so in the next two years

### **(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

Select from:

- ☒ No standardized procedure

### **(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change**

*While the data exists, currently it is not embedded in KDP's GHG inventory. The intent is to bring the data into the inventory going forward to allocate emissions and/or reductions from our Regenerative Agriculture program in the future.*

*[Fixed row]*

## **(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.**

### **(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations**

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, from suppliers

### **(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered**

Select all that apply

- ☒ Land use rights
- ☒ Labor rights
- ☒ Human rights protected under international law
- ☒ The principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), including as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
- ☒ Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations

### **(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance**

Select all that apply

- ☒ Certification
- ☒ Supplier self-declaration
- ☒ Third party audits

#### (8.14.5) Please explain

*KDP relies on certification and verification schemes to assess compliance with applicable forest regulations and mandatory standards with respect to purchases of priority inputs only. Their assessment includes third-party audits of on-farm practices consistent with sampling methodologies employed by the certification and verification schemes..*

*[Fixed row]*

#### (8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

*[Fixed row]*

#### (8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

##### (8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Risk of water stress
- ☒ Commodity sourcing footprint
- ☒ Current and future sourcing risk
- ☒ Opportunity to build resilience at scale
- ☒ Supply of commodities strategically important
- ☒ Opportunity for increased human well-being in area
- ☒ Opportunity to protect and restore natural ecosystems

##### (8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

We prioritize our investments in locations that are strategically important to our sourcing footprint (both present and future) while also applying analysis of risks and opportunities for impact at scale.  
[Fixed row]

## **(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.**

### **Row 1**

#### **(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID**

Select from:

☒ LJ1

#### **(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative**

*Blue Harvest Regenerative*

#### **(8.15.2.3) Country/area**

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Honduras and Nicaragua

#### **(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area**

*Central Honduras and Northern Nicaragua*

#### **(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative**

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### **(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)**

180000

#### (8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

*Select all that apply*

☒ Funder: Provides full or partial financial resources

#### (8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

2014

#### (8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

*Select from:*

☒ Please specify :2026

#### (8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

9100000

#### (8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

##### **Environmental**

- ☒ Biodiversity protected and/or restored
- ☒ Increased and/or maintained protected areas
- ☒ Ecosystem services maintained and/or enhanced
- ☒ Improved rate of carbon sequestration (e.g., through restoration)
- ☒ Reduced emissions from land use change and/or agricultural production
- ☒ Improved community resilience from climate adaptation plans or mitigation efforts
- ☒ Adequate water availability, water quality or access to WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) services

##### **Governance**

- ☒ Governance forums that represent all relevant stakeholders in place and maintained
- ☒ Promotion of transparency, participation, inclusion, and coordination in landscape policy, planning, and management

## **Social**

- ✓ Ensuring local communities and smallholders benefit from the outcomes of landscape/jurisdictional initiative
- ✓ Improved standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups
- ✓ Income diversification amongst producers in area

## **Production**

- ✓ Improved and/or maintained soil health
- ✓ Increased adoption of sustainable production practices (e.g., input use efficiency and water management practices)
- ✓ Uptake of regenerative agriculture (e.g., agroforestry) practices

### **(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative**

#### **Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment**

- ✓ Collaborate on management/land use planning in the landscape/jurisdiction
- ✓ Collaborate on landscape sustainability assessments through participatory mapping
- ✓ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for livelihoods and human well-being
- ✓ Share spatial data and land management plans with other stakeholders in the landscape/jurisdiction
- ✓ Collaborate to maintain representation from all relevant stakeholders within governance structure of initiative
- ✓ Co-design and develop goals, strategies and an action plan with timebound targets and milestones for the initiative
- ✓ Help establish a transparent governance platform responsible for managing the initiative and its activities with clear roles, responsibilities and balanced decision-making

#### **Build community and multi-stakeholder capacities**

- ✓ Engage stakeholders on importance of conservation, restoration and/or rehabilitation
- ✓ Promote and implement climate change adaptation and mitigation activities

#### **Support and incentivize sustainable production and community land use practices**

- ✓ Capacity building for farmers, smallholders and local communities to implement good agricultural practices (including improved efficiency, crop diversification and adoption of certification)
- ✓ Collaborate on integrated watershed management and remediation activities

#### (8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

- ☒ Sub-national government
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ NGO and/or civil society
- ☒ Producers
- ☒ Private sector

#### (8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

*The Blue Harvest Regenerative program seeks to promote sustainable farming practices and increase access to clean water for coffee farmers and communities in Central America.*

#### (8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

#### (8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

*Since 2022, this program has trained more than 2,800 farmers to apply water- and climate-smart practices on their coffee farms, supported more than 84,000 acres for regenerative agriculture and conservation. This is monitored via targeted visits and survey deployment among farmers, wet mill staff, and other community members.*

#### (8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, we are making a claim

#### (8.15.2.19) Type of claim made

Select from:

- ☒ Individual claim

### **(8.15.2.20) Provide further details on your claim**

*KDP is claiming acreage supported via this engagement toward our public regenerative agriculture and conservation goal*  
[Add row]

**(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.**

**Row 1**

### **(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID**

*Select from:*

☒ LJ1

**(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

[Add row]

**(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?**

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

**(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains**

**Row 1**

### (8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Coffee

### (8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☒ Involved in industry platforms

☒ Engaging with communities

☒ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

☒ Funding research organizations

### (8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Worldwide

### (8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☒ Please specify :We participate in activities that cover much of our coffee sourcing footprint listed in 8.5

### (8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Please see our latest Corporate Responsibility report and go to the Supply Chain Section. <https://keurigdrpepper.com/Keurig-Dr-Pepper-Corporate-Responsibility-Report-2023.pdf>

[Add row]

**(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).**

**Row 1**

#### **(8.17.1.1) Project reference**

*Select from:*

☒ Project 1

#### **(8.17.1.2) Project type**

*Select from:*

☒ Forest ecosystem restoration

#### **(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project**

*Select all that apply*

☒ Improvement to soil health

☒ Reduction of GHG emissions

☒ Contribution to SBTi target(s)

☒ Increase in carbon sequestration

☒ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

☒ Improvement of standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups

☒ Further transformative change through sharing of project design, implementation and lessons learnt

