

C0. Introduction

C0.1

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

Orkla is a leading supplier of branded consumer goods to the grocery, out-of home, specialized retail, pharmacy, and bakery sectors. The Nordic and Baltic regions and selected countries in Central Europe are Orkla’s main markets. The Orkla Group also holds strong positions in selected product categories in India.

Orkla’s Branded Consumer Goods business comprises the Orkla Foods Nordic & Baltics, Orkla Foods International, Orkla Confectionery & Snacks, Orkla Care and Orkla Food Ingredients business areas. Orkla also has operations organised under the Orkla Investments business area, consisting of its investment in Jotun (42.6% interest), in addition to Hydro Power and financial assets. Orkla ASA is listed on the Oslo Stock Exchange and its head office is in Oslo, Norway. As of 31 December 2021, Orkla had 21,369 employees. The Group’s turnover in 2021 totaled NOK 49.2 billion.

Orkla’s strategic objective is to strengthen its position as the leading branded consumer goods company in the Nordics, Baltics, Central Europe, India, and other selected markets. Innovations based on the Group’s unique local customer and consumer insight are an important growth driver. By working more closely as “One Orkla”, the Group will more effectively exploit economies of scale and create cross-cutting synergies. In this way, Orkla will strengthen its long-term competitiveness, while preserving its local presence. In 2021, Orkla continued its efforts to develop its portfolio in geographies, categories, and channels, and carried out cut cost initiatives across the value chain, in both supply chain and commercial functions. During the year, the Group also strengthened its position as leading branded consumer goods company through the acquisition of several companies.

Orkla wishes to contribute to sustainable development by offering healthy, environmentally friendly products, maintaining high food safety standards, making efficient use of resources, carrying out supply chain improvements and generally operating responsibly. Orkla’s sustainability work is pivotal to Orkla’s ability to create growth, build trust and remain a competitive business. In 2017 the Group developed new, common sustainability targets that will apply up to 2025. In 2020, Orkla launched a new internal sustainability aspiration up to 2030 which underscores the **importance** of sustainable products and of mobilizing the entire organization. Orkla’s sustainability strategy covers the following main topics: nutrition and wellness, safe products, sustainable sourcing, environmental engagement and care for people and society. We are committed to helping solve global health and sustainability challenges and support the UN’s global goals. Sustainability has become a natural part of our business model, and we have developed criteria for how we define sustainable products.

C0.2

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

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years	Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for
Reporting year	January 1 2021	December 31 2021	No	<Not Applicable>

C0.3

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

- Austria
- China
- Czechia
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- Germany
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Malaysia
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Russian Federation
- Slovakia
- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

C0.4

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

NOK

C0.5

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

Operational control

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

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

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

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

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

Row 1

Primary reason

Do not own/manage land

Please explain

We have performed company-wide analysis and we have concluded that emissions from agriculture/forestry activities undertaken on own land are not relevant for us since we do not own any agricultural farms.

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

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

Agricultural commodity

Cattle products

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

20-40%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

A broad range of Orkla's products include dairy products and we estimate that 20-40% of the revenues come from products with raw materials originating from dairy products.

Agricultural commodity

Wheat

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

10-20%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

A broad range of Orkla's products include wheat and we estimate that 10- 20% of the revenues come from products with raw materials originating from wheat.

Agricultural commodity

Sugar

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

20-40%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

A broad range of Orkla's products include sugar and we estimate that 20-40% of the revenues come from products with sugars as an ingredient.

Agricultural commodity

Palm Oil

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Less than 10%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

Orkla purchases palm oil mainly from Indonesia and Malaysia as well as South America and West Africa. We do not have own operations in the producing countries, but purchase from European food companies. Orkla does not have aggregated data on the share of products containing palm oil, hence the figure is a best estimate.

Agricultural commodity

Soy

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Less than 10%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

Orkla uses various types of soy based raw materials in different product categories.

Agricultural commodity

Timber

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

More than 80%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

Almost all products use some sort of paperbased packaging, hence the high estimate. Orkla purchase packaging materials consisting of virgin paper and recycled fibre mainly from European producers.

C0.8

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

Indicate whether you are able to provide a unique identifier for your organization	Provide your unique identifier
Yes, an ISIN code	0010848237

C1. Governance

C1.1

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

Yes

C1.1a

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

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Director on board	The Orkla Sustainability Strategy and EHS management (including climate change), are anchored at Orkla Group Executive Board and the Board of Directors. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors performs a review of the risk picture with a 0-5 year perspective, including sustainability risks. The Committee reports to the Chairman of the Board. An important climate-related decision made during 2021 was the establishment of Orkla Alternative Proteins (OAP) as a separate company to coordinate and strengthen our investment in plant-based food. OAP supports Orkla companies' efforts to develop best possible products along important dimensions such as health and sustainability. This decision was anchored at the Orkla Group Executive Board.

C1.1b

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

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Scope of board-level oversight	Please explain
Scheduled – some meetings	Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding risk management policies Reviewing and guiding annual budgets Reviewing and guiding business plans Setting performance objectives Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues	<Not Applicable>	Orkla has developed Group targets for sustainability towards 2025. These include several climate-related targets. Orkla's Board of Directors monitors the Group's efforts by means of an annual assessment of progress in general sustainability work, annual assessment of progress in environmental work, quarterly reviews of changes in key environmental climate indicators and ongoing discussion of individual matters considered to be of material importance of Orklas operations. Orkla's Group Director of Corporate Communications and Corporate Affairs has administrative responsibility for Orkla's corporate responsibility work, and determines which matters are to be submitted to the Board of Directors. The Board also assesses Orkla's annual sustainability reporting.

C1.1d

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

	Board member(s) have competence on climate-related issues	Criteria used to assess competence of board member(s) on climate-related issues	Primary reason for no board-level competence on climate-related issues	Explain why your organization does not have at least one board member with competence on climate-related issues and any plans to address board-level competence in the future
Row 1	Yes	Board members have the competence on climate related issues based on their self assessment. In addition competence is provided from Orkla environmental specialists twice a year through presentation on the status of work and strategy for climate change mitigation.	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C1.2

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

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Reporting line	Responsibility	Coverage of responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Quarterly
Other committee, please specify (Audit Committee)	<Not Applicable>	Managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Annually
Chief Operating Officer (COO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Quarterly
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	More frequently than quarterly

C1.2a

(C1.2a) Describe where in the organizational structure this/these position(s) and/or committees lie, what their associated responsibilities are, and how climate-related issues are monitored (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change is integrated into company strategy and company-wide management process. Therefore, the positions with the highest responsibilities for climate-related issues are the CEO of Orkla, and the CEO, Sustainability Director and COO of the business areas who have the overall overview of all strategic areas in the company. CEO reports to the Board of Orkla and status on climate-related issues is presented at least once a year in Board meetings. Senior Vice President, EHS reports on the status of climate related issues to CEO within regular meetings. SVP, EHS has quarterly meetings with Orkla BA's where climate-related issues are discussed with the Sustainability Director and COO. They provide feedback to SVP, EHS regarding plans, activities, targets and other climate-related initiatives. The assessing of climate-related issues is assigned to SVP, EHS that have competencies in environmental field.

The CEO of each Orkla company is responsible for implementing the Group's directive on corporate responsibility and drawing of action plans for sustainability work based on Orkla's sustainability targets up to 2025. This work must be integrated into the company's operations and be based on the precautionary principle and the principle of continuous improvement. To ensure ongoing follow-up in each Orkla company, a semi-annual update of the risk picture is carried out, in addition to the risk analysis that is integrated into the company's decision-making processes.

The audit committee has competences related to risk assessment. The climate-related issues are monitored on regular basis through established systems and routines. Orkla's overall risk picture, including climate-related issues, is reviewed by the Group Executive Board and discussed by the Board of Directors, in addition to being reviewed by the Board's Audit Committee. Orkla's Executive Management Team is presented with the status twice a year, in addition to taking part in ongoing discussions of individual cases that are considered to be of significant importance to Orkla's operations. The Group's risk management lies within the remit of the finance functions and is intended to ensure that all risk of significance for Orkla's value creation is identified, analysed and effectively dealt with by business areas and specialized staffs. The Central Finance staff are responsible for Orkla's risk management model, and the Group's risk management programme is reviewed on a regular basis.

In 2020, Orkla's Sustainability Committee was established to facilitate coordination of sustainability work across business areas and functions, initiate joint development activities and provide support for Orkla's Group Executive Board.

C1.3

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

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

C1.3a

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

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity incentivized	Comment
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Non-monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	
Chief Operating Officer (COO)	Monetary reward	Energy reduction target	Orkla has a long-term incentive programme for executive managers divided into financial and personal targets. Sustainability targets such as KPI's for climate change related issues will be included in this.
Business unit manager	Non-monetary reward	Energy reduction target	
Facilities manager	Non-monetary reward	Energy reduction target	
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	Sustainability strategy is followed by the Chief Sustainability Officer and includes different clear targets related to climate change.

C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

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

Yes

C2.1a

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

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	3	Budget plan, KPI performance follow-up
Medium-term	3	10	Our business practice is to have a medium- term 3 year business plan.
Long-term	10	20	Our medium- term plan was developed for years 2016-2025, setting the Orkla climate commitment for 2025 based on the Science Based Targets initiative. For the long-term perspective we have considered 2040 as a target year for our SBT and commit to reduce GHG for scope 1&2 with 80% by 2040 (base year 2014) and scope 3 with 75%.

C2.1b

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

Orkla has conducted structured climate risk analysis in line with the recommendations from the TCFD both in 2019 and in 2021. This work has increased Orkla's understanding of how climate-related risks and opportunities can affect Orkla's business, financial conditions, and strategy in the future. The results from the TCFD workshops are included in Orkla's overall climate risk assessment. Orkla evaluates climate risks at all levels, risks assessed as having a low impact is included at the same level as high risks as these risks might have a more substantial financial or strategic impact in the future. Orkla is continuously evaluating risks and updating the risk matrix on a regular basis.

Orkla defines substantive financial or strategic impact as an impact that has a material effect on Orkla's current or future profitability. In the context of a climate-related risk, Orkla considers impacts with a cost above 25 MNOK as high in our risk assessments, as well as in contingency cases. The thresholds established to identify climate-related risks that are evaluated to have a substantive financial or strategic impact are defined as follows:

- A risk with a low financial or strategic impact is defined as an EBDITA-impact of below 5% of enterprise value, with a likelihood of 20%.
- A medium risk is defined as having an EBDITA-impact of 5% of enterprise value, with a likelihood of between 20-60%.
- A high risk is defined as having an EBDITA-impact of more than 5% of enterprise value, with a likelihood of more than 60%.

Orkla has a diversified company and product portfolio, which reduces the risk of significant profit fluctuations. In addition, we keep introducing measures throughout the value chain in order to mitigate the risk.

[\[GML1\]](#)Noe mer å tilføye her?

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

Direct operations

Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term

Medium-term

Long-term

Description of process

The identification and management of climate-related risks and opportunities follows Orkla's established guidelines for risk management. A corporate system to identify, assess, manage, and report risks and opportunities is implemented. The risk management framework state that all significant matters must be considered and include a plan to reduce or control the risk by implementing initiatives and mitigating actions. Climate-related risks and opportunities are defined as significant.

The overall Orkla risk review is conducted once a year lead by the Group Financial department responsible for the overall Risk Management report and implementation of the risk management process in Orkla. Orkla Board of Directors and Group Executive Board are on a regular basis presented with the risk reviews of the Group's activities for identifying, assessing, and responding to risks including climate-related risks and opportunities.

Each business area and each Orkla company is responsible for identifying and managing risks, including climate-related risks, within their respective areas. To ensure ongoing follow-up, a semi-annual bottom-up analysis is requested to update the Orkla risk picture. In addition, the risk analysis is integrated into the companies' decision-making processes. Risk assessments carried out in the business areas and Orkla companies are presented to and discussed by the internal boards of directors as part of the budget process. Designated risk management experts carry out detailed risk assessments in certain specialised fields and are responsible for selected measures to mitigate risk at Group level. Group EHS is responsible for the assessment of climate-related risks and opportunities.