☒ Improvement to environmental regulation

☒ Improvement of water availability and quality

☒ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☒ Securing continued supply of agricultural commodities

☒ More inclusive, transparent, and empowering governance processes

#### **(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?**

*Select from:*

☒ No

### (8.17.1.5) Description of project

*The five-year project aims to connect and integrate on-farm restoration of soil and water resources with broader landscape protection (i.e. conservation) within critical watersheds. Leveraging learning from prior phases of the Blue Harvest program, Blue Harvest Regenerative is scaling impact to 116,803 new hectares of land to be brought under sustainable management via water-smart practices and community-led conservation activities. The project will also support the livelihoods of over 8,000 farmers. The work will be implemented via two strategic objectives: 1. Scale up the adoption of water smart practices within coffee production systems to increase productivity and resilience through the restoration of soil and water resources. 2. Catalyze multi-sector stakeholder collaboration to scale agricultural landscape restoration and protect critical forested lands and watersheds.*

### (8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

*Select all that apply*

☒ Project based in sourcing area(s)

### (8.17.1.7) Start year

2021

### (8.17.1.8) Target year

*Select from:*

☒ 2027

### (8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

0

### (8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

60209

### (8.17.1.11) Country/Area

*Select from:*

☒ Nicaragua

#### (8.17.1.12) Latitude

13.09578

#### (8.17.1.13) Longitude

-85.997399

#### (8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☒ Annually

#### (8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

1660000

#### (8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

- ☒ Improvement of water availability and quality
- ☒ Improvement to soil health
- ☒ Improvement to sustainability of production practice
- ☒ Increase in carbon sequestration
- ☒ Reduction of GHG emissions

#### (8.17.1.17) Please explain

See description. Coordinates reflect Soppexca.

### Row 2

#### (8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☒ Project 2

### (8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☒ Forest ecosystem restoration

### (8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement to soil health   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement to environmental regulation                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduction of GHG emissions   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement of water availability and quality                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contribution to SBTi target(s)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement to sustainability of production practices            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase in carbon sequestration   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Securing continued supply of agricultural commodities            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> More inclusive, transparent, and empowering governance processes |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement of standard of living, especially for vulnerable and/or marginalized groups            |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further transformative change through sharing of project design, implementation and lessons learnt |  |

### (8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☒ No

### (8.17.1.5) Description of project

*The five-year project aims to connect and integrate on-farm restoration of soil and water resources with broader landscape protection (i.e. conservation) within critical watersheds. Leveraging learning from prior phases of the Blue Harvest program, Blue Harvest Regenerative is scaling impact to 116,803 new hectares of land to be brought under sustainable management via water-smart practices and community-led conservation activities. The project will also support the livelihoods of over 8,000 farmers. The work will be implemented via two strategic objectives: 1. Scale up the adoption of water smart practices within coffee production systems to increase productivity and resilience through the restoration of soil and water resources. 2. Catalyze multi-sector stakeholder collaboration to scale agricultural landscape restoration and protect critical forested lands and watersheds.*

### (8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☒ Project based in sourcing area(s)

#### (8.17.1.7) Start year

2021

#### (8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☒ 2027

#### (8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

4552

#### (8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

56594

#### (8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☒ Honduras

#### (8.17.1.12) Latitude

14.222599

#### (8.17.1.13) Longitude

-88.547671

#### (8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☒ Annually

#### (8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

1660000

#### (8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Improvement of water availability and quality
- ☒ Improvement to soil health
- ☒ Improvement to sustainability of production practice
- ☒ Increase in carbon sequestration
- ☒ Reduction of GHG emissions

#### (8.17.1.17) Please explain

*See description. Coordinates reflect Asoprosan.*

*[Add row]*

## C9. Environmental performance - Water security

### (9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

##### Row 1

##### (9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☒ Facilities

##### (9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

*We do not include several small office locations, and some small sales and distribution locations.*

##### (9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Non-material to KDP's water footprint.

##### (9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

##### (9.1.1.8) Please explain

We are focused on where we use the most water in our organization and can therefore drive the most efficiency and meaningfully contribute to water stewardship. Included in our scope are our fully operational manufacturing sites, all major warehouses and distribution centers, and headquarter offices

## Row 2

### (9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☒ Water aspects

### (9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

We do not include discharges of rainwater

### (9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☒ Small volume [rainwater]

### (9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

### (9.1.1.8) Please explain

Rainwater/run-off that enters the site/facility boundary and is captured could also be counted as an output or discharge (even if not used in operations) if returned to the water environment via a dedicated discharge destination; e.g. river or groundwater via soakaway/filtration pond. You may choose to exclude collected rainwater from your discharge accounting, unless this would result in an error in your balance of more than 5%.

[Add row]

## (9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

### Water withdrawals – total volumes

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Monthly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Primary Data - Direct Monitoring and Utility Billing*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP facilities withdraw water from a combination of well and municipal sources, depending on the site. These data is obtained from Utility-provided data and/or internal metering and tracked monthly based on a using a resource management reporting tool.*

## 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

*Direct Monitoring*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP facilities pull water from a combination of well and municipal sources, depending on the site. These data are obtained from Utility-provided data and/or internal metering and tracked monthly based on a using a resource management reporting tool.*

### Water withdrawals quality

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

#### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Daily

#### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Direct Monitoring*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP facilities have rigorous water quality standards for ingredient water. This water is monitored for many parameters with frequencies dictated by against internal KDP quality standards. All ingredient water at KDP undergoes pre-treatment prior to entering the production process.*

### 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

*Direct Monitoring*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP facilities track wastewater discharges for all manufacturing facilities. These data are obtained from Utility-provided data and/or internal metering and tracked monthly based on a using a resource management reporting tool.*

## 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

*Direct Monitoring*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP facilities track wastewater discharges monthly by site and destination. These data are obtained from Utility-provided data and/or internal metering and tracked monthly based on a using a resource management reporting tool.*

## Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

### (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

*Direct Monitoring*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP facilities track wastewater discharges monthly by site. These data are obtained from Utility-provided data and/or internal metering and tracked monthly based on a using a resource management reporting tool.*

## 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:

☒ Quarterly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Direct Monitoring*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Each site measures and monitors its own discharge and effluent water quality parameters, as legally required, for example via permits. Monitoring frequency varies based on Site-specific permitting and reporting requirements.*

### Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We design our systems to comply with prohibited discharge standards as defined in the Clean Water Act for national pre-treatment standards (at 40 CFR Part 403.5(b), in the Code of Federal Regulations), or local limits, whichever is more stringent. We do not expect the relevance of this metric to change in the future.*

### Water discharge quality – temperature

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We design our systems to comply with prohibited discharge standards as defined in the Clean Water Act for national pre-treatment standards (at 40 CFR Part 403.5(b), in the Code of Federal Regulations), or local limits, whichever is more stringent. We do not expect the relevance of this metric to change in the future.*

### 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

*Direct Monitoring*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP calculates water consumption by subtracting discharge from withdrawal which are tracked monthly using a resource management reporting tool.*

## Water recycled/reused

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Estimated*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*A small amount of KDP's total water use is recycled and in a closed loop system that is specifically quantified. At some facilities, RO reject water can be re-used for other purposes and/or additional treatment. At one facility in Mexico, we reuse treated water from production to irrigate landscaping on-site and to flush toilets in the facility. Our use of recycled water will not change soon.*

## The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

Direct Monitoring

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*KDP ensures WASH services for all our workers as a standard practice. Potable water is readily available at all facilities and monitored in-line with all our other operational needs for high quality water.*

[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)

13175

##### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Total withdrawals are about the same as last year at 4.1% lower compared to 2022. In 2023, our water use ratio was 1.85 liters of water to make 1 liter of product (1.82 L/L in 2022 & 1.83 L/L in 2021). This metric accounts for the cold side of our business which makes up 99% of our water use. Withdrawals are directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. KDP has an ambitious goal to improve our water use efficiency at our refreshment beverage manufacturing facilities by 20% by 2025 so our withdrawals to potentially decrease accordingly. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations. Thresholds used include Less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

## Total discharges

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

5982

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Total discharges are about 6.8% lower in 2023 compared to 2022. In 2023, our water use ratio was 1.85 liters of water to make 1 liter of product. This metric accounts for the cold business which makes up 99% of our water use. Discharges are directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume mitigated by future efficiency improvements.. KDP has an ambitious goal to improve our water use efficiency at our refreshment beverage manufacturing facilities by 20% by 2025 so our withdrawals to potentially decrease accordingly Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the 5 year time horizon. Thresholds used include: Less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher.*

### Total consumption

#### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

7193

#### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Total consumption is about the same as last year, down 1.8%. We calculate consumption using the following formula (Consumption Withdrawal – Discharges) 7,193 13,175 – 5,982. Because withdrawals and discharges are fairly flat, consumption is also flat. Our consumption volumes are directly tied to our sales volumes, so in the future, they will rise, fall or remain flat in line with demand. Thresholds used include: Less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 Higher, greater than 51 much higher.*

*[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)

6505

#### (9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

49.37

#### (9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☒ WRI Aqueduct

#### (9.2.4.9) Please explain

*Total water withdrawal from water stressed areas is the sum of KDP's municipal water and groundwater sourced from geographic areas defined by WRI's Water Risk Atlas tool where Baseline Water Stress is "high" or "extremely high" stress (the ratio of total withdrawals to total renewable supply in a given area, 40-100%). In 2023, 49% of the water withdrawn by KDP was from an area defined as water stressed which is slightly HIGHER than in 2022 (48%). KDP utilizes WRI's Aqueduct tool to assist us in assessing our risk relative to our water use. Through our enterprise risk management (ERM) process, company level risks are identified and prioritized.*  
[Fixed row]

## **(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?**

### **Coffee**

#### **(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known**

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### **(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress**

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

#### **(9.2.6.3) Please explain**

*Based on our updated risk assessment, 0.04% of coffee is sourced from areas of high water-stress. We anticipate that this proportion could increase over the long (3-10 years) term as suitable land for coffee growing is limited by impacts of climate change, potentially driving production to areas more prone to water stress. KDP uses this metric within the organization to inform its responsible sourcing strategy for coffee among other relevant water and sustainability factors. We utilize the Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas 3.0 tool to conduct risk assessment of priority raw materials from our supply chain. Raw materials sourced from areas with water stress are identified based on KDP's sourcing regions at the country level and the Baseline Water Stress indicator from the WRI's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool. A spatial analysis was conducted to map country-level crop-growing areas and Baseline Water Stress indicator. High water stress areas for coffee are defined as regions where 40% or more of the growing areas falls under "high" and/or "extremely high" baseline water stress as defined in Aqueduct (the ratio of total withdrawals to total renewable supply in a given area, 40-100%). Coffee sourced from water stressed areas are identified using the 2023 sourcing data. Based on our updated risk assessment, 0.11% of coffee is sourced from areas of high water-stress. We anticipate that this proportion could increase over the long term (3-10 years) as suitable land for coffee growing is limited by impacts of climate change, potentially driving production to areas more prone to water stress. KDP uses this metric within the organization to inform its responsible sourcing strategy for coffee among other relevant water and sustainability factors. KDP defines apple supplier water withdrawals sourced from a water stressed area as the sum of municipal, groundwater and surface water sourced from geographic areas defined by WRI's Water Risk Atlas tool where Baseline Water Stress is high or extremely high stress (the proportion of total withdrawals to total renewable supply in a given area, 40-100%). Based on our*

updated risk assessment, 0% of apples are sourced from areas of high water-stress. This proportion has not changed over the last year, and we do not anticipate medium term (1-3 years) changes to the water stress profile for our apple sourcing geographies. KDP uses this metric within the organization to inform its responsible sourcing strategy for appl

## Fruit

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☒ 0%

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

We utilize the Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas 3.0 tool to conduct risk assessment of priority raw materials from our supply chain. Raw materials sourced from areas with water stress are identified based on KDP's sourcing regions at the country level and the Baseline Water Stress indicator from the WRI's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool. A spatial analysis was conducted to map country-level crop-growing areas and Baseline Water Stress indicator. High water stress areas for apples are defined as regions where 40% or more of the growing areas falls under "high" and/or "extremely high" baseline water stress as defined in Aqueduct (the ratio of total withdrawals to total renewable supply in a given area, 40-100%). Apples sourced from water-stressed areas are identified using the 2023 sourcing data. Based on our updated risk assessment, 0% of apples are sourced from areas of high water-stress. This proportion has not changed over the last year, and we do not anticipate medium-term (1-3 years) changes to the water stress profile for our apple sourcing geographies. KDP uses this metric within the organization to inform its responsible sourcing strategy for apples among other relevant water and sustainability factors.

## Maize/corn

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☒ 1-10

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*We utilize the Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas 3.0 tool to conduct risk assessment of priority raw materials from our supply chain. Raw materials sourced from areas with water stress are identified based on KDP's sourcing regions at the country level and the Baseline Water Stress indicator from the WRI's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool. A spatial analysis was conducted to map country-level crop-growing areas and Baseline Water Stress indicator. High water stress areas for maize are defined as regions where 40% or more of the growing areas falls under "high" and/or "extremely high" baseline water stress as defined in Aqueduct (the ratio of total withdrawals to total renewable supply in a given area, 40-100%). Maize sourced from water-stressed areas are identified using the 2023 sourcing data. Based on our updated risk assessment, 4% of maize is sourced from areas of high water-stress. We anticipate that this proportion could increase over the long term (3-10 years) due to the potential for climate change to increase maize's water demand and limit the water available for irrigation. KDP uses this metric within the organization to inform its responsible sourcing strategy for maize among other relevant water and sustainability factors.*

## Timber products

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☒ No, but we intend to obtain this data within the next two years

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*we assess risk for some fiber inputs, but not all*  
*[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

*This source is not relevant because we do not use/withdraw water from this source. We do not anticipate any changes in our sites' withdrawal of fresh surface water in the foreseeable future. KDP is reliant on high quality water as a primary ingredient in our beverages, and therefore sources and treats water from municipal and groundwater sources.*

#### Brackish surface water/Seawater

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*This source is not relevant because we do not use/withdraw water from this source. We do not anticipate any changes in our sites' withdrawal of brackish surface water in the foreseeable future.*

#### Groundwater – renewable

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3109

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*Groundwater - renewable as a water source is considered relevant to our portfolio because there are four active KDP manufacturing locations that rely on renewable groundwater for operations. KDP's water withdrawals from renewable groundwater sources are higher in 2023 (up 1% from 2022). Withdrawals from this source increased slightly because of our overall increase to production compared to 2022. Our US sites rely heavily on municipal water. As we work towards our commitment to improve our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025 we expect our use of this source to potentially decrease. Thresholds used include: Less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 Higher, greater than 51 much higher.*

### Groundwater – non-renewable

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*A majority of water is purchased from local municipalities. We expect this withdrawal amount to remain the same into the foreseeable future.*

### Produced/Entrained water

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*A majority of water is purchased from local municipalities. We expect this withdrawal amount to remain the same into the foreseeable future.*

### Third party sources

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

10067

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*Third party sources are considered relevant water sources because a majority of our water is purchased from local municipalities. KDP's water withdrawals from third-party sources decreased slightly (6%) compared to 2022. As we work towards our commitment to improve our water use ratio by 20% by 2025, we expect our reliance on water sourced from third parties to continue to potentially decrease. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations. Thresholds used include: Less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 Higher, greater than 51 much higher.*

[Fixed row]

#### (9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

##### Fresh surface water

#### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2038

#### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

#### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Fresh surface water/seawater is considered a relevant destination for our discharges where proper permitting exists. KDP's 2023 discharges to this destination are 17% lower than in 2022 at 34% of total discharges. This is mostly due to variability at one of our major facilities.. Discharges are directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume. As we work towards our commitment to improve our water use ratio by 20% by 2025, we expect our discharges to fresh surface water could decrease accordingly. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations. Thresholds used include: Less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 Higher, greater than 51 much higher.*

### Brackish surface water/seawater

#### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Brackish Surface water/seawater is not a relevant destination as all water discharges are either to POTW or fresh surface water. KDP has not in the past and does not anticipate discharging any water to groundwater in the future.*

## Groundwater

### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Groundwater is not a relevant destination as most water discharges are either to POTW or fresh surface water. KDP has one site that discharges rainwater to groundwater via absorption lagoon, irrigation, and absorption well, however this volume is less than 5% of total discharges.*

## Third-party destinations

### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3944

### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Third-party destinations are considered relevant as all water discharges are made to POTW or freshwater. Our discharge to this destination is [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:*

☒ Not relevant

#### **(9.2.9.6) Please explain**

*We do not use tertiary treatment at any of our facilities.*

### **Secondary treatment**

#### **(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge**

*Select from:*

☒ Relevant

#### **(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

2242

#### **(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☒ Lower

#### **(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 31-40

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*We use secondary treatment as necessitated by jurisdictional requirements, composition of site wastewater, and capacity of the facilities receiving the wastewater. The jurisdictional requirements (regulatory standards) will vary from region to region.*

#### Primary treatment only

#### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

306

#### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 1-10

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*We use primary treatment as necessitated by jurisdictional requirements, composition of site wastewater, and capacity of the facilities receiving the wastewater. The jurisdictional requirements (regulatory standards) will vary from region to region.*

### Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

#### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

246

#### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 1-10

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*Discharge to the natural environment without treatment is minimal and only performed when allowed by jurisdictional requirements.*

## **Discharge to a third party without treatment**

### **(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge**

*Select from:*

☒ Relevant

### **(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

3188

### **(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☒ About the same

### **(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

*Select from:*

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

### **(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to**

*Select from:*

☒ 51-60

### **(9.2.9.6) Please explain**

*At the majority of our sites, we complete wastewater pretreatment and then discharge to a third party for treatment. The rationale is that this is an appropriate level of treatment to meet our permit requirements.*

**Other**

### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*Other discharge types 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

10

### (9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☒ 26-50

### (9.3.4) Please explain

*Ten focus communities were determined by a water risk assessment that utilized the Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer and the World Resources Institute's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas, and expert knowledge from LimnoTech. The locations are: Miami and Jacksonville, Florida; Houston and Irving, Texas; Sacramento, Vernon and Victorville, California; and Tecámac, Tehuacán and Tlajomulco, Mexico.*

## Upstream value chain

### (9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☒ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

### (9.3.4) Please explain

*Our upstream value chain assessment is focused on sourcing regions, not facilities*