In the autumn 2021 Orkla took important steps to strengthen our methodology for a top-down risk and opportunity assessment for climate-related issues. This work has increased Orkla's understanding of how climate-related risks and opportunities can affect Orkla's business, financial conditions, and strategy in the future.

Orkla assessed climate related risks and opportunities in short-term (1-3 years), medium-term (3-10 years), and long-term (10-20 years) perspectives. The climate-related risks are evaluated based on their potential strategic or financial impact, where we have set a threshold at 5% of EBITDA. The identified risks and opportunities are integrated into our overarching climate strategy and included in plans and mitigating actions. The overall climate-related assessment should be updated on a regular basis, and we will ensure that the findings are taken into consideration in the bottom-up assessments and initiatives for reducing climate gas emissions in Orkla companies and value chain.

The risk assessment system will contribute to a correct risk process. The system requests to identify sources of risk, areas of impacts, potential financial or strategic consequences and asks for mitigation activities. Acceptance criteria associated with the risk and opportunities is defined to ensure the common probability and consequence scales. There is a set of predefined criteria for how risks are assessed using a risk register scale. The probability and the consequence of the risks are rated as "Low", "Medium" or "High" and are visualized in a matrix. The sequence is then to assess, analyse, plan for initiatives, implement the initiatives and review them. The identified risks are presented as a collected risk picture for the company and is aggregated to the Orkla risk picture. The owner of the risk factors must implement relevant mitigation strategies and activities.

Case studies for the process used to determine which climate related risks and opportunities could have a substantive financial or strategic impact.

Physical risks:

For example, we are seeing a risk of higher price volatility on industrialized crops as a result of climate change. Increased extreme weather, water scarcity, and higher mean temperature will affect agricultural products, and more than half of direct materials of Orklas supply derive from agriculture. As a part of the described process above, this risk has been identified as a climate-related risk as increased price volatility on crops is a result of climate change. The evaluation of this risk will include an assessment of it's strategic and financial impact on Orkla, which we have evaluated to be high and the likelihood is considered to be almost certain.

Transitional opportunity:

As consumers become more conscious about climate change, Orkla is seeing an opportunity in the sale of plant-based food. We are therefore developing and introducing products with higher carbon activity, meeting consumers and customer's expectations such as vegetarian products. As a part of the described process above, we have evaluated this opportunity as climate-related as this opportunity is a result of a more sustainably conscious consumer and customer base base. The evaluation of this risk includes an assessment of its strategic and financial impact on Orkla, which we have evaluated to be medium and the likelihood is considered to be almost certain.

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

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Current regulation	Relevant, always included	Compliance with existing regulation is a requirement for all our business units, and the risk of violations of current regulation is monitored through internal EHS audits and governance procedures. Current regulations include national and regional laws and regulations in areas such as emission and environment, product claims, taxes, corporate governance and reporting. Within the risk assessment process, we consider the likelihood and potential consequences of becoming affected by changes in current regulation, such as changes in the regulation on purchase of emission allowances and CO2 taxes as this can impact our operational costs. Currently only one boiler at Orkla Foods Sweden Eslöv factory is obliged to purchase emission allowances. We do not expect that other Orkla factories will be included in the EU ETS within phase four. The production is also already influenced by energy tax in the fuel price. As an example, in Norway the energy tax included in the fuel price has an effect of 1090 NOK per tonne of CO2e.
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	Emerging regulations include emerging national and regional laws and regulations in areas such as environment, product claims, taxes, corporate governance and reporting. All emerging regulations impacting the business are assessed as part of our environmental management system, as not complying can lead to higher operational costs. An important considered risk is future regulations regarding HFCs as R-404A (GWP 3922) in Europe. In 2021, Orkla's total emission from R-404A was 1339.8 tCO2e, hence a future regulation regarding R-404A will most likely lead to higher operational cost due to taxes and/or HFC leak controls.
Technology	Relevant, always included	We consider risks related to implementation of new technologies and innovations that will be necessary to reach our emission reduction targets and follow the transition to low-carbon and energy efficient business. Effective development and implementation of new technologies as sustainable packaging and renewable energy is important to maintain a competitive position in the market and fulfil customer requirements and expectations. Failure to keep up with technological change can be a risk for Orkla both in terms of reputation amongst stakeholders, but also from a climate change perspective if we fail to meet our emissions reduction targets .
Legal	Relevant, always included	Compliance with national and international legal requirements are non-negotiable for Orkla. Risks related to litigation claims associated with e.g. introduction of new products on the market might lead to additional future costs as well as affecting our reputation. Hence, the risk is always assessed at business level and recognized as relevant for Orkla. Both the EU and individual countries are currently introducing statutory requirements for carrying out due diligence, and expectations of companies like Orkla are increasing. For example, enhanced reporting requirements following the EU Taxonomy, classifying business activities as sustainable/non-sustainable according to a set of criterias. As a Norwegian listed company, Orkla is not subject to the reporting requirements for the 2021 financial year, but this is expected to apply to Norwegian companies for the financial year 2022. Not being aligned with the EU taxonomy poses a risk for Orkla in terms of reputational damage and a decrease in investments.
Market	Relevant, always included	Market risks are closely monitored at business level in all Orkla companies. We consider risks related to changes in consumer and customer behavior as highly relevant to Orkla. Such market changes can lead to reduced demand for our products and may lead to a decrease in income, and therefore this risk is a part of the overall risk assessment at business level. Consumers and professional costumers are increasingly requesting information on the climate impact of individual products or raw materials, which necessitates new knowledge and expertise and could increase complexity. In order to meet these demands, several Orkla companies have in the past years introduced climate impact labelling of food. This may lead to increased operational costs as this necessitates new knowledge and expertise and could increase complexity.
Reputation	Relevant, always included	In the risk assessment process, we have considered risks related to reduced reputation of the company. Reputational risks related to sustainability are always present, as Orkla might receive negative mention in the media. Potential examples could be pollution from factories, misleading marketing, ingredients with a negative environmental impact, incorrect reporting, suppliers with unsustainable practices or focus on the environmental impacts of company transportation. Stakeholders are increasingly concerned with climate and water related risks such as deforestation practices, palm-oil use and single-use packaging. Failure to meet stakeholder expectations may lead to a weaker reputation which may lead to decrease in income due to lower demand for our products. Reputational risks are therefore assessed as relevant and is assessed at business level. Systematic work across all of Orkla to prevent undesirable practices and reduce the negative environmental impacts of our products and operations is critical to reduce the reputation risk.
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	Acute physical risks e.g. through seasonal flooding and drought in areas where we source our raw materials can lead to increased raw material and operational costs as well as reduced access to raw materials. Hence, the risks are assessed as relevant and evaluated at business level. Flooding and water scarcity might also increase energy costs, for example dry dams. The risks of drought and flooding is currently evaluated as a low risk as only a few of Orkla's companies are located in vulnerable areas. Orkla's companies in India and Romania, who are exposed to water shortages or power supply interruptions are taking risk mitigating actions. Such acute physical risks can for example affect transportation routes, delaying delivery of goods from the production sites to costumers or incoming goods, resulting in increased costs associated with the delivery delays.
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	Climate change is causing water scarcity, erosion and changes in biodiversity that affect the basis for agriculture in vulnerable areas. Changing temperatures and precipitations patterns may lead to decreased availability of critical raw materials in the supply chain and volatile prices, especially for agricultural commodities. This may lead to increased operational cost or even disrupt the business operations along the value chain of Orkla companies. This type of chronic physical climate risk is expected to lead to considerable fluctuation in the prices of cocoa, cotton, soya and other agricultural products from Asia, Africa, South America and Southern Europe in both the short and long term. In the years ahead, drought, flooding and other forms of extreme weather may also affect crop harvests in the rest of Europe and the USA. The anticipated effects of such chronic physical climate risks are cost fluctuations, quality deficiencies and temporary supply problems for key raw materials such as grain, fruit, vegetables and animal products. More than half of direct materials of Orkla's supply chain derive from agriculture, and marine products, fruits, berries, coca and most vegetables depend on other species (biodiversity) for feed and pollination. Chronic physical risks will shift production zones, annual yields will become more variable and price volatility of agricultural commodities will increase. These types of risks are relevant and always included in Orkla's risks assessments .

C2.3

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

Yes

C2.3a

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

Identifier

Risk 1

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation	Carbon pricing mechanisms
---------------------	---------------------------

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification

<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description

Orkla considers emerging regulations related to carbon pricing mechanisms as a potential risk, for example potential changes in regulations imposed by the European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS). Orkla expects that we will be affected by drastic GHG emission reduction requirements as a potential consequence, and Orkla will therefore probably be required to purchase emission allowances for its factory's emissions. As a result, we expect increased operational cost in factories participating in the scheme.

Today the production of foods and other consumer goods are not included in the EU ETS. The 4th trading periode (2021 – 2030) will continue with a system of free

allocation and has been revised to focus on sectors at the highest risk of relocating their production outside of the EU. The consumer goods sector is not included in this. The chosen sectors will receive 100% of their allocation for free. For less exposed sectors, free allocation is foreseen to be phased out after 2026 from a maximum of 30% to 0 at the end of phase 4 (2030). It is of importance to follow the development of the EU requirements and legislation.

Time horizon

Short-term

Likelihood

About as likely as not

Magnitude of impact

Low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

3700000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

Currently only one boiler at Orkla Foods Sweden Eslöv factory is obliged to purchase emission allowances. We don't expect any additional Orkla factories to be included in the next phases of the EU-ETS. Assuming a CO2-price of 250 NOK per tonne CO2e in 2021 for the EU ETS phase 4 we estimate the maximum cost to be 3,7 MNOK.

Cost of response to risk

200000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

The Group closely follows the development of political framework conditions in each market the Group operates in, and if possible the risks and probability are quantified and taken into account in the financial evaluation of the projects, both ongoing and new projects. The management method used to tackle described risk include a number of GHG emission reduction projects. This is established through a Corporate Program "Improved resource and energy efficiency". The program also includes the movement from non-renewable to renewable energy sources as well as investments in renewable energy production. One of the examples for movement from non-renewable to renewable energy sources is the transition at Orkla crisps factory at Åland, Finland, to electricity generated by locally produced wind power. This saves the factory approximately 1000 tonnes CO2 each year. Examples of improved energy efficiency at several Orkla factories include replacement of lights with LED lights, reduction of energy consumption, sensor control and new electrical systems. Direct cost associated with responding to this risk is a part of an ongoing business and is related to following development in regulatory requirements by EHS employees. The cost of response to risk is approximately 20% of 2 FTE's, which amounts to 200 000 NOK.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation	Carbon pricing mechanisms
---------------------	---------------------------

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification

<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description

Orkla assess that there is a likeliness of emerging regulations related to the introduction of direct carbon taxes on fossil fuels, as well as an increase in carbon taxes on fossil fuels. In countries where such market instrument has already been introduced, an increase of operational costs are already seen. In Norway and Sweden carbon taxes is a part of the fuel prices, and Orkla is expecting the introduction of such taxes in the other countries where Orkla operates. One example from Norway is that the Norwegian Government has published a White Paper regarding an increase in carbon taxes for the non-quota sector. Orkla has an overall goal to work towards fossil free energy consumption and all companies set targets to reduce the use of fossil energy sources. This will in effect have positive effect on climate gas emissions as well as reduced cost due to carbon taxes. In the Orkla crisps factory in Åland, the Group has moved from non-renewable to the generation of renewable electricity through locally produced wind-power. Orkla will increasingly focus on the movement from non-renewable to renewable energy-sources.

Time horizon

Short-term

Likelihood

Likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

57700000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

Taxes have been introduced in several European countries, but the effect is still unclear. An estimate has been made based on the effect in Norway and Sweden, where the tax is already a part of the fuel price (1090 NOK per tonne of CO₂e). The financial impact was calculated based on amount of tCO₂e emitted in 2021 in Norway and Sweden from burning of fossil fuels that is: 53 000 tCO₂e and multiplied with a price of 1 tCO₂e that is 1 090 NOK that gives 57 770 000 NOK.

Cost of response to risk

200000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

The Group closely follows the development of political framework conditions in each market the Group operates in, and if possible, the risks and probability are quantified and taking into account in the financial evaluation of the projects, both ongoing and new projects. One of the examples where the Group has made a decision to move from non-renewable to renewable energy sources in order to meet emerging requirements, is the transition at Orkla crisps factory at Åland, Finland, to electricity generated by locally produced wind power. This saves the factory 1000 tCO₂ annually. Direct costs associated with management of this risk is allocated between all the implicated business units from local management up to the Group's central staff units. Direct cost associated with responding to this risk is a part of an ongoing business and is related to following development in regulatory requirements by EHS employees. The cost of response to risk is approximately 20% of 2 FTE's, which amounts to 200 000 NOK.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Downstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation	Mandates on and regulation of existing products and services
---------------------	--

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification

<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description

Orkla sees a potential risk with the introduction of new regulations regarding information and documentation of environmental impact from products. For example, carbon footprint labelling. This may lead to increased operational costs as this necessitates new knowledge and expertise and could increase complexity. Orkla has developed a tool that makes it possible to map the climate footprint of food products and has begun to provide information on this impact for selected products and customer groups. For example, TORO launched in 2019 a climate impact label to give guidance to consumers on the climate efforts of TORO products and tips on making good climate-smart choices. In 2021, this climate impact label was used on additional products from Orkla Foods Norway. Both Orkla Foods Sweden and Orkla foods Cesko a Slovensko launched similar climate impact label for several of their products. In the years to come, use of this tool will be expanded to include more companies and products. This is a difficult process that will have to be carried out over time.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

Likely

Magnitude of impact

High

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

1600000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

If legislation is introduced, we assume there will be a requirement for a third-party verified LCA assessment of products. Based on prices for the consultancy services needed to conduct LCA assessments, the estimated cost per product is NOK 200 000 on average. The reported financial impact is based on third-party LCA assessments for 8000 products, and Orkla is planning on doing the LCA assessments of the remaining products internally. Given the high cost, we recommend that such regulation is not introduced and that other measures are evaluated. The potential financial impact was calculated as following: 200 000 NOK x 8 000 products that gives 1 600 000 000 NOK.

Cost of response to risk

3000000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

The Group closely follows the development of political framework conditions in each market the Group operates in, and if possible the risks and probability are quantified and taking into account in the financial evaluation of the projects, both ongoing and new projects. Orkla has developed a tool for calculating the Climate impact related to products, "Climate impact tool". Several of Orkla's companies have started to implement the tool, to get a better understanding of the product's climate impact. By working with this type of measure we reduce the risk for mandatory environmental product declarations. Direct cost associated with responding to this risk is allocated between all the implicated business units from local management up to the Group's central staff units. The cost associated with further development of the Climate Impact Tool was estimated to 2 000 000 NOK. The work within the companies to implement the tool and develop product LCAs are estimated to 1 000 000 NOK. The cost of response is therefore the sum of both.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 4

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical	Temperature variability
------------------	-------------------------

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification

<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description

Changing temperatures and precipitations patterns may lead to decreased availability of critical raw materials in the supply chain and volatile prices, especially for agricultural commodities. These may lead to increased operational cost or even disrupt the business operations along the value chain of Orkla companies. Both energy, water and other important food raw materials might be affected. Several Orkla companies in areas exposed to water shortage or power supply interruptions, such as India and Romania, are taking risk-mitigation action. MTR Foods in India has established systems for collecting rainwater, recycling water and ensuring access to locally produced solar energy.

Time horizon

Short-term

Likelihood

Virtually certain

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

490000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

The financial impact was estimated to less than 1% increase in operational cost, as this affects only a few of our factories in India and Romania . Orkla's operating expenses in 2021 was 49 billion NOK, therefore, the potential financial impact was calculated to 490 000 000 NOK.

Cost of response to risk

5000000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

An obvious method to respond to the described risk is to reduce consumption of energy and increase energy efficiency. Another method is to diversify the supply sources and become less vulnerable to sudden disruption in the supply change due to e.g. draughts and extreme weather. Example of management method is a mobilized effort in order to increase the percentage of palm oil certified by the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil in the palm oil used by Orkla. Certification reduces the risk of deforestation and other undesirable practices. Orkla's main suppliers have also initiated a range of measures to monitor their sub-contractors, prevent and put out fires and promote sustainable cultivation. Costs associated with responding to this risk relates mainly to internal analyses in order to find more energy efficient solutions. There is also a significant cost premium linked to sourcing environmentally certified palm oil, cocoa, soy, and other raw materials, but regard this as investment in long-term risk reduction (by securing sustainable production of raw materials). The cost of responding to this risk will require internal personnel to conduct analyses for the Orkla companies in order to implement the needed measures. The cost of response risk is estimated to be 5 million NOK, which amounts to the required personnel internally at Orkla (10 FTE's = 5 million NOK).

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

Yes

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

Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Downstream

Opportunity type

Products and services

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Development and/or expansion of low emission goods and services

Primary potential financial impact

Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

Company-specific description

Consumers are increasingly conscious about climate change and place greater importance on environmental sustainability with growing awareness on product's carbon footprint. Food with low carbon footprint, for example plant-based food, are increasingly popular. The increased interest in a plant-based diet offers substantial opportunity for growth for Orkla. We therefore see an opportunity in developing and introducing products with higher carbon productivity, meeting consumers and customers' expectations such as vegetarian products. Examples are the launch of the Orkla vegetarian and vegan product lines Anamma, NATURLI and the Frankful brands. We are already seeing an increased demand from these products, and our goal is to be one of Europe's leading players in alternative proteins by 2030.

Time horizon

Short-term

Likelihood

Likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

3000000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

The financial figure is representing a turnover that will be achieved by 2025 from plant-based food. To calculate this figure we took into account that current aggregate turnover from plant-based food is 1 047 million and compared to 2020 it increased by 23%. Assuming that opportunity will be realized through combination of organic growth and acquisitions the financial impact was estimated to be around 3 000 000 000 NOK in 2025.

1 047 million (revenue in 2020) *1,233 (23% organic growth) + 250 million NOK (cost merges and acquisitions 160 million invested in change foods and 90 million to Arkeon)* 4 years = 3 000 000 NOK

Cost to realize opportunity

250000000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Orkla aims to achieve strong growth in plant-based products in new markets. We are seeing an increased customer interest for more plant-based products. The development of plant-based, environmentally friendly products was an important aspect of Orkla's innovation work in 2021 and will remain a key platform in the future. In 2021, we launched a number of products that will make it possible for consumers to make more sustainable choices in everyday life. Orkla has defined the development of seaweed as a new sustainable growth area through the establishment of the company Orkla Ocean. In 2021, we also established Orkla Alternative Proteins (OAP) as a separate business unit. OAP will collaborate closely with the various companies in Orkla Food Ingredients and Orkla Foods, which currently develop, market and sell plant-based food, and together they will develop a general strategy for alternative proteins in Orkla. We will continue to increase our investments in plant-based products based on established positions. We estimate the cost of 250 000 000 NOK, this number is based on the Orkla's investments to companies, working with development of alternative proteins Arkeon (90 million NOK investment) and change foods (160 million NOK).
160 million NOK + 90 million NOK = 250 million NOK

We are already starting to see the results of our product development of plant-based foods. Plant-based food produced by Orkla had an aggregate turnover of NOK 1 407 million in 2021 and a growth of 23 per cent compared to 2020.

Comment**Identifier**

Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

Renewable energy accounted for a total of 47 per cent of our energy use in 2021. We intend to reach our target of 60 per cent renewable energy in 2025 by phasing out fossil fuels and increasing use of energy from renewable sources. Therefore, we see increased use of renewable energy as an opportunity, as the transition to renewable energy is expected to generate a growing cost benefit in the years to come, in step with energy market price trends. This opportunity has the potential to reduce our exposure to climate-related energy taxes and thereby reducing the operating costs. Orkla has invested in HydroPower production in Norway. The energy operations generate and supply electricity to the Nordic power market and have an annual production of 2.5 TWh.

One of the examples for movement from non-renewable to renewable energy sources is the transition at Orkla crisps factory at Åland, Finland, to electricity generated by locally produced wind power. It is estimated that the factory will save 1000 tCO₂ annually. Examples of improved energy efficiency at several factories are replacement of lights with LED lights, reduction and control of the leakage of compressed air and improved shut-off procedures. We also have a plan to replace boilers based on fossil fuel to boilers using bio-fuel or renewable electricity.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Virtually certain

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

222000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

The energy consumption is estimated to be reduced by 30% in 2025 compared to the base line year 2014. The energy costs for 2020 was 739 NOK million. Assuming an 30% reduction in energy costs by 2025 will lead to an annual saving of 222 NOK million.

Cost to realize opportunity

5000000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

There is a constant focus among the different Orkla facilities and sites to reduce and reuse energy in order to reduce energy/carbon intensity of the products. Management method used to take advantage of described opportunity include a number of GHG emission reduction projects. This is established through a Corporate Program "Improved resource and energy efficiency". The program also includes the movement from non-renewable to renewable energy sources as well as investments in renewable energy production. Example of improved energy efficiency that are focused at several factories are replacement of lights with LED lights, reduction of energy consumption, sensor control and new electrical systems. In addition, Orkla is participating in the research program HighEFF at Sintef, to increase energy efficiency and ensure green industries. One project example is Orkla Confectionery & Snacks Denmark, that supply surplus heat from its crisps factory at Sønderød to Fjernvarme fyn district heating company. This is equivalent to heat for 400 households and reduces the plant's CO2 emissions by around 600 tonnes per year. New measures are being explored with a view of supplying district heating to additional households. We estimate an average annual cost for realization of opportunities to be 5 MNOK, which is the salary of 10 Orkla employees required.

Comment**Identifier**

Opp3

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type

Energy source

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

Primary potential financial impact

Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

Company-specific description

Orkla has invested in HydroPower production in Norway. The energy operations generate and supply electricity to the Nordic power market and have an annual production of 2.5 TWh. Orkla Hydro Power is also a part of the system for Guarantees of Origin (GO) and selling certificates for renewable energy and projects. We consider the increased demand for renewable energy as an opportunity for HydroPower, as it has the potential to increase the Group's revenues. In addition, Orkla has a target of 60 per cent renewable energy in 2025 by phasing out fossil fuels and increasing use of energy from renewable sources. Renewable energy accounted for a total of 47 per cent of our energy use in 2021. The use of GoOs is a central part of this strategy to realise the targets, and Orkla has decided to secure GoOs for all Orkla operations in Europe linked to own production of hydro power to secure 100% renewable electricity.

Time horizon

Short-term

Likelihood

Likely

Magnitude of impact

Low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

12500000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

The financial impact, total revenue, is estimated based on the estimated price for GoOs of NOK 5,0 /MWh and the average production of electrical energy in Orkla of 2,5TWh. The potential financial impact has been calculated as following: 2,5 TWh x 5 NOK that gives a total revenue of 12 500 000 NOK.

Cost to realize opportunity

5000000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Orkla has invested in HydroPower production in Norway, which generate and supply electricity to the Nordic power market and have an annual production of 2.5TWh. Orkla Hydro power is also a part of the system for Guarantees of Origins (GO) and selling certificates for renewable energy and projects. Orkla has also decided to secure GoOs for all Orkla operations in Europe linked to own production of hydro power. The use of GoOs is a central part of this strategy to realise the targets, and Orkla has decided to secure GoOs for all Orkla operations in Europe linked to own production of hydro power to secure 100% renewable electricity. This had a cost of approx 450 000 NOK in 2021. The estimated cost in the future is estimated to vary and cost to realize opportunity is estimated to 5 MNOK.

Comment**C3. Business Strategy****C3.1****(C3.1) Does your organization's strategy include a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world?****Row 1****Transition plan**

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

Publicly available transition plan

Yes

Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your transition plan

We have a different feedback mechanism in place

Description of feedback mechanism

In order to have a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world we go through the approval process of our targets and plans with SBTi and have recently received an approval of near term, long term and net-zero targets. Climate targets are presented at board meetings twice a year for board members and shareholder representatives, where feedback is collected. Near term targets and climate transition plan were presented at capital market day 2021, where shareholders and other investors had an opportunity to comment. The performance is regularly re-evaluated and presented at Orkla's quarter reports, where feedback is collected.