*[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 6

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Vernon

#### (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**

- ☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.024

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-118.204

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

- ☒ Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

517

#### (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**

517

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

138

**(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

138

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

379

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

## Row 2

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 1

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Houston*

### (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

**Afghanistan**

☒ Other, please specify :San Jacinto

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

*29.685*

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

*-95.394*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

☒ No

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

542

**(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**

542

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

213

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ 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**

51

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

161

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

329

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

### Row 3

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

☒ Facility 2

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Irving*

#### (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**

☒ Trinity River (Texas)

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.84149

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-96.8928

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1189

### (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**

1189

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

404

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

5

**(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

399

#### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

785

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

### Row 4

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 5

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Sacramento

#### (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 :Lower American

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.61496

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-121.43375

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

418

#### (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**

418

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

253

**(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

253

#### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

165

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher

### Row 5

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 9

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Tlajomulco*

### (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**

☒ Santiago

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

*20.452*

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

*-103.433*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

559

**(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**

559

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

112

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Higher

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

112

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

447

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Higher

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher

### Row 6

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 8

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Tehuacan

#### (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**

☒ Papaloapan

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

18.483

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-97.403

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

☒ No

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

893

#### (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**

893

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

281

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

281

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

#### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

#### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

612

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

### Row 7

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 7

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Victorville

#### (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

**Afghanistan**

- ☒ Other, please specify :Mojave

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.584

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-117.376

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

- ☒ No

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

933

#### (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**

933

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

306

**(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

306

#### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

626

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

### Row 8

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 4

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Miami*

### (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 :Everglades

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

*25.8275*

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

*-80.31553*

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☒ No

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

297

#### (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

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

112

**(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**

112

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

185

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year***Select from:*☒ Higher

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

## Row 9

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

☒ Facility 3

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*Jacksonville*

### (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**

☒ St. Johns River

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.26012

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-81.60708

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

641

#### (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**

641

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

360

**(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

360

#### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

281

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher*

### Row 11

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 10

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Tecamac

#### (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**

- ☒ Panuco

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

19.704

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-98.948

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

- ☒ Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

517

#### (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**

517

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

78

**(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

78

#### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

439

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water use is directly related to our production so will rise, fall or remain flat in line with production volume as mitigated by future efficiency improvements. Thresholds used include less than (51) much lower, (6)-(50) lower, (5)-5 about the same, 6-50 higher, greater than 51 much higher

[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' issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board*

## 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' issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board*

## Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☒ Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*This metric is not within the scope of our assurance engagement*

## Water discharges – 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' issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board*

## Water discharges – volume by destination

### (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' issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board*

## Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☒ Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*This metric is not within the scope of our assurance engagement*

## Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☒ Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*This metric is not within the scope of our assurance engagement*

## Water consumption – total volume

### (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' issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board*  
[Fixed row]

## (9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☒ Yes, CDP supply chain members buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

## (9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member.

### Row 1

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 1

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

*Houston*

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

*Select from:*

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

### Row 2

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

☒ Facility 2

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

*Irving*

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

### Row 3

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 3

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

*Jacksonville*

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.

## Row 4

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 4

### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Miami

### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

vFacilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.

### (9.4.1.5) Comment

Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.

## Row 5

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 5

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Sacramento

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*vFacilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

### Row 6

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 6

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Vernon

### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

## Row 7

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 7

### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Victorville

### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

#### Row 8

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 8

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Tehuacan

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

## Row 9

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 9

### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

*Tlajomulco*

### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.*

### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

## Row 10

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 10

### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

Facilities identified in 9.3.1 produce a variety of liquid refreshment beverages which are sold in various quantities and combinations to multiple retailers.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

Water issues incorporated into our long-term business objectives include physical risks due to availability and quality issues as well as reputational risks from direct operations in basins at risk. In 2022, we announced our aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact are efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that our contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes, per the Water Resilience Coalition. In our direct operations, KDP is committed to improving our water use efficiency by 20% by 2025. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.

[Add row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	14814000000	1124402.28	We anticipate that KDP's water withdrawal efficiency will improve over time as we continue to deploy water efficiency measures.

[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

## Coffee

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

11900

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Freshwater consumption

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☒ Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*KDP conducted its first enterprise water footprint analysis in 2018, covering the full value chain to inform our risk assessment and responsible sourcing program. The footprint analysis leveraged the Water Footprint Network (WFN) research as a proxy for agricultural commodity suppliers' water use intensity. The WFN data used includes both "blue" and "green" water intensity expressed in terms of the volume (m3) of freshwater (i.e., rainwater plus surface and/or groundwater) consumed per unit mass (metric tons) of production. The water intensity of coffee varies based on country of origin. KDP sources coffee from regions around the world. A weighted average water intensity of Coffee was calculated based on KDP's 2023 sourcing regions and the corresponding proportion of sourcing. In 2023 the intensity metric was about the same compared to 2022. Also, as we work with suppliers that meet standards outlined in our Code of Conduct and corresponding product-specific standards, intensity figures could change in response. We consider these metrics internally for evaluation of our water footprint and development of responsible sourcing programming.*

## Fruit

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

304

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Freshwater consumption

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☒ Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*KDP conducted its first enterprise water footprint analysis in 2018, covering the full value chain to inform our risk assessment and responsible sourcing program. The footprint analysis leveraged the Water Footprint Network (WFN) research as a proxy for agricultural commodity suppliers' water use intensity. The WFN data used includes both "blue" and "green" water intensity expressed in terms of the volume (m3) of freshwater (i.e., rainwater plus surface and/or groundwater) consumed per unit mass (metric tons) of production. The water intensity of apples varies based on country of origin. Currently, KDP's apples are primarily sourced from the USA and a small portion from Canada. A weighted average water intensity of Apples was calculated based on KDP's 2023 sourcing regions and the corresponding proportion of sourcing. As we work with suppliers that meet standards outlined in our Code of Conduct and corresponding product-specific standards, intensity figures have not varied substantially from year to year, because WFN values and sourcing regions have remained similar, although this may vary in the future. We consider these metrics internally for evaluation of our water footprint and development of KDP's Responsible Sourcing program.*

## Maize/corn

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

651

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Freshwater consumption

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☒ Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*KDP conducted its first enterprise water footprint analysis in 2018, covering the full value chain to inform our risk assessment and responsible sourcing program. The footprint analysis leveraged the Water Footprint Network (WFN) research as a proxy for agricultural commodity suppliers' water use intensity. The WFN data used includes both "blue" and "green" water intensity expressed in terms of the volume (m3) of freshwater (i.e., rainwater plus surface and/or groundwater) consumed per unit mass (metric tons) of production. The water intensity of Maize varies based on country of origin. KDP sources maize (for HFCS) mainly from the USA and a small portion from Mexico and Canada. A weighted average water intensity of Maize was calculated based on KDP's 2023 sourcing regions and the corresponding proportion of sourcing. In 2023 the intensity metric was about the same compared to 2022. As we work with suppliers that meet standards outlined in our Code of Conduct and corresponding product-specific standards, intensity figures for Maize could vary year to year in the future. We consider these metrics internally for evaluation of our water footprint and development of responsible sourcing programming.*

## Timber products

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☒ No, not currently but we intend to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Water intensity for Timber will require additional data before the assessment can be completed*

*[Add row]*

## (9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

### Row 1

#### (9.12.1) Product name

*Liquid refreshment beverages*

#### (9.12.2) Water intensity value

*1.85*

#### (9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Water withdrawn

#### (9.12.4) Denominator

*Production (m3)*

#### (9.12.5) Comment

Units of numerator is cubic meters (m3)

[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:

☒ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years

### **(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact**

Select from:

☒ Important but not an immediate business priority

### **(9.14.4) Please explain**

*Water is a precious natural resource that is essential to our business. As water is the primary ingredient in most of our beverages, we have a particular responsibility to be good stewards of water use in our operations, our communities and throughout our supply chain. Our water stewardship goals are focused on safeguarding water resources and building healthy communities resilient to climate change. We conduct periodic water risk assessments of our operations and supply chain. To refine our understanding of challenges for our high water-risk sites, we assess each site in the context of the surrounding watershed, the local water issues and other local entities' interest and perspective on those issues. We have public goals and programs to both increase operational efficiency and to replenish water through conservation and restoration projects with conservation organizations in communities where we operate that have high water risk.*

[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, but we plan to within the next two years

### (9.15.1.2) Please explain

*In 2022, KDP announced an aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact means Efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes. Net Positive Water Impact aims to deliver measurable net positive impact in water-stressed basins, focusing on the availability, quality, and accessibility of freshwater resources.*

## Water withdrawals

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☒ Yes

## Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

### (9.15.1.2) Please explain

*In 2022, KDP announced an aspiration to achieve Net Positive Water Impact by 2050, which builds on KDP's existing water stewardship commitments. Net Positive Water Impact means Efforts to reduce water stress by focusing on water availability, quality and access and that contributions exceed impacts on water stress in the same region, as quantified by established methodologies and measured via both short-term outputs and long-term outcomes. Net Positive Water Impact aims to deliver measurable net positive impact in water-stressed basins, focusing on the availability, quality, and accessibility of freshwater resources.*

## Other

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☒ Yes

[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 consumption

☒ Reduction per unit of production

#### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2019

#### (9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2017

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

1.95

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

12/31/2025

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

1.56

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

1.85

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Underway

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

26

**(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

☒ Sustainable Development Goal 6

☒ Water Resilience Coalition

**(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*We have an ambitious goal to improve our water use ratio (WUR) by 20% by 2025, moving from a 2017 baseline of 1.95 liters required to make one liter of product (L/L) to 1.56 L/L. Our progress is underway with a WUR of 1.85 in 2023, down 5% versus 2017. The target's scope includes our cold beverage manufacturing facilities and excludes coffee manufacturing sites and the apple sauce production facility at Williamson. Although we may be challenged to meet this goal within our designated time frame, we remain committed to improving the water efficiency of our operations over the time horizon.*

#### **(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*In 2023, and continuing, we will be investing in water treatment technology with the goal to improve water use efficiency. We remain committed to our glidepath to attain our 2025 goal with a continued focus on improving water use ratio. To date, KDP has implemented water use ratio dashboards at 12 sites to monitor, understand and trend daily water use and efficiency, installed 2nd-Stage reverse osmosis technology to improve the efficiency of our existing treatment infrastructure at our Columbus, Ohio site, and conducted a water efficiency continuous improvement exercise and invested in water reuse treatment infrastructure at our Tehuacán Site in Mexico. The enhanced water treatment allows water discharge from our bottle rinsers to be reused in the site's auxiliary systems, such as cooling towers, condensers and restrooms. Since holding the event, the site has improved its water use ratio by over 20% and saved over 30 million gallons of water. Although we may be challenged to meet this*

#### **(9.15.2.16) Further details of target**

*Approach is aligned to Beverage Industry Environmental Roundtable definitions and approach*

### **Row 2**

#### **(9.15.2.1) Target reference number**

Select from:

☒ Target 2

#### **(9.15.2.2) Target coverage**

Select from:

☒ Basin level

#### **(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

**Watershed remediation and habitat restoration, ecosystem preservation**

☒ Other watershed remediation and habitat restoration, ecosystem preservation please specify :Water replenishment, availability

**(9.15.2.4) Date target was set**

12/31/2019

**(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

12/31/2019

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

3

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

12/31/2030

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

100

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

55

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Underway

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

54

**(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

☑ Water Resilience Coalition

### (9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*KDP has a goal to partner with our highest water-risk operating communities, so that by 2030 we are annually replenishing 100% of water used in our beverages in those communities. Ten focus communities were determined by a water risk assessment that utilized the Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer and the World Resources Institute's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas, and expert knowledge from our vendor, LimnoTech. Water replenishment project water volumes are calculated on a yearly basis (ML/year), based on the annual volume of potential benefit delivered according to volumetric water benefit accounting. Progress towards the goal this reporting year is calculated as follows:  $(3-100) / (3-55)$  53.6%.*

### (9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*KDP has a goal to partner with our highest water-risk operating communities, so that by 2030 we are annually replenishing 100% of water used in our beverages in those communities. We conduct periodic water risk assessments of our operations and supply chain. To refine our understanding of challenges for our high water-risk sites and to identify opportunities to implement water related measures, we assess each site in the context of the surrounding watershed, the local water issues and other local entities' interest and perspective on those issues. Through various collaborations with NGOs and industry partners, we achieved 55% replenishment for high water-risk operating communities through the end of 2023. Key to driving progress were additional investments and implementation projects in these high water-risk operating areas.*