Frequency of feedback collection

More frequently than annually

Attach any relevant documents which detail your transition plan (optional)**Explain why your organization does not have a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world and any plans to develop one in the future**

<Not Applicable>

Explain why climate-related risks and opportunities have not influenced your strategy

<Not Applicable>

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

	Use of climate-related scenario analysis to inform strategy	Primary reason why your organization does not use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy	Explain why your organization does not use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy and any plans to use it in the future
Row 1	Yes, qualitative and quantitative	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C3.2a

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

Climate-related scenario	Scenario analysis coverage	Temperature alignment of scenario	Parameters, assumptions, analytical choices
Transition scenarios IEA 2DS	Company-wide	<Not Applicable>	The assessment was made based on the scenarios presented by IPCC and IEA, using the shared socioeconomic pathways (SSP). Given the lowest overshoot the global emissions must be reduced by 49-72% by 2050 from 2010 levels in order to have a 12 to 22% chance of stabilizing temperatures below 2°C temperature increase relative to the preindustrial temperature. The scenario has been evaluated in medium- and long-term perspectives and the analysis has been both qualitative and quantitative. The scenario is dominated by transition risks and assumes a stringent and immediately introduced climate policies and innovation, reaching net zero emissions around 2050. Pricing and taxation of GHG emissions may lead to higher operating costs, and changes in investment and upgrades strategies. The costs are already seen in countries where such market instruments already have been introduced. In Norway and Sweden, carbon taxes are a part of the fuel prices, and Orkla is expecting the introduction of such taxes in other countries where Orkla operates. The production of food and other consumer goods are not included in the EU ETS as of now, however it is assumed that there will be an increase in carbon prices both in the medium- and long-term perspectives, increasing operating costs. On the other hand, Orkla sees increased use of renewable energy as an opportunity as the transition to renewable energy is expected to generate a growing cost benefit. This opportunity has the potential to reduce exposure to climate-related energy and carbon taxes and thereby reducing operating costs. More stringent regulations lead to higher cost of food raw materials, impacting short-term margins. Raw materials with high carbon footprint and low carbon energy substitutes are especially exposed to increases in prices due to carbon pricing. For example, farmers will have to pay more for input factors such as diesel, electricity, fertilizer, and pesticides, increasing prices of agricultural commodities. In the long-term this will lead to an increase in raw materials which can impact costs for end consumers, potentially reducing demand for our products. In a long-term perspective it is expected that prices will stabilize and that costumers are adapting to a sustainable living.
Physical climate scenarios	Company-wide	<Not Applicable>	This scenario follows a path in which social, economic, and technological trends do not shift markedly from historical patterns, but the world takes action to limit emission growth. However, the world fails to cut emissions in the short term and misses the goals set in the Paris agreement. This results in close to +2 degrees warming by 2050 but is lowered using carbon sequestration and storage (CSS). The assessment is based on IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), climate scenario RCP 4.5 and the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs). The scenario is dominated by several physical risks, due to the lack of coordinated policy actions to limit climate change. The scenario has been evaluated in medium- and long-term perspectives and the analysis has been both qualitative and quantitative. More than half of direct materials of Orkla’s supply chain derive from agriculture, and marine products, fruits, berries, cocoa, and most vegetables depend on other species for feed and pollination. Orkla spends about 15% on biodiversity pollinated products. The scenario assumes that in the medium term there will be a reduced global yield due to climate change, overexploitation, and biodiversity loss, which will lead to higher prices. Growth in the world population, coupled with more food demand, will enable continued deforestation and biodiversity loss. In the long term, it is expected that there will be more effort put into both climate change reduction and loss of biodiversity. Production zones will shift, annual yields will become more variable, and price volatility of agricultural commodities will become more variable, and price volatility of agricultural commodities will increase. For Orkla, it is assumed that there will be a price shock on vegetables, oils, grain, and livestock products due to losses/gains in yield from year to year. This will lead to higher operational costs for Orkla and in the medium- and long-term higher costs of products for the end-customers. Certain raw material relies heavily on water availability and are therefore impacted by changes in precipitation patterns, higher mean temperatures, and extreme heat events that all exacerbate water scarcity. Limitations on water concessions, higher costs or water extraction bans can as a result affect deliveries of upstream products and packaged goods.
Physical climate scenarios	Company-wide	<Not Applicable>	This scenario assumes that only currently implemented policies are preserved, and that economic growth is more important than climate action. The world does not cut emissions and climate change accelerates causing 2.5 degree of warming by 2050, and >+3 by 2100 bringing irreversible changes. The assessment is based on IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), climate scenario RCP 8.5 and the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs). The scenario involves little to no transitional risks early on, but results in irreversible and global disrupting physical risks. Due to the failure to limit climate change, there is a dependence on fossil fuels and energy intensity is high. More extreme weather events are becoming a regularity, as well as drought, flooding, heavy precipitation, and sea level rise. These climate-related impacts are assumed to increase due to the warming that follows. The scenario has been evaluated in medium- and long-term perspectives and the analysis has been both qualitative and quantitative. The lack of policies will lead to more deforestation and biodiversity loss, which will affect the food system. Due to the impact on biodiversity and ecosystems, prices for raw materials will increase as areas for producing are diminishing. It is assumed that all regions will be affected, increasing prices from more than 5000 of Orkla’s supplier plants. It is almost certain that agricultural droughts or too much precipitation is expected to increase globally affecting yields. In the long-term, this is expected to increase in severity. Production zones will shift, annual yields will become more variable, and price volatility of agricultural commodities will become more variable. For Orkla, it is assumed that this will lead to a price shock on vegetables, oils, grain, and livestock products due to losses/gains in yield from year to year. This will lead to higher operational costs for Orkla and in the medium- and long-term higher costs of products for the end-customers. Changes to precipitation patterns, higher mean temperatures, and extreme heat events all exacerbate water scarcity. Limitations on water concessions, higher costs or water extraction bans can as a result affect deliveries of upstream products and packaged goods. It is expected in the medium and long term that water scarcity may impact prices or disrupt Orkla’s production due to delivery delays, with more suppliers being affected in the long-term.

C3.2b

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

Row 1

Focal questions

How will climate change impact the availability and prices of raw materials, and how will this affect Orkla financially?

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

More than half of direct materials of Orkla’s supply derive from agriculture. Physical risks present in the RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 scenarios such as biodiversity loss, increased extreme weather and higher mean temperatures combined with overexploitation will reduce crops and increase prices of raw materials. This can in the long-term affect prices of products for the end-costumer. As a consequence, the demand for our products can be reduced, impacting revenues. Global aggregate agricultural production is not projected to decline before 2050, but suitable production zones will shift, annual yields will become more variable, and price volatility of agricultural commodities will increase. It is expected that vegetables, oils, grain, and livestock products are likely to feel price shocks due to losses/gains in yield from year to year. For example, in both scenarios it is expected that global wheat will see a +-3% volatility in the medium-term and +-8% in the long term. This will increase prices of these commodities in the medium- and long-term, leading to higher prices for the end customers. Climate change will particularly affect smallholder farms, as they are less likely to be able to adapt to climatic changes. This can lead to price volatility and reduce the availability of certain raw materials, such as cocoa, shea- and coconut oils, butts, berries and fruits. It is assumed that there will be an 89% yield loss in cocoa during droughts, leading to production interruptions for two of Orkla’s sites. To increase understanding of how to develop and source from production systems that are more resilient to climatic changes, Orkla engages in improvement projects in the value chain, working closely with suppliers to ensure that they have solid sustainability strategies and to diversify their sourcing. Another part of our strategy is to use third-party certifications to ensure sustainably produced raw materials and contribute to improved agricultural practices. Orkla’s ability to source globally is an important mitigating factor and we strive to have flexible product recipes that can be put in use if necessary. This means that we can alternate suppliers and origins depending on the current situation.

C3.3

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

	Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?	Description of influence
Products and services	Yes	Consumers are increasingly concerned about the climate footprint from their food consumption. Food with low carbon footprint (vegan, locally produced, etc) are increasingly popular. We therefore see a strategic opportunity in developing and introducing new products meeting consumers and customer expectations like e.g. vegetarian products and products with improved packaging. This opportunity impacts all business areas. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be high as long as we see developing demand for those kinds of products. Plant-based food produced by Orkla had an aggregate turnover of NOK 1 047 million in 2021 and growth of 23 per cent compared to 2020. By 2025, we aim to achieve a turnover of NOK 3 billion in plant-based food. Our goal is to be one of Europe's leading players in alternative proteins by 2030. The most strategic decision related to this in 2021 was the establishment of Orkla Alternative Proteins (OAP) as a separate business unit in 2021. OAP will collaborate closely with the various companies in Orkla Food Ingredients and Orkla Foods, which currently develop, market and sell plant-based food, and together they will develop a general strategy for alternative proteins in Orkla. We will continue to build and develop strong local positions, but OAP will also contribute to increasing our rate of growth outside our present home markets. We assess this opportunity to be short- and medium term.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Yes	We see a potential risk of volatile prices and lower availability of raw materials (mainly agriculture) due to climate change. We assume that these risks will impact all business areas. The magnitude of impact is increasing, but the consequence of extreme weather is moderate for Orkla in the short and medium term. Most of Orkla's manufacturing and sourcing is carried out in the Nordics, the Baltics and Eastern Europe, where the likelihood of water shortages and drought is lower than in areas with a warmer climate. However, raw materials produced in other continents, like cocoa, are at risk because of climate change combined with unsustainable farming practices, hence the availability might be threatened. We therefore engage in improvement projects in the value chain, working closely with our suppliers. The most important strategic decision made was the establishment of a new classification system for sustainable food raw materials with detailed criteria for sustainable raw material production. The system offers a comprehensive approach to promoting sustainable agricultural production, based on the Farm Sustainability Assessment (FSA) framework, developed by SAI platform. Key raw materials are assessed, and supplier's certification systems are compared with the FSA. Where there are no relevant FSA criteria, Orkla has initiated action to establish the necessary criteria. If an existing certification system does not meet the requirements of the FSA Silver level, Orkla will consider other, more suitable certification programmes.
Investment in R&D	Yes	We see an opportunity in developing new products including packaging as well as being part of developing new technologies as partner in R&D programs (e.g. development of bio-based plastic, energy efficient production and increasing recycling). The magnitude of impact is increasing. We see this as a strategic opportunity partly due to increased consumer demands, but also due to expected future regulations on packaging made from fossil raw materials. In 2021 the Orkla companies has continued their efforts to optimize packaging, design packaging to facilitate recycling and develop new packaging solutions based on recyclable, recycled or renewable materials. The most important strategic decisions relating to this has been firstly our efforts to work on recycling design. Several Orkla's companies has begun using mono-material plastic packaging, which means that the packaging is made of one and the same material and can be handled as a single waste product. Secondly, Orkla is involved in a variety of development projects in cooperation with suppliers, external centers of expertise and other players in the value chain. For example, Orkla cooperates with HolyGrail, which is a joint international project under the auspices of AIM, the European Brands Association. The goal is to test digital watermarking for packaging which makes it possible to track the packaging through the value chain. By identifying types of plastic and previous applications, waste packaging can be sorted more accurately, and the quality of the recycled plastic can be improved. Lastly, the Orkla companies are making active efforts to use more recycled materials in our packaging, increasing the share to 54% in 2021. We assess this opportunity to be medium term.
Operations	Yes	We see an opportunity in renewable energy which we assume will reduce operational costs. The magnitude of the impact is currently low but may increase in the future as we already see increasing carbon taxes in Europe. Orkla has invested in HydroPower production in Norway, which generate and supply electricity to the Nordic power market and have an annual production of 2.5TWh. Orkla Hydro power is also a part of the system for Guarantees of Origins (GO) and selling certificates for renewable energy and projects. Orkla has also decided to secure GoOs for all Orkla operations in Europe linked to own production of hydro power. Renewable energy accounted for a total of 47% of our energy use in 2021. A strategic decision related to our operations is setting our target of 60% renewable energy in 2025 will be reached by phasing out fossil fuels and increasing our use of energy from renewable sources. We assess this opportunity to be short-term.