### (9.15.2.16) Further details of target

*We conduct periodic water risk assessments of our operations and supply chain. To refine our understanding of challenges for our high water-risk sites and to identify opportunities to implement water-related measures, we assess each site in the context of the surrounding watershed, the local water issues and other local entities' interest and perspective on those issues. Through various collaborations with NGOs and industry partners, we achieved 55% replenishment for high water-risk operating communities through the end of 2023. Key to driving progress were additional investments and implementation projects in these high water-risk operating areas.*

[Add row]

## C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

### (10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

#### (10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (10.1.2) Target type and metric

##### Plastic packaging

- ☒ Reduce the total weight of plastic packaging used and/or produced
- ☒ Reduce the total weight of virgin content in plastic packaging
- ☒ Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic packaging
- ☒ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale
- ☒ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is compostable

##### Plastic goods/products

- ☒ Increase the proportion of our goods/products that are recyclable in practice and at scale

#### (10.1.3) Please explain

*KDP has various plastic commitments that we're aiming to achieve by 2025 including: Converting 100% of our packaging to be recycled or compostable; Using 25% post-consumer recycled content in our plastic packaging; And achieve a 20% virgin plastic reduction across our plastic packaging portfolio by 2025. KDP defines recyclable packaging as packaging for which design is not a barrier to the packaging being successfully collected, sorted and reprocessed into another material, a product component or a recycled raw material. Packaging we consider to be recyclable includes materials and formats for which recovery, sortation and end markets exist or can practically be scaled across North America, noting that many communities may not accept or sort certain materials or formats today. We likewise consider plastic packaging to be recyclable if it is deemed "recyclable with detrimental qualities" by the APR. Regarding the target to increase the proportion of recyclable plastic waste that is collected, sorted, and recycled in the community: KDP has co-founded three industry coalitions and works with a variety of partners to invest in*

*initiatives that amplify both dollars and action for recycling infrastructure and consumer education. These industry coalitions all have goals of increasing the quantity and quality of materials recovered. In 2023, we continued to work toward our 2025 sustainable packaging goals. We began the conversion of Bai to 100% recycled plastic bottles and completed the conversion of Core Hydration products to 100% recycled plastic bottles – both excluding caps and lids. This effort, along with several lightweighting accomplishments, helped to reduce our virgin plastic footprint by 15% versus the 2019 baseline. Our PCR content across our plastic packaging portfolio was 17% in 2023, ultimately impacted by the overall reduction of virgin plastic. Across our entire packaging portfolio, we achieved 27%, an increase from 24% in 2022. Also in 2023, 2% of our plastic portfolio was reusable versus 1% in 2022. Approximately 95% of our packaging in 2023 was designed to be recyclable or compostable. In 2024, we performed a review of cold beverage packaging that meets our definition of recyclable and updated our measurement to include plastic packaging that is considered “recyclable with detrimental qualities” by the APR. We applied this adjustment to our recyclability metric reported for 2023 and all prior years included in this report. We remain committed to our glidepath to attain our 2025 sustainable packaging goals. [Fixed row]*  
[Fixed row]

## **(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.**

### **Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)**

#### **(10.2.1) Activity applies**

Select from:

☒ No

#### **(10.2.2) Comment**

N/A

### **Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)**

#### **(10.2.1) Activity applies**

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### **(10.2.2) Comment**

*This applies to our brewers, brewer components and some brewer accessories*

## Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Durable plastic goods and/or components may be utilized in our manufacturing process and/or distribution process.*

## Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*We process plastic pre-forms to make bottles for finished goods.*

## Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ Yes

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Many of our goods/products are packaged in plastics.*

## Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

### (10.2.2) Comment

N/A

## Provision of waste management and/or water management services

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

### (10.2.2) Comment

N/A

## Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*While we don't offer these services directly, we collaborate with others in our industry to fund Closed Loop Partners, which provides below-market rate loans to finance projects that build out circular economy infrastructure for plastic in the United States.*

## Other activities not specified

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

## (10.2.2) Comment

N/A

[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)

234334

#### (10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☒ % virgin fossil-based content

☒ % post-consumer recycled content

#### (10.5.3) % virgin fossil-based content

83

#### (10.5.6) % post-consumer recycled content

17

#### (10.5.7) Please explain

Primarily in PET content.

[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

☒ % reusable

(10.5.1.2) % of plastic packaging that is reusable

2

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

*In 2023, 2% of our plastic portfolio was reusable versus 1% in 2022. US recycling rates do not reach 30% based on the definition used by CDP so the percent of plastic packaging that is recyclable at scale as 0%.*  
[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
- ☒ Species management
- ☒ Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[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**

*Although we have not completed a formal biodiversity assessment, KDP considers biodiversity impacts within our environmental strategy, ingredient sourcing, water stewardship activities, and regenerative agriculture programs.*

### **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**

*Although we have not completed a formal biodiversity assessment, KDP considers biodiversity impacts within our environmental strategy, ingredient sourcing, water stewardship activities, and regenerative agriculture programs.*

### **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

*Although we have not completed a formal biodiversity assessment, KDP considers biodiversity impacts within our environmental strategy, ingredient sourcing, water stewardship activities, and regenerative agriculture programs.*

### 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

*Although we have not completed a formal biodiversity assessment, KDP considers biodiversity impacts within our environmental strategy, ingredient sourcing, water stewardship activities, and regenerative agriculture programs.*

### 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

*Although we have not completed a formal biodiversity assessment, KDP considers biodiversity impacts within our environmental strategy, ingredient sourcing, water stewardship activities, and regenerative agriculture programs.*

### 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:

☒ Not assessed

#### (11.4.2) Comment

*Although we have not completed a formal biodiversity assessment, KDP considers biodiversity impacts within our environmental strategy, ingredient sourcing, water stewardship activities, and regenerative agriculture programs.*

*[Fixed row]*

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

☒ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☒ Water intensities of products and services

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

## General standards

☒ ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*Water Use Ratio (WUR) [as liters of water required to make one liter of product]. WUR is based on production volumes for beverage manufacturing facilities, which for this assurance engagement will be taken as read.*

### (13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

## Row 2

### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

*Select all that apply*

☒ Climate change

☒ Plastics

### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

#### Environmental performance – Plastics

☒ Other data point in module 10, please specify :Total plastic packaging

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

## General standards

☒ ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*This report encompasses the packaging data for KDP-owned and operated facilities, which include primary secondary, and tertiary packaging, as well as brewer packaging. Materials procured by external bottlers and brewer accessory contract manufacturers are not included. Recyclable packaging is packaging for which design is not a barrier to the packaging being successful collected, sorted and reprocessed into another material, a product component or a recycled raw material. Packaging we consider to be recyclable includes materials and formats for which recovery, sortation and end markets exist or can be practically be scaled across North America, noting that many communities may not accept or sort certain materials or formats today. We likewise consider plastic packaging to be recyclable if it is deemed “recyclable with detrimental qualities” by the APR. For all other material categories, our recyclability determinations are informed by applicable law and the guidance of several organizations, including the Sustainable Packaging Coalition, the Aluminum Association, the Can Manufacturers Institute, the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, the Glass Packaging Institute, the Carton Council and the American Forest & Paper Association. Packaging specifications — weight, composition and PCR content — are sourced from our suppliers. In the absence of specific data, KDP estimates are based on analogous products, ensuring our reporting reflects the most accurate information possible.*

### **(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)**

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

## **Row 3**

### **(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured**

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Plastics

### **(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured**

#### **Environmental performance – Plastics**

- ☒ Other data point in module 10, please specify :% of Post-consumer Recycled (PCR) content across Total Packaging Portfolio

### **(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard**

#### **General standards**

- ☒ ISAE 3000

### **(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process**

*This report encompasses the packaging data for KDP-owned and operated facilities, which include primary secondary, and tertiary packaging, as well as brewer packaging. Materials procured by external bottlers and brewer accessory contract manufacturers are not included. Recyclable packaging is packaging for which design is not a barrier to the packaging being successful collected, sorted and reprocessed into another material, a product component or a recycled raw material. Packaging we consider to be recyclable includes materials and formats for which recovery, sortation and end markets exist or can be practically be scaled across North America, noting that many communities may not accept or sort certain materials or formats today. We likewise consider plastic packaging to be recyclable if it is deemed “recyclable with detrimental qualities” by the APR. For all other material categories, our recyclability determinations are informed by applicable law and the guidance of several organizations, including the Sustainable Packaging Coalition, the Aluminum Association, the Can Manufacturers Institute, the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, the Glass Packaging Institute, the Carton Council and the American Forest & Paper Association. Packaging specifications — weight, composition and PCR content — are sourced from our suppliers. In the absence of specific data, KDP estimates are based on analogous products, ensuring our reporting reflects the most accurate information possible.*

#### **(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)**

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

#### **Row 4**

#### **(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured**

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Plastics

#### **(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured**

##### **Environmental performance – Plastics**

- ☒ Other data point in module 10, please specify :% of Post-Consumer Recycled (PCR) content across Total Plastic Packaging Portfolio

#### **(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard**

##### **General standards**

- ☒ ISAE 3000

#### **(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process**

*This report encompasses the packaging data for KDP-owned and operated facilities, which include primary secondary, and tertiary packaging, as well as brewer packaging. Materials procured by external bottlers and brewer accessory contract manufacturers are not included. Recyclable packaging is packaging for which design is not a barrier to the packaging being successful collected, sorted and reprocessed into another material, a product component or a recycled raw material. Packaging we consider to be recyclable includes materials and formats for which recovery, sortation and end markets exist or can be practically be scaled across North America, noting that many communities may not accept or sort certain materials or formats today. We likewise consider plastic packaging to be recyclable if it is deemed “recyclable with detrimental qualities” by the APR. For all other material categories, our recyclability determinations are informed by applicable law and the guidance of several organizations, including the Sustainable Packaging Coalition, the Aluminum Association, the Can Manufacturers Institute, the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, the Glass Packaging Institute, the Carton Council and the American Forest & Paper Association. Packaging specifications — weight, composition and PCR content — are sourced from our suppliers. In the absence of specific data, KDP estimates are based on analogous products, ensuring our reporting reflects the most accurate information possible.*

### **(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)**

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.pdf*

## **Row 5**

### **(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured**

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Plastics

### **(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured**

#### **Environmental performance – Plastics**

- ☒ Other data point in module 10, please specify :% of all KDP Packaging which is Recyclable or Compostable (based on KDP Definitions)

### **(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard**

#### **General standards**

- ☒ ISAE 3000

### **(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process**

*This report encompasses the packaging data for KDP-owned and operated facilities, which include primary secondary, and tertiary packaging, as well as brewer packaging. Materials procured by external bottlers and brewer accessory contract manufacturers are not included. Recyclable packaging is packaging for which design is not a barrier to the packaging being successful collected, sorted and reprocessed into another material, a product component or a recycled raw material. Packaging we consider to be recyclable includes materials and formats for which recovery, sortation and end markets exist or can be practically be scaled across North America, noting that many communities may not accept or sort certain materials or formats today. We likewise consider plastic packaging to be recyclable if it is deemed “recyclable with detrimental qualities” by the APR. For all other material categories, our recyclability determinations are informed by applicable law and the guidance of several organizations, including the Sustainable Packaging Coalition, the Aluminum Association, the Can Manufacturers Institute, the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, the Glass Packaging Institute, the Carton Council and the American Forest & Paper Association. Packaging specifications — weight, composition and PCR content — are sourced from our suppliers. In the absence of specific data, KDP estimates are based on analogous products, ensuring our reporting reflects the most accurate information possible.*

#### **(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)**

*ERM CVS\_Limited Assurance Report for KDP 2024 CDP\_October 15 Final.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**

*In our 2023 Water Security disclosure, we indicated that in 2022, KDP had not been subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations. Upon further review, while there were no violations related to withdrawals, there were violations related to wastewater and stormwater, but none that resulted in fines, in 2022.*  
[Fixed row]

**(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.**

#### **(13.3.1) Job title**

*Chief Corporate Affairs Officer*

#### **(13.3.2) Corresponding job category**

Select from:

☒ Other C-Suite Officer

[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