C3.4

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

	Financial planning elements that have been influenced	Description of influence
Row 1	Revenues	Climate risks and opportunities are impacting Orkla's financial planning. For example, we see an opportunity for increased sale of vegan, vegetarian and organic food and products with a reduced climate impact. Consumers' increased focus on health and sustainability has given rise to strong innovations in 2021, under new brands, but also under the well-established brands in the portfolio. The estimated share of revenues from vegan and lacto-ovo vegetarian products was in 2021 50%, compared to 49% in 2020 and 46% in 2019. Due to the increased demand by consumers, we are expecting an increase in revenue from sale of vegan, vegetarian, and organic products in the short- and medium term. Orkla aims to achieve strong growth in plant-based products in new markets. This opportunity has been a key part in Orkla's financial planning in order to meet consumer's expectations and Orkla aims to achieve strong growth in plant-based foods in the coming years. The time horizon is assessed to be medium-term.

C3.5

(C3.5) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's transition to a 1.5°C world?

Yes

C3.5a

(C3.5a) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's transition to a 1.5°C world.

Financial Metric

Revenue

Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned with a 1.5°C world in the reporting year (%)

50

Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align with a 1.5°C world in 2025 (%)

65

Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align with a 1.5°C world in 2030 (%)

75

Describe the methodology used to identify spending/revenue that is aligned with a 1.5°C world

Orkla has set science – based targets. Targets are considered 'science-based' if they are in line with what the latest climate science deems necessary to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement – limiting global warming to well-below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C. During the validation process we calculated the emissions for each of the scopes. Scope 3 appeared to be the biggest contributor, responsible for more than 90% of the impact. In scope 3 we identified purchased goods and services as the category we need to focus on. Orkla has developed a climate impact tool, based on the LCA methodology, which helps to estimate carbon emissions from our products. Calculations shown that impact from vegan and vegetarian is significantly lower than from animal based. Therefore, in order to align our revenue with a 1.5 world, we are planning to increase production of plant based products.

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

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

Absolute target

C4.1a

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

Target reference number

Abs 1

Year target was set

2021

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2

Scope 2 accounting method

Market-based

Scope 3 category(ies)

<Not Applicable>

Base year

2014

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

134879

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

152528

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

<Not Applicable>

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

287408

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

100

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

100

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

<Not Applicable>

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

100

Target year

2025

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

65

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

100592.8

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

119854

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

3073

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

<Not Applicable>

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

122927

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

88.0447629529075

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this a science-based target?

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

Target ambition

1.5°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We have 100% coverage and no exclusions, because we have an efficient reporting system in place and manage to cover all of our direct operations

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

The Science-based target was developed based on IPCC AR5 RCP2.6. The target is going to be achieved through phasing out fossil fuels for stationary combustion (burning oil and heavy fuel oil) as well as purchase of guarantees of origin for the total electricity consumption in Orkla Group. Through these activities we were able to achieve 63% reductions compared to the base year.

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

<Not Applicable>

Target reference number

Abs 2

Year target was set

2021

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2

Scope 2 accounting method

Market-based

Scope 3 category(ies)

<Not Applicable>

Base year

2014

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

134879

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

152528

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

<Not Applicable>

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

287408

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

100

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

100

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

<Not Applicable>

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

100

Target year

2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

70

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

86222.4

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

119854

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

3073

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

<Not Applicable>

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

122927

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

81.7558513134141

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this a science-based target?

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

Target ambition

1.5°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We have 100% coverage and no exclusions, because we have an efficient reporting system in place and manage to cover all of our direct operations.

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

The Science-based target was developed based on IPCC AR5 RCP2.6. The target is going to be achieved through phasing out fossil fuels for stationary combustion (burning oil and heavy fuel oil) as well as purchase of guarantees of origin for the total electricity consumption in Orkla Group. Through these activities we were able to achieve 63% reductions compared to the base year.

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

<Not Applicable>

Target reference number

Abs 3

Year target was set

2021

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 3

Scope 2 accounting method

<Not Applicable>

Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services

Base year

2014

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

3669075

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

3669075

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

100

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

100

Target year

2025

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

30

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

2568352.5

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

2753757

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

2753757

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

83.1561088285194

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this a science-based target?

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

Target ambition

1.5°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We have 100% coverage and no exclusions, because we have an efficient reporting system in place and manage to cover all of our direct operations.

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

In order to achieve 30% reduction by 2030, we have implemented a climate change mitigation strategy throughout the whole company. The most of our impacts is generated from raw materials, therefore we are closely collaborating with our suppliers and focusing on production of plant-based food. In addition, we are continuously working to minimize the impact from our packaging throughout the whole life cycle. Our efforts helped to reduce Scope 3 emissions by 9% from 2014.

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

<Not Applicable>

Target reference number

Abs 4

Year target was set

2017

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 3

Scope 2 accounting method

<Not Applicable>

Scope 3 category(ies)

Category 1: Purchased goods and services

Base year

2014

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

3669075

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

3669075

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

100

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

100

Target year

2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

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

1834537.5

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

2753757

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

2753757

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

49.8936652971117

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this a science-based target?

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

Target ambition

1.5°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We are covering 100% of our Scope 3 emissions and do not exclude any of the categories.

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

In order to achieve 30% reduction by 2030, we have implemented a climate change mitigation strategy throughout the whole company. The most of our impacts is generated from raw materials, therefore we are closely collaborating with our suppliers and focusing on production of plant-based food. In addition, we are continuously working to minimize the impact from our packaging throughout the whole life cycle. Our efforts helped to reduce Scope 3 emissions by 9% from 2014.

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

<Not Applicable>

C4.2

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

Net-zero target(s)

C4.2c

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

Target reference number

NZ1

Target coverage

Company-wide

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

Abs1

Abs2

Abs3

Abs4

Target year for achieving net zero

2045

Is this a science-based target?

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

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We are covering 100% of our Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions, including bioenergy

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

Yes

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

Planned activities to reach the net-zero target includes energy reduction efforts, purchases of guarantees of origin, and the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy.

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

C4.3

(C4.3) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Yes

C4.3a

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	22	
To be implemented*	23	10000
Implementation commenced*	4	1600
Implemented*	80	36852
Not to be implemented		

C4.3b

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

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings	Lighting
--------------------------------	----------

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

250

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

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

2500

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

650000

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

6-10 years

Comment

Lighting has been replaced with LED at several sites

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes	Waste heat recovery
---	---------------------

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

3500

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

Scope 1

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

7000000

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

23000000

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

Installation of heat pump.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)
--------------------------------	--

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

600

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

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

600000

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

2000000

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

Improvement of cooling technology at sites.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption	Large hydropower (>25 MW)
-------------------------------	---------------------------

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

32502

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

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

0

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

165000

Payback period

No payback

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

1-2 years

Comment

Emission reduction due to purchase of guarantees of origin for the consumption of the additional amount of electricity (9,591 MWh) in 2021 compared with 2020 in Orkla's locations in Europe, China, Malaysia and India.

C4.3c

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

Method	Comment
Employee engagement	Orkla has implemented resource and efficiency program where employee engagement in sustainability work is a part of it. We encourage all employees through different internal initiatives to contribute to Orkla sustainability work and help achieving common goals in these terms.
Internal incentives/recognition programs	Orkla recognizes and prizes any contribution to sustainability work both monetary and non-monetary. We believe that appreciation of the hard work of each part involved in achieving sustainability goals will pay off and stimulate even better performance in the future.
Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards	Orkla committed to phase out heavy oil that is a part of implemented resource and efficiency program. This will allow to be compliant with stringent requirements and drive low carbon business .
Financial optimization calculations	Before making decision of any investment Orkla assesses how it will impact the financial planning towards what climate-related benefits it will bring. The investments with the highest environmental benefits and lowest financial contribution required minimizing the payback time are prioritized.

C4.5

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

Yes

C4.5a

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

Level of aggregation

Product or service

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

Low-Carbon Investment (LCI) Registry Taxonomy

Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other	Other, please specify (Vegetarian food and hydropower)
-------	--

Description of product(s) or service(s)

Orkla is involved in a variety of research and innovation projects with the purpose of developing low-carbon or otherwise sustainable products and circular business models. So far, the biggest contributions to revenues come from vegetarian food and products with low-carbon packaging.

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

No

Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Functional unit used

<Not Applicable>

Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

<Not Applicable>

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

32

C5. Emissions methodology

C5.1

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

No

C5.1a

(C5.1a) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

Row 1

Has there been a structural change?

No

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

<Not Applicable>

Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

<Not Applicable>

C5.1b

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?	Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s)
Row 1	No	<Not Applicable>

(C5.2) Provide your base year and base year emissions.**Scope 1****Base year start**

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

134879

Comment

Note: The base year emission has been updated to most recent data.

Scope 2 (location-based)**Base year start**

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

93730

Comment

Note: The base year emission has been updated to most recent data.

Scope 2 (market-based)**Base year start**

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

152528

Comment

Note: The base year emission has been updated to most recent data.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services**Base year start**

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3669075

Comment**Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods****Base year start**

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

140545

Comment**Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)****Base year start**

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26088

Comment

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24207

Comment

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10703

Comment

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8046

Comment

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11069

Comment

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

30572

Comment

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13

Comment

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

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

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

189199

Comment

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

204378

Comment

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

Base year start

January 1 2014

Base year end

December 31 2014

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

34115

Comment

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

C5.3

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

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

C6. Emissions data

C6.1

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

Reporting year

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

119854

Start date

<Not Applicable>

End date

<Not Applicable>

Comment

C6.2

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

Row 1

Scope 2, location-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

Scope 2, market-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

Comment

C6.3

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

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based

60820

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)

3073

Start date

<Not Applicable>

End date

<Not Applicable>

Comment

C6.4

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

No

C6.5

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

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

2753757

Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

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

100

Please explain

The emission data is calculated based on production input of raw materials and "cradle-to-gate" LCA emission factors which again are developed according to ISO 14040-series for different food ingredients and packaging materials made by Swedish Institute for Food and Bio Technology AB, Gothenburg. The number includes emissions associated with withdrawal and treatment of water. Factors used are: 0.149 kg CO2e per m3 for water withdrawal and 0.272 kg CO2e per m3 for water treatment (DEFRA 2021). The GWP values used to calculate the emissions are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year). Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard.

Capital goods

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO₂e)

129434

Emissions calculation methodology

Spend-based method

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

100

Please explain

The figure is based on the financial accounting and purchased capital goods, such as machinery and buildings. The CO₂ factor was calculated for each type of capital goods and connected to the spend. We used factors of 0,17 kg CO₂/nok for the machinery and 0,0124 kg CO₂/nok for the construction, based on the conducted LCA.

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

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO₂e)

22479

Emissions calculation methodology

Fuel-based method

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

100

Please explain

These are upstream scope 3 emissions from the reported fuel consumption emissions in scope 1 and electricity consumption in scope 2. The data source is identical to the data sources in scope 1 and 2 and the source for the emissions factors is The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, DEFRA 2021. For diesel: 0.6261 kg CO₂e per litre, for petrol: 0,6028 kg CO₂e per liter, for burning oil: 0,5281 kgCO₂e per liter, for LPG: 0,1838 kgCO₂e per liter, for natural gas: 0,3459 kgCO₂e per m³. For electricity, the source of emission factor is IEA 2014-2016. As long as electricity consumption from Norwegian locations constitutes over 80% of the total electricity consumption in Orkla Group the same emission factor: Electricity nordic grid loss (0.0015 kgCO₂e/kWh) was used to calculate upstream emission from the total electricity consumption. The GWP values used to calculate the emissions are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year). Data quality is identical to what is reported in scope 1 and 2. Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO₂e)

22293

Emissions calculation methodology

Supplier-specific method

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

100

Please explain

Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. The emission data comes from the 3rd party companies providing transportation services to Orkla.

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO₂e)

9224

Emissions calculation methodology

Waste-type-specific method

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

100

Please explain

The activity data is provided by the waste management supplier. In order to reflect the new LCA standard (EN15804) the emission factors shows the total climate impact of waste treatment without including avoided emissions in other systems (next cycle). This means that the energy recovery from the incineration of waste for the production of district heating is not deducted from the emission factor of waste for incineration. Recycled waste fractions includes only a small transport component (collection of waste) while the material recycling and replacement of virgin materials takes place outside the system (by the actor who buy the recycled material). The emission factor is 0.502 kg CO₂ per kg incinerated waste and 0.0213 for recycled waste. The source of emission factors is Ecoinvent 3.8 and DEFRA 2021. The GWP values used to calculate the emissions are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year). Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard.

Business travel

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1142

Emissions calculation methodology

Distance-based method

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

100

Please explain

The data is provided by internal system. The emission factors used come from DEFRA 2021. The GWP values used to calculate the emissions are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year). Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard.

Employee commuting

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

10340

Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

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

100

Please explain

We used average data method by applying the CO2 factors from Trafikverket to number of Orkla employees and European commuting patterns. The following CO2 factors were used 0,13 kg CO2 eq/pkm – car, 0,05 kg CO2 eq/pkm – bus, 0, 0016 kg CO2 eq/pkm and 0,0017 kg CO2 eq/pkm- train.

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Please explain

Any emissions from relevant upstream leased asset are already reported in Scope 1, the emissions are therefore 0.

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

28584

Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

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

100

Please explain

Average data method was used as per GHGP. Transportation distance was estimated to be 300 km to the warehouse and 30 km distribution, based on location of the sites. The following CO2 factors from Trafikverket were used 0,2 kg CO2 eq/tkm for distribution lorry and 0,06 2 kg CO2 eq/tkm for long distance transportation.

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

13

Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

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

100

Please explain

Orkla ASA produces almost only consumer's goods with no further processes involved . We took into account Orkla Food Ingredients as the only company that sells B to B. Generally main sold product is improver for bread. Therefore, the calculation was based on carbon footprint of bread (22 g CO2 eq/kg) and internal analysis of contribution of improver to carbon footprint of baking products (20%).

Use of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Please explain

Orkla ASA is mainly into food production and only a small share of the products needs further preparation before consumption. As a food producer this category is optional for Orkla.

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

172242

Emissions calculation methodology

Waste-type-specific method

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

100

Please explain

To obtain the figure we used waste type specific method and took into account all the waste that is generated at the end of life stage of Orkla's products and the specific treatment method applied to this type of waste. The emission factor is on average 0.502 kg CO2 per kg incinerated waste and 2 kg CO2 for recycling of waste, depending on the type of waste. The source of emission factors is Ecoinvent 3.8 and DEFRA 2021. The GWP values used to calculate the emissions are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year). Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard.

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Please explain

Orkla does not have any downstream leased assets.

Franchises

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

188221

Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

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

100

Please explain

The average data method was used. We used the emission data from similar type of franchises and applied it to the Koti and New York pizza, that Orkla owns. The CO2 factor per one pizza place was considered to be 575,6 t CO2 eq.

Investments

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

19600

Emissions calculation methodology

Investment-specific method

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

100

Please explain

Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. The GHG emission was calculated based on % ownership of Jotun AS - 42.6% and the total GHG emission provided by the company. The GWP values used for calculation of Jotun AS GHG emission are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year).

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Please explain

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Please explain

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

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

No

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

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

Agricultural commodities

Cattle products

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

Company-wide GHG emission calculation

Agricultural commodities

Wheat

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

Company-wide GHG emission calculation

Agricultural commodities

Sugar

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

Company-wide GHG emission calculation

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

(C-AC6.9a/C-FB6.9a/C-PF6.9a) Report your greenhouse gas emissions figure(s) for your disclosing commodity(ies), explain your methodology, and include any exclusions.

Cattle products

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

253000

Denominator: unit of production

<Not Applicable>

Change from last reporting year

Lower

Please explain

Cattle absolute emissions are calculated by multiplying consumption (from Orkla ERP systems) by emission factors. The emission factors are developed for Orkla product category groups based on official sources and verified by RICE research institute of Sweden. The GHG emission for cattle products is based on LCA performed for each product that belongs to this group: beef, milk, milk powder, cream, cheese and butter. The total GHG emission from cattle products has decreased in comparison with 2019.

Sugar

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54000

Denominator: unit of production

<Not Applicable>

Change from last reporting year

Higher

Please explain

Sugar absolute emissions are calculated by multiplying consumption (from Orkla ERP systems) by emission factors. The emission factors are developed for Orkla product category groups based on official sources and verified by RICE research institute of Sweden. The total GHG emission from sugar products has slightly increased compared to 2019.

Wheat

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

43000

Denominator: unit of production

<Not Applicable>

Change from last reporting year

Much lower

Please explain

Wheat absolute emissions are calculated by multiplying consumption (from Orkla ERP systems) by emission factors. The emission factors are developed for Orkla product category groups based on official sources and verified by RICE research institute of Sweden. The total GHG emission from wheat have slightly increased in comparison with 2019.

C6.10

(C6.10) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Intensity figure

0.0000035

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

180673

Metric denominator

unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total

50441000000

Scope 2 figure used

Location-based

% change from previous year

12.5

Direction of change

Decreased

Reason for change

There has been observed 0.16% decrease in Scope 1 and 2 location-based GHG emissions in comparison with previous years caused among others by GHG reduction initiatives including those reported in answer to question C4.3b, such as improved energy efficiency in buildings by changing to LED lights. Besides there has been observed increase in revenue by 7.01%. All in all, the value of the current KPI has been reduced by 12.5% compared to 2020.

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

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

Yes

C7.1a

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

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
CO2	119853	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
CH4	302	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
N2O	393	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
HFCs	2367	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

C7.2

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Sweden	42290
Denmark	11051
Germany	870
Estonia	3598
Netherlands	1187
Poland	2080
Austria	3455
China	46
Spain	379
India	585
Norway	12042
Finland	6501
Russian Federation	43
Lithuania	572
Latvia	7930
Malaysia	14
Iceland	406
Portugal	299
Romania	2687
Slovakia	994
Czechia	21050
Hungary	69
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1704

C7.3

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

By business division

C7.3a

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

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Orkla Care	1927
Orkla Confectionary & Snacks	28532
Orkla Food Ingredients	17653
Orkla Foods	71151
Orkla Corp.	0
Orkla Consumer & Financial Investments	590

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

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

Partially

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

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

Activity

Processing/Manufacturing

Emissions category

<Not Applicable>

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

119854

Methodology

Default emissions factor

Please explain

The GWP values used to calculate the emissions are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year). Allocation is based on the principle of operational control in the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. The emission factors used for calculations are the same as disclosed in answer to question C8.2c. The data input is real data gathered from all business units. No exclusions made.

C7.5

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

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Sweden	8985	1445
Denmark	1647	393
Germany	283	
Estonia	8282	31
Netherlands	1656	20
Poland	2087	
Austria	433	
China	2048	
Spain	197	
India	7547	
Norway	3974	74
Finland	1729	1110
Russian Federation	795	
Lithuania	75	
Latvia	1707	
Malaysia	3955	
Iceland		
Portugal	171	
Romania	1826	
Slovakia	432	
Czechia	12310	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	671	
Hungary	8	

C7.6

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

By business division

C7.6a

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

Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Orkla Care	6200	551
Orkla Confectionary and Snacks	11509	1381
Orkla Food Ingredients	9246	524
Orkla Foods	31240	529
Orkla Corp.	78	16
Orkla Consumer & Financial Investments	2547	72

C7.9

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

Decreased

C7.9a

(C7.9a) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

	Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
Change in renewable energy consumption	5669	Decreased	3.13	There was a Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission reduction in amount of 5669 tCO2e due to purchase of guarantees of origin for additional electricity consumption in Orkla European locations. The emission value percentage was calculated as following: $(5670 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e} / 180,965 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}) * 100 = 3\%$ where: 5669tCO2e - GHG emission reduction due to above described reasons 180,965 tCO2e - Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission in 2020
Other emissions reduction activities	36853	Decreased	18.43	There was a Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission reduction in amount of 36.853 tCO2e due to different GHG emission reduction initiatives described in answer to question C4.3b. The emission value percentage was calculated as following: $(36,853 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e} / 180,965 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}) * 100 = 20\%$ where: 8,620tCO2 - GHG emission reduction due to above described reasons 180,966 tCO2e - Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission in 2020.
Divestment	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no divestments.
Acquisitions	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no acquisitions.
Mergers	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no mergers.
Change in output	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no change in output.
Change in methodology	8026	Decreased	4.44	There was a decrease in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission in amount of 8026 tCO2e due to update of emission factor values used for calculations. The emission value percentage was calculated as following: $(8026 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e} / 180,965 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}) * 100 = 4.44 \%$ where: 8026 tCO2e - GHG emission reduction due to above described reason 180,674 tCO2e - Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission in 2020.
Change in boundary	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no change in boundaries.
Change in physical operating conditions	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no change in physical operation conditions.
Unidentified	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no change in unidentified reasons.
Other	0	No change	0	No change in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission due to no change due to other reasons.

C7.9b

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

Market-based

C8. Energy

C8.1

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

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

C8.2

(C8.2) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Yes

C8.2a

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

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	HHV (higher heating value)	35006	582033	617039
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	469964	0	469964
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	18139	35559	53697
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>	359	<Not Applicable>	359
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	523468	617592	1141059

C8.2b

(C8.2b) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	No

C8.2c

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

Sustainable biomass

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
35006

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

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

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

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

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment
Wood pellets, biofuels and biogas

Other biomass

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

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

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

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

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

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

Heating value

Please select

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

<Not Applicable>

Comment

Coal

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

<Not Applicable>

Comment

Oil

Heating value

HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

30848

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

<Not Applicable>

Comment

Burning oil, heavy fuel oil

Gas

Heating value

HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

506673

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

<Not Applicable>

Comment

Natural gas, LPG and CNG

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

Heating value

HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

44512

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

<Not Applicable>

Comment

Petrol and diesel

Total fuel

Heating value

HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

617039

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

<Not Applicable>

Comment

C8.2d

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

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	359	359	359	359
Heat				
Steam				
Cooling				

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Norway

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

125810

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Solar

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

India

Tracking instrument used

Please select

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

297

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

India

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

Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Solar

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Norway

Tracking instrument used

Please select

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

62

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Austria

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3159

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

China

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3267

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Czechia

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

27789

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Denmark

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

40449

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Estonia

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

12242

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Finland

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

17255

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Germany

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

818

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Hungary

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Iceland

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

5988

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

India

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

10395

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3197

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Latvia

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

10875

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Lithuania

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1159

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Please select

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Malaysia

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

5947

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Netherlands

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

4433

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Poland

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3125

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Portugal

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

721

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Romania

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

5294

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Russian Federation

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2121

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Slovakia

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3109

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Spain

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

989

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates (EACs) purchase

Energy carrier

Electricity

Low-carbon technology type

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Sweden

Tracking instrument used

GO

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

181789

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Norway

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

Comment

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

Austria

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

3159

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

China

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

3267

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Czechia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

27789

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Denmark

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

40448

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

38511

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

78959

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Estonia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

12242

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

631

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

12873

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Finland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

17255

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

10095

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

27350

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Germany

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

818

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Hungary

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

35

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Iceland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

5988

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

India

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

10395

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Ireland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

1

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Latvia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

10874

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Lithuania

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

1159

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Malaysia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

5947

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Netherlands

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

4433

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Norway

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

125810

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

6806

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

132616

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Poland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

3125

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Portugal

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

721

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]**

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Romania

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

5294

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Russian Federation

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

2121

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Slovakia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

3109

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Spain

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

989

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

Sweden

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

181789

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

26552

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

208341

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

Country/area

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

3196

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

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

<Calculated field>

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

<Not Applicable>

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

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

C10. Verification

C10.1

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

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

C10.1a

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

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

EY_Assurance_CDP_letter_2022.pdf

Page/ section reference

1

Relevant standard

ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.1b

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

Scope 2 approach

Scope 2 location-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

EY_Assurance_CDP_letter_2022.pdf

Page/ section reference

1

Relevant standard

ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Scope 2 approach

Scope 2 market-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

EY_Assurance_CDP_letter_2022.pdf

Page/ section reference

1

Relevant standard

ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.1c

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

Scope 3 category

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

EY_Assurance_CDP_letter_2022.pdf

Page/section reference

1

Relevant standard

ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

66

C10.2

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

Yes

C10.2a

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

Disclosure module verification relates to	Data verified	Verification standard	Please explain
C6. Emissions data	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1)	ISAE 3000 (Revised), Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information	Verification of year on year change in Scope 1 GHG emission is company wide and performed annually. As long as we use ISAE 3000 standard for verification of emissions in all scopes. the same standard was chosen in this case.
C6. Emissions data	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 2)	ISAE 3000 (Revised), Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information	Verification of year on year change in Scope 2 GHG emission is company wide and performed annually. As long as we use ISAE 3000 standard for verification of emissions in all scopes. the same standard was chosen in this case.
C6. Emissions data	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 3)	ISAE 3000 (Revised), Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information	Verification of year on year change in Scope 3 GHG emission is company wide and performed annually. As long as we use ISAE 3000 standard for verification of emissions in all scopes. the same standard was chosen in this case.

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

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

Yes

C11.1a

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

EU ETS

C11.1b

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

EU ETS

% of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

15

% of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

Period start date

January 1 2021

Period end date

December 31 2021

Allowances allocated

0

Allowances purchased

3180

Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO₂e

3180

Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO₂e

0

Details of ownership

Facilities we own and operate

Comment

C11.1d

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

In Orkla only one boiler house, in Eslov, Sweden, is at the size to be part of EU ETS scheme. The strategy for complying with EU ETS is to have a constant focus on energy efficiency measures, which will directly reduce the relevant emissions. As part of Orkla's focus on energy efficiency, our goal is to achieve a 20% reduction in energy consumption for the 2014–2020 period and a 30% reduction up to 2025. To transfer best practices for improving energy efficiency, Orkla prepared a central energy initiative in 2015 as part of its Improved Resource and Energy Efficiency programme. As a result of the programme, a growing number of efficiency improvement projects are being implemented in all the business areas. Adjusted for acquisitions and increased turnover, energy consumption has been reduced by 19% since 2014.

C11.2

(C11.2) Has your organization originated or purchased any project-based carbon credits within the reporting period?

No

C11.3

(C11.3) Does your organization use an internal price on carbon?

No, and we do not currently anticipate doing so in the next two years

C12. Engagement

C12.1

(C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?

Yes, our suppliers

Yes, our customers/clients

Yes, other partners in the value chain

C12.1a

(C12.1a) Provide details of your climate-related supplier engagement strategy.

Type of engagement

Information collection (understanding supplier behavior)

Details of engagement

Collect climate change and carbon information at least annually from suppliers

Other, please specify (Including climate change in supplier selection/management mechanism through our Supplier Code of Conduct)

% of suppliers by number

90

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

90

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

90

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

At Orkla we work closely with our suppliers all over the world to promote a sustainable value chain for food and grocery products. Regardless of the country concerned, we require that they all comply with the Orkla Supplier Code of Conduct, which defines what we consider to be necessary for the proper conduct of business. Close monitoring of suppliers plays a crucial role in ensuring compliance with our strict guidelines. Orkla's branded consumer goods companies have more than 25,000 direct suppliers. This multitude of suppliers makes it important to give priority to monitoring those considered to be most at-risk of failing to comply with our code of conduct. To identify these suppliers, Orkla carry out systematic risk assessments, in which certain countries, production methods and product categories are given a special risk weighting. Orkla subjects all its main direct suppliers to a bi-annual risk screening using a proprietary tool based on criteria relating to working conditions, the environment and anticorruption. Approx. 4500 suppliers are considered critical Tier 1 suppliers, standing for 90% of the total purchasing spend, which is the suppliers included in our engagement. Risky suppliers are assessed in greater detail based on a standardised method developed by the organisation Sedex. Orkla attaches importance to maintaining a good dialogue with its suppliers in order to promote good practices and continuous improvement. A large part of the Orkla companies' purchases come from local suppliers located in the company's home country. The Nordic region and the Baltics are the primary markets for Orkla's branded consumer goods. 60% of Orkla's overall sourcing comes from local suppliers. The inherent risk of breaches of workers' and human rights, as well as environmental issues, are assessed as higher in connection with purchasing from suppliers in Asia and in certain complex supplier chains for products such as cocoa, palm oil and fish. Climate-related issues are also part of certifications schemes that Orkla has implemented, cocoa (Rainforest Alliance), palm oil (RSPO), fish products (MSC), packaging (FSC), cotton (GOTS), where Orkla has clear policies and goals for the implementation.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

All suppliers receive the Orkla Supplier Code of Conduct which outlines our expectation on our suppliers. They are required to sign and return the document in which it is stated that environmental impact is considered throughout the value chain. The signing of the Code of Conduct is documented and followed up through internal databases and that's how we measure our success in these terms. We systematically assess all new suppliers as part of a pre- screening process. All existing critical suppliers based on spend are assessed every other year through a desktop assessment including dimensions such as corruption, climate risk and inherent category risk. We ask our high and medium risk suppliers to become Sedex members. Sedex is a global organization to drive improvement for sustainable business practices in global supply chain. Energy consumption is a part of the SAQ (self-assessment questionnaire) that the suppliers are filling out. Selected suppliers are assessed through SMETA 4-pillar audits. In our monitoring of direct suppliers, we primarily identify minor discrepancies, which the suppliers are required to remedy. Measure of success here is share of non-compliances closed. For non-tier 1 suppliers we have a category-based risk assessment process and follow up through our tier 1 suppliers and various type of improvement activities such as certification or supplier led improvement projects. Orkla are members of SAI Platform and aims to use certification standards on minimum SAI Silver level, as an example RSPO is on Gold level. Our certification standards set out important requirements on our supply chains in terms of environmental demands and help farmers improve by various capability building efforts. The percentage of Orkla's raw materials that are certified increased in 2020. An example is that 87% of all cocoa now is Rainforest Alliance certified. Example: close cooperation with local farms that grow potatoes, cucumbers, beets and other vegetables to document the environmental impact of the production and also meeting customers demand for food products based on local raw materials. In India, MTR Foods has worked actively for several years to promote production of clean milk and improve conditions for impoverished dairy farmers.

Comment

Orkla engages currently with around 4500 suppliers on climate-related issues.

C12.1b

(C12.1b) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with your customers.

Type of engagement & Details of engagement

Education/information sharing	Run an engagement campaign to educate customers about the climate change impacts of (using) your products, goods, and/or services
-------------------------------	---

% of customers by number

100

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

Please explain the rationale for selecting this group of customers and scope of engagement

As a leading supplier of branded goods, Orkla wants to contribute to sustainable development by offering products and solutions that promote a healthy, sustainable lifestyle. This includes targeted efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, develop packaging solutions that increase recycling and contribute to sustainable agriculture, fisheries and other raw material production. In addition, the companies in the Group actively engage in innovation activities to develop food products with a favourable nutrition profile, increase consumption of plant-based food and use recycled materials and raw materials from renewable sources. The driver behind this work is due to the enhanced demand from our customers on more transparent information about sustainability and the risk of damaging our reputation by not meeting consumer demands. This could lead to a reduction in revenues if we see a decrease in the demand of our products. Our engagement strategy has therefore been to help customers in choosing products with low carbon impact and provide the necessary information for them to make informed choices. We have several ongoing engagement campaigns related to sustainable products and consumption in all of our geographical locations and across business areas. In addition, the Orkla companies have launched a number of products with new packaging solutions that help to increase recycling of packaging waste, products with a smaller climate footprint and healthier food products, snacks and bakery goods. For example, we have developed a climate impact labelling of food on several of our products. The label is based on a climate impact scale developed in cooperation with RISE Research Institutes of Sweden. Products are ranked according to whether they have a high, medium, low, or very low climate impact and is clearly marked on the product package. The scope of engagement is set at 100% of our customers because we provide information about our sustainable products through our annual sustainability reporting, which is publicly available, on our website and on the packaging of our products. This information is therefore readily available for all of our customers in all geographical locations.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

The impact and success of the engagement strategy is measured by share of revenue deriving from plant-based food and products which have a smaller climate impact through packaging solutions. We are clearly seeing an impact of our engagement strategy towards our customers through enhanced demand for sustainable products and heightened awareness amongst our customers. Climate-smart labelling is one of our engagement strategies towards customers. It was launched in 2021 and has over the past years been put to use on several of Orklas brands, such as TORO, Grandiosa, Bare Bra and NATURLI. The numbers show that, for example, in 2021, 16% of our revenue derived from products that are defined by Orkla as 'Most sustainable' according to a set of internally defined criteria, compared to 15% in 2020. One of the internally defined criteria include climate-smart packaging. Plant-based food produced by Orkla generated a total turnover of MNOK 1 407 in 2021, an increase of 23% from 2020.

C12.1d

(C12.1d) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with other partners in the value chain.

We collaborate with certification organisations and key suppliers on preventing tropical deforestation, incl. collaboration with the RSPO, UTZ and Proterra and FSC. This is based on a Group-wide no deforestation policy with time-bound commitments. We prioritize engagement in the supply chains which are considered high-risk. The risk assessment is based on externally available reports and internal competence. In the case of raw materials from tropical regions, Orkla works closely with selected suppliers who implement their own programmes for ensuring deforestation-free raw material production.

We collaborate with other consumer goods companies, retailers and experts to improve business practices linked to climate management, sustainable sourcing and other challenges. Palm oil is an important raw material, also for companies that manufacture cleaning and personal hygiene products. In 2020, Orkla Home & Personal Care joined the Action for Sustainable Derivatives (ASD), an industry initiative targeting suppliers and producers that use derivatives rather than pure palm oil. ASD works to make it possible to trace palm oil all the way back to plantations, to be able to identify environmental and/or social challenges and contribute to improvements at local level.

Orkla uses several types of plant-based protein and constantly seeks interesting new alternatives that are better for the environment and health. Orkla participates in a research project run by Lund University to learn more about rapeseed as an alternative to soya as a source of protein. The aim is to obtain a high-quality ingredient from rapeseed with good techno-functional properties.

C12.2

(C12.2) Do your suppliers have to meet climate-related requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?

No, but we plan to introduce climate-related requirements within the next two years

C-AC12.2/C-FB12.2/C-PF12.2

(C-AC12.2/C-FB12.2/C-PF12.2) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Yes

C-AC12.2a/C-FB12.2a/C-PF12.2a

(C-AC12.2a/C-FB12.2a/C-PF12.2a) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Management practice reference number

MP1

Management practice

Fertilizer management

Description of management practice

Orkla's main suppliers are followed up through an audit program and specific cooperation programs. Several management practices are introduced through these contacts. One example is a cooperation between Orkla Foods Sweden and local farmers producing cucumbers. The farmers are IP-certified and minimize their use of chemical fertilizers.

Your role in the implementation

Knowledge sharing

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

The implementation of described management practice is encouraged by regular meetings, dialogue and audits.

Climate change related benefit

Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

Comment

C-AC12.2b/C-FB12.2b/C-PF12.2b

(C-AC12.2b/C-FB12.2b/C-PF12.2b) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Yes

C12.3

(C12.3) Does your organization engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate?

Row 1

Direct or indirect engagement that could influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Yes, we engage indirectly through trade associations

Does your organization have a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

No, but we plan to have one in the next two years

Attach commitment or position statement(s)

<Not Applicable>

Describe the process(es) your organization has in place to ensure that your engagement activities are consistent with your overall climate change strategy

Our engagement activities with policymakers are linked to reduction of food waste for example. In order to ensure that it is in line with our climate strategy we are internally evaluating every engagement initiative. In this case waste reduction was in line with our target on waste reduction and overall climate strategy.

Primary reason for not engaging in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

<Not Applicable>

Explain why your organization does not engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

<Not Applicable>

C12.3b

(C12.3b) Provide details of the trade associations your organization engages with which are likely to take a position on any policy, law or regulation that may impact the climate.

Trade association

Other, please specify (NHO Mat og Drikke (Norwegian Food and Drink Federation))

Is your organization's position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Has your organization influenced, or is your organization attempting to influence their position?

We publicly promote their current position

State the trade association's position on climate change, explain where your organization's position differs, and how you are attempting to influence their position (if applicable)

NHO is an active partner for the Norwegian government in engaging business in efforts towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and has a particular focus on business opportunities linked to renewable energy and technology development. Orkla supports the sustainable development goals and have support the positive initiatives from the trade associations. Among others Orkla has taken a leading role in the work on zero deforestation in Norway and Sweden.

Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year, if applicable (currency as selected in C0.4) (optional)

Describe the aim of your organization's funding

<Not Applicable>

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

Trade association

Other, please specify (Cereal Europe)

Is your organization's position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Has your organization influenced, or is your organization attempting to influence their position?

We publicly promote their current position

State the trade association's position on climate change, explain where your organization's position differs, and how you are attempting to influence their position (if applicable)

Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year, if applicable (currency as selected in C0.4) (optional)

Describe the aim of your organization's funding

<Not Applicable>

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

Trade association

Other, please specify (Swedish Food Federation)

Is your organization's position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Has your organization influenced, or is your organization attempting to influence their position?

We publicly promote their current position

State the trade association's position on climate change, explain where your organization's position differs, and how you are attempting to influence their position (if applicable)

Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year, if applicable (currency as selected in C0.4) (optional)

Describe the aim of your organization's funding

<Not Applicable>

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

C12.4

(C12.4) Have you published information about your organization's response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).

Publication

In mainstream reports

Status

Complete

Attach the document

Orkla-Arsrapport-2021.pdf

Page/Section reference

P. 111-131

Content elements

Emissions figures

Emission targets

Other metrics

Comment

Publication

In mainstream reports, incorporating the TCFD recommendations

Status

Complete

Attach the document

Orkla-TCFD-Report-2021.pdf

Page/Section reference

Whole report

Content elements

Governance

Strategy

Risks & opportunities

Emissions figures

Emission targets

Comment

C13. Other land management impacts

C-AC13.2/C-FB13.2/C-PF13.2

(C-AC13.2/C-FB13.2/C-PF13.2) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in C-AC12.2a/C-FB12.2a/C-PF12.2a that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Yes

C-AC13.2a/C-FB13.2a/C-PF13.2a

(C-AC13.2a/C-FB13.2a/C-PF13.2a) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Management practice reference number

MP1

Overall effect

Positive

Which of the following has been impacted?

Soil

Water

Description of impacts

Reduced soil and water pollution. We have just started cooperation with suppliers related to different management practices.

Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Yes

Description of the response(s)

The cooperation so far with few suppliers to start with we have a positive attitude to manage, mitigate, control or adapt to management practice.

C15. Biodiversity

C15.1

(C15.1) Is there board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues	Description of oversight and objectives relating to biodiversity	Scope of board-level oversight
Row 1	Yes, both board-level oversight and executive management-level responsibility	The Orkla Sustainability Strategy and EHS management (including biodiversity) are anchored at Orkla Group Executive Board and at the Board of Directors. Orkla's overall risk picture, including risks relating to biodiversity, is reviewed by the Group Executive Board and discussed by the Board of Directors, in addition to being reviewed by the Board's Audit Committee. Orkla's Board of Directors monitors the groups efforts by means of an annual assessment of progress in sustainability work, quarterly reviews of changes in key EHS indicators, and ongoing discussion of individual matters considered to be of material importance to Orklas operations. This assessment includes a range of climate related topics, such as biodiversity. During 2021, Orkla conducted a risk assessment in accordance with TCFD, which included risks relating to biodiversity. Orkla also assessed the impact Orkla's activities and products have on our entire value chain, including biodiversity. This was presented to, and, approved by the Executive Management. The production of food raw materials can give rise to a risk of biodiversity loss, and is therefore of great importance to Orkla. Climate change, including biodiversity, is interated into the company's strategy and company-wide management process. Therefore, the positions with the highest responsibilities are the CEO of Orkla, and the CEO, Sustainability Director and COO of the business areas who have the overall overview of all strategic areas in the company.	<Not Applicable>

C15.2

(C15.2) Has your organization made a public commitment and/or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity?

	Indicate whether your organization made a public commitment or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity	Biodiversity-related public commitments	Initiatives endorsed
Row 1	Yes, we have made public commitments and publicly endorsed initiatives related to biodiversity	Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species	SDG Other, please specify (SAI Platform Framework, SBTN Corporate Engagement Program)

C15.3

(C15.3) Does your organization assess the impact of its value chain on biodiversity?

	Does your organization assess the impact of its value chain on biodiversity?	Portfolio
Row 1	Yes, we assess impacts on biodiversity in both our upstream and downstream value chain	<Not Applicable>

C15.4

(C15.4) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Have you taken any actions in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	Type of action taken to progress biodiversity-related commitments
Row 1	Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments	Land/water protection Land/water management Species management Education & awareness Law & policy Livelihood, economic & other incentives

C15.5

(C15.5) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
Row 1	No, we do not use indicators, but plan to within the next two years	Please select

C15.6

(C15.6) Have you published information about your organization's response to biodiversity-related issues for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).

Report type	Content elements	Attach the document and indicate where in the document the relevant biodiversity information is located
In voluntary sustainability report or other voluntary communications	Content of biodiversity-related policies or commitments Impacts on biodiversity Biodiversity strategy	P. 97, 112, 118, 124,142-147 Orkla-Arsrapport-2021.pdf
In voluntary sustainability report or other voluntary communications	Risks and opportunities	P. 16-17, 21 Orkla-TCFD-Report-2021.pdf

C16. Signoff

C-FI

(C-FI) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

C16.1

(C16.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	Chief Sustainability Officer	Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

SC. Supply chain module

SC0.0

(SC0.0) If you would like to do so, please provide a separate introduction to this module.

SC0.1

(SC0.1) What is your company's annual revenue for the stated reporting period?

	Annual Revenue
Row 1	50441000000

SC1.1

(SC1.1) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Requesting member
McDonald's Corporation

Scope of emissions
Scope 1

Allocation level
Company wide

Allocation level detail
<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e
253

Uncertainty (±%)
5

Major sources of emissions
Natural gas, propane and wood pellets combustion, as well as refrigerants leakage

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

230950018

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify (Revenue from sold products)

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

The brands purchased by Mc Donalds are produced in Fågelmara, Eslöv, Orchard Valley Foods Sweden, Frima Vafler Denmark and Orkla Wound Care in operations in Spain and Poland. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from the factories. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

McDonald's Corporation

Scope of emissions

Scope 2

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

36

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Electricity

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

230950018

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify (Revenue from sold products)

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

The brands purchased by Mc Donalds are produced in Fågelmara, Eslöv, Orchard Valley Foods Sweden, Frima Vafler Denmark and Orkla Wound Care with operations in Spain and Poland. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from the factories. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

S Group

Scope of emissions

Scope 1

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

3147

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Burning oil, propane, and wood pellets combustion, as well as refrigerants leakage

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

431957094

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify (Revenue from sold products)

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

The brands purchased by S Group are produced by Orkla Wound Care with operations in Spain, Orkla Health in Denmark, Orkla Food Ingredients factories in Sweden, Orkla Foods factories in Finland, as well as Orkla Confectionery & Snacks factories in Finland and Estonia. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from S Group. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

S Group

Scope of emissions

Scope 2

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

723

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Electricity

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

431957094

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify (Revenue from sold products)

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

The brands purchased by S Group are produced by Orkla Wound Care with operations in Spain, Orkla Food Ingredients factories in Sweden, , Orkla Foods factories in Estonia, as well as Orkla Confectionery & Snacks factories in Finland and Estonia. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from S Group. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

Kesko Corporation

Scope of emissions

Scope 1

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

2107

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Burning oil, propane, and wood pellets combustion, as well as refrigerants leakage

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

286713050

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify (Revenue from sold products)

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

The brands purchased by Kesko Corporation are produced in Orkla Confectionery & Snacks factories in Finland, Latvia and Estonia, Orkla Foods factory in Latvia, Orkla Food Ingredients factory in Sweden, as well as Orkla Wound Care factories in Poland and Spain and Orkla Health in Denmark. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from Kesko Corporation. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

Kesko Corporation

Scope of emissions

Scope 2

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

328

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Electricity

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

286713050

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify

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

The brands purchased by Kesko Corporation are produced in Orkla Confectionery & Snacks factories in Finland, Latvia and Estonia, Orkla Foods factory in Latvia, Orkla Food Ingredients factory in Sweden, as well as Orkla Wound Care factories in Poland and Spain and Orkla Health in Denmark. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from Kesko Corporation. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

Salling Group A/S

Scope of emissions

Scope 1

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

231.2

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Burning oil, propane, and wood pellets combustion, as well as refrigerants leakage

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

109282838

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify (Revenue from sold products)

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

The brands purchased by Salling Group A/S are produced in Orkla Food Ingredients factory in Denmark, factories in Orkla Foods Denmark and Easyfood, Orkla Health in Denmark, as well as Orkla Wound Care operation in Spain. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from Salling Group A/S. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

Salling Group A/S

Scope of emissions

Scope 2

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

65.2

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Electricity

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

109282838

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Other, please specify (Revenue from sold products)

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

The brands purchased by Salling Group A/S are produced in Orkla Food Ingredients factory in Denmark, factories in Orkla Foods Denmark and Easyfood, Orkla Health in Denmark, as well as Orkla Wound Care operation in Spain. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from Salling Group A/S. Therefore, it is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

AstraZeneca

Scope of emissions

Scope 1

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Burning oil, propane, and wood pellets combustion, as well as refrigerants leakage

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Please select

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

The brands purchased by AstraZeneca are produced by one Orkla Wound Care operations in Spain and Poland. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from AstraZeneca. The generated revenue from the sale of products to AstraZeneca is a percentage below 0, and the emissions are therefore 0. The allocation of emissions based on revenue is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

Requesting member

AstraZeneca

Scope of emissions

Scope 2

Allocation level

Company wide

Allocation level detail

<Not Applicable>

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

Uncertainty (±%)

5

Major sources of emissions

Electricity

Verified

Yes

Allocation method

Other, please specify (Based on revenue from sale of products)

Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Please select

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

The brands purchased by AstraZeneca are produced by one Orkla Wound Care operations in Spain and Poland. These factories are included in annual GHG emission accounting and hence, Orkla has an overview of the carbon footprint for their production. The allocation of emissions was based on revenue from AstraZeneca. The generated revenue from the sale of products to AstraZeneca is a percentage below 0, and the emissions are therefore 0. The allocation of emissions based on revenue is limited due to the fact the factories produce also other products with different market value. The market value of the products does not necessarily correspond to the carbon footprint.

SC1.2

(SC1.2) Where published information has been used in completing SC1.1, please provide a reference(s).

The Scope 1 and 2 GHG emission on a company level is presented in the Orkla Annual Report, 2021. However, it is not split per factory.

SC1.3

(SC1.3) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Allocation challenges	Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges
Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective	Limitation of products portfolio.

SC1.4

(SC1.4) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

Yes

SC1.4a

(SC1.4a) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities.

Orkla in cooperation with Swedish research institute has developed LCA tool to assess environmental impact of each product in its portfolio. That includes also carbon footprint. The tool will facilitate allocation of emissions to each customer in the future. Knowing the quantities of orders and the carbon footprint of the particular products we will be able to easily calculate associated total GHG emissions with high certainty.

SC2.1

(SC2.1) Please propose any mutually beneficial climate-related projects you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

SC2.2

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

No

SC4.1

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

No, I am not providing data

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

	I understand that my response will be shared with all requesting stakeholders	Response permission
Please select your submission options	Yes	Public

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms