Japan Tobacco Inc.

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

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

.

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ JPY

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

JT Group is a leading global tobacco company and our products are sold in over 130 markets. We are also active in pharmaceutical and processed food businesses, and we expect them to establish a foundation for future profit contribution, as we strive for sustainable growth. Headquartered in Tokyo, JT is listed on the Tokyo Stock Exchange and our company comprises three main business units: Tobacco business: headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland since 2022, manufactures and offers tobacco products all over the world. Our leading brands are Winston, Camel, MEVIUS and LD in combustibles, as well as Ploom and Logic in RRP (Reduced-Risk Products). Pharmaceutical business: Our pharmaceutical business focuses on the R&D, manufacturing, and sale of prescription drugs, concentrating on three specific therapeutic areas: Cardiovascular, Kidney and Skeletal Muscle; immunology; and neuroscience. Processed food business: Our processed food business handles the frozen and ambient food business, mainly for frozen noodles, frozen okonomiyaki (Japanese savoury pancakes), and packaged cooked rice, and the seasonings business, focusing on seasonings including yeast extracts.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/30/2023

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ 4 years

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

Select from:

☑ 4 years

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

Select from:

☑ 4 years

[Fixed row]

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

2841.1

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

JP3726800000

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Jordan
☑ Malawi
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Serbia
☑ Armenia
☑ Austria
☑ Belarus
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Lebanon
☑ Morocco
☑ Myanmar
☑ Nigeria
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Sudan
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Zambia
☑ Algeria
☑ Andorra
☑ Denmark
☑ Georgia
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Tunisia
☑ Ukraine
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Cambodia
☑ Ethiopia
☑ Viet Nam

☑ Mongolia
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Thailand
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Kyrgyzstan
☑ Tajikistan
☑ Netherlands
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Indonesia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Singapore
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Iran (Islamic Republic of)
☑ United Republic of Tanzania
☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No, this is confidential data	*Our tobacco business use geolocation data for water risk assessment. For business confidentiality reason data are not to be disclosed.*

[Fixed row]

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

Production

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

Select from:

☑ Value chain (excluding own land)

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

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

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

JT Group owns a small amount of land which is used for tobacco production. The quantity of tobacco grown on JT Group owned land is immaterial, both in absolute terms and in proportion to the amount that is sourced from directly contracted growers and third party suppliers. This production volume accounts for only about 0.1% of total tobacco volume. As a result, JT Group considers produced volume to be not applicable within this disclosure.

Processing/ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Distribution

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

Select from:

☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

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

Select from:

☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Manufacturing

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

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

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

746072.92

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

Select from:
☑ No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Hardwood logs
☑ Paper
☑ Primary packaging
☑ Secondary packaging
☑ Wood-based bioenergy

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:
☑ 71-80%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.22.19) Please explain

Timber is considered a significant commodity for JTI as 100% of our revenue is dependent on it, and it impacts both our tobacco curing and packaging processes. [Fixed row]

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

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

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

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

91.2% of JT Group's revenue is dependent on tobacco. The remainder of the revenue comes from pharmaceuticals (3.3%), processed foods (5.4%) and others (0.1%). Tobacco accounts for a significant proportion of revenue and accounts for the majority of emissions and so will be the only commodity presented in this

response.

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No
[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders relevant and included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Mapping is full coverage including upstream, own operations and downstream value chain stages. The first step entailed determining key value chain activities and key actors in the value chain, including own operations. Then, the impacts, gross risks and opportunities were identified along the value chain, including in JTI's own operations. The next stage included an assessment of materiality following a double materiality approach for each phase of the value chain for each individual topic. Finally, material information related to upstream, own operations and downstream value chain stages was disclosed in JTI's sustainability statements. Key activities mapped in the upstream supply chain include Tobacco leaf growing (for both our directly contracted growers and 3rd party leaf suppliers), Leaf processing, Transport and distribution to manufacturing centres, other raw material extraction and processing. Downstream activities mapped include Transport and distribution, Use of our sold products and End of use treatment of our sold products. The process of mapping our value chain is interlinked into our wider risk assessment processes, including our Water risk assessment, Climate scenario analysis and Biodiversity assessment. The double materiality process allows for a comprehensive assessment of risks throughout the value chain.
[Fixed row]

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

	Plastics mapping	Value chain stages covered in mapping
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Downstream value chain

[Fixed row]

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

Timber products

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:
☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:
☑ 100%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

Consistent with the business' 3-year annual planning cycle.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

4

(2.1.3) To (years)

11

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

Consistent with the JT Group Sustainability Targets; the plan currently in place is from 2019 to 2030.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

12

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

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

We have longer term commitments which are aligned with climate change scenarios up to 2050 and with the Paris Agreement.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☑ Life Cycle Assessment

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Other, please specify **:**Regional Climate Model World Resources Institute regional climate model IBTrACS World Bank

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Cold wave/frost

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

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

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

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

☑ Heat stress
☑ Sea level rise
☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

Technology

☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The JTG process for identifying climate-related risks and opportunities in our direct operations is embodied in the Group's cross-functional Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process. We identify risks and dependencies that could have impacts on the business based on internal knowledge, regulations and the results of scenario analysis. Each function reviews the list of potential risks and assesses whether they exceed our definition of having "substantive impact". The response and management process of our ERM process incorporates plans to mitigate, transfer, accept or control the identified risks/dependencies and to capitalize on opportunities. Where we can materially impact a risk/dependency, we decide to either mitigate that risk or transfer the risk via insurance. In relation to opportunities, these are typically developed into business cases which if approved are incorporated into our Annual and Strategic Planning process. A case study of how the process has been applied to Physical risks and opportunities: Many climate-related risks, such as water availability, water stress and extreme weather, are considered in our water risk assessment process of our manufacturing sites. In our factory in Turkey in 2021, to mitigate risk of flooding, we increased the drainage system capacity, installed a roof membrane to prevent leakage into the tobacco leaf storage warehouse, and increased the capacity of the drainage channels, ensuring the collection points were not under the water level and causing backlogs. A case study of how the process has been applied to transitional risks and opportunities: In order to avoid a significant increase in business cost off the back of new regulations and carbon taxes, we implement energy reduction activities across all sites, look to use more renewable energy and move to the use of non-fluorocarbon systems. One example is our Sweden factory, which sources bio-steam from a nearby facility and uses a steam-to-hot-water conversion system to heat the office. Combined with energy efficiency measures, this has reduced GHG emissions at this factory by 84% since 2015. Time horizon applied to the risk management process and frequency of assessment: To ensure sustainable business growth, we conducted climate scenario analysis on both a medium- (2030) and long-term (2050) horizon. This process enabled us to understand and assess the implications of these risks, and prioritise as necessary across these time horizons. We have built the results of our assessment into our wider strategy; establishing objectives and targets that we need to achieve to mitigate and adapt to the priority risks. In order to achieve these objectives and targets, we consider initiatives that need to be implemented across the short (through our annual and Strategic plan), medium and long term. Other value chain stages: We identify, assess and respond to risks in the upstream stage of the value chain by asking our key suppliers, of both leaf and non-tobacco materials, to respond to CDP Supply Chain. The risks identified are analysed and mitigation measures developed accordingly. We consider consumers as one of the key stakeholders when setting our Sustainability strategy and developing new products, and therefore are a key aspect of our ERM process. Thus, we have approved a new set of Circularity targets to reduce the impact of our products and packaging through innovative design solutions and facilitating responsible collection and disposal.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Quantitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Life Cycle Assessment

Other

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

☑ Other, please specify **:**Regional Climate Model World Resources Institute regional climate model IBTrACS World Bank

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Wildfires

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

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

☑ Heat waves
☑ Cold wave/frost
☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Heat stress
☑ Sea level rise
☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation

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

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Our updated CSA process includes a step-by-step methodology to comprehensively assess climate-related risks, opportunities and dependencies across our business. We consider climate impacts across two timeframes (2030 and 2050) and four warming scenarios (ranging from a "Worst-case scenario" aligned to SSPs 5 to 8.5, with temperatures likely to exceed 4C warming; to a "Net-zero scenario" aligned to SSPs 1 to 2.6, with temperatures not likely to exceed 2C. 1) Stage 1 of the CSA process is "Baseline and scoping": This involved business mapping, stakeholder interviews, and comprehensive risk/opportunity/dependency screening to identify a long-list of climate risks, opportunities and dependencies relevant to JTI's operations and value chain. 2) Prioritisation: We shortlisted 35 physical and transition risks, opportunities and dependencies based on JTI stakeholders' perceived exposure and vulnerability for JTI towards key topics. 3) Hotspot climate scenario analysis: Qualitative climate scenario analysis of the 35 prioritised topics, exploring the magnitude of change in the risk / opportunity / dependency. 4) In-depth scenario analysis and business impact assessment: Detailed analysis of a subset of risks, opportunities and dependencies to be prioritised based on the hotspot analysis results under multiple climate change scenarios and time horizons. Culminates in the assessment (quantification) of potential business impacts. Stages 1-3 of this updated CSA process have been completed in 2023, stage 4 is expected to be completed in October 2024. Per previous CDP disclosures, JTG have been conducting detailed scenario analysis for several years prior to the implementation of this updated process. JT Group's separate climate risk assessment processes, including CSA, feed into the group's overarching enterprise risk assessment process described in row 1 of this table. The risks identified and assessed as part of CSA are fed into the group-level risk assessment where they are prioritised for escalation to board level and subsequent mitigation following the process outlined above.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Databases

☑ FAO/AQUASTAT

☑ Regional government databases

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

☑ Heat waves

☑ Pollution incident

Chronic physical

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation

☑ Impact on human health

☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

Technology

☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Water utilities at a local level

☑ Other water users at the basin/catchment level

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

JT Group's water risk assessment methodology has been developed by incorporating relevant information which could influence our approach to future water management and water stewardship. The information includes that gained from the WRI Aqueduct and WWF-DEG and other tools (such as GEMI Local Water Tool etc.), as well as site information. We integrate these data with other publicly available information with help from subject matter experts to implement our overall risk assessment approach. Our water risk assessment considers risks, opportunities and dependencies across the following categories: • Physical water scarcity (Quantity and quality – including potential impacts on human health) • Economic water scarcity (Regulatory, economic and infrastructure risks) • Flooding • Wastewater (regulatory risks and risks of contamination from sites and 3rd parties) • Future trends JT Group's separate risk assessment procedures, including the water risk assessments, feed into the group's overarching enterprise risk assessment process described in row 1 of this table. The risks identified and assessed as part of water risk assessment are fed into the group-level risk assessment where they are prioritised for escalation to board level and subsequent mitigation following the process outlined above.

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Databases

☑ FAO/AQUASTAT

☑ Maplecroft Global Water Security Risk Index

☑ Regional government databases

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

Chronic physical

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

Policy

☑ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

Reputation

☑ Impact on human health

Technology

☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Water utilities at a local level

☑ Other water users at the basin/catchment level

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Water risk management has been implemented in relation to the tobacco business's manufacturing supply chain. Using Verisk Maplecroft risk indices and WRI Aqueduct, to date, the tobacco business has assessed over 5,500 of its key suppliers, in relation to water-related risks and dependencies including water quality, water stress, flood, drought and climate change. The tobacco business has integrated water-related risk into its core business processes, through inclusion in the 'Suppliers ESG Screening and Risk Management Process'. JT Group's separate risk assessment procedures, including the water risk assessments, feed into the group's overarching enterprise risk assessment process described in row 1 of this table. The risks identified and assessed as part of the water risk assessment are fed into the group-level risk assessment where they are prioritised for escalation to board level and subsequent mitigation following the process outlined above

Row 5

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Sub-national

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Other

☑ Internal company methods

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Declining ecosystem services

☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies

☑ Soil degradation

☑ Water stress

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Our Biodiversity assessment for the Tobacco business considers impacts on land, freshwater and maritime ecosystems. It considers the impacts of pollutants, resource consumption (water plus others), biological alterations, and other ecosystem disturbances, to allow identification of priority impacts to be mitigated. All of JT Group's separate risk assessment processes, including the Biodiversity assessment, feed into the group's overarching enterprise risk assessment process described in row 1 of this table. The risks identified and assessed as part of the Biodiversity assessment are fed into the group-level risk assessment where they are prioritised for escalation to board level and subsequent mitigation following the process outlined above.

Row 6

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Databases

☑ Regional government databases

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Wildfires

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Suppliers

☑ Other commodity users/producers at a local level

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Our assessment of forest-related risks was completed under our climate scenario analysis. Our updated CSA process includes a step-by-step methodology to comprehensively assess climate-related risks, opportunities and dependencies across our business. We consider climate impacts across two timeframes (2030 and 2050) and four warming scenarios (ranging from a "Worst-case scenario" aligned to SSPs 5 to 8.5, with temperatures likely to exceed 4C warming; to a "Net-zero scenario" aligned to SSPs 1 to 2.6, with temperatures not likely to exceed 2C. 1) Stage 1 of the CSA process is "Baseline and scoping": This involved business mapping, stakeholder interviews, and comprehensive risk/opportunity/dependency screening to identify a long-list of climate risks, opportunities and dependencies relevant to JTI's operations and value chain. 2) Prioritisation: We shortlisted 35 physical and transition risks, opportunities and dependencies based on JTI stakeholders' perceived exposure and vulnerability towards key topics. 3) Wildfires are assessed using the Fire Weather Index (FWI), which is a meteorological-based index used worldwide to estimate fire danger. It is developed by the Canadian Forestry Service to estimate forest fire ignition and spread conditions based on several weather variables (temperature, precipitation, relative humidity, and wind speed). JT Group's separate risk assessment processes, including the CSA, feed into the group's overarching enterprise risk assessment process described in row 1 of this table. The risks identified and assessed as part of the CSA are fed into the group-level risk assessment where they are prioritised for escalation to board level and subsequent mitigation following the process outlined above.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

Interconnections are assessed through a number of Climate and Nature related assessments. These include company-wide Climate Scenario Analysis and Biodiversity assessments, as well as business specific the water risk assessments, Climate Scenario Analysis and Biodiversity impact assessments. Through these processes, it was confirmed that JTG's tobacco business, which represents 91.2% of JTG revenue is dependent on nature (for example for its tobacco and wood based raw materials and water supply), which brings with it a number of risks for example operational as well as opportunities for examples encouraging move to renewable energy.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:
☑ Yes, we are currently in the process of identifying priority locations

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations
☑ Areas important for biodiversity
☑ Areas of rapid decline in ecosystem integrity
☑ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

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

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Through the water risk assessment process, locations that are at risk due to water scarcity are identified and prioritised for management. Biodiversity risks have been assessed in the Tobacco business's biodiversity assessment, allowing for the identification of sites that are located in areas that are important from a conservation perspective or are significantly at risk from biodiversity decline. For Forestry-related risks, a specific analysis of the origins of timber in our supply chain is ongoing, and will allow identification of further priority locations.

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

1000000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

The JTG definition for substantive impact focuses on 3 key areas (which can be considered in isolation or combination): i) Financially: a materiality threshold of anything with an impact or estimated impact of 1 billion Yen. Financial risk is judged by combining the following two factors: "magnitude of possible impact" on our business and "likelihood of its occurrence." ii) Attention in the mainstream media (national or international outlets, such as press, television, etc.). iii) Attention from shareholders who have a 1% or larger share in the business.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

1000000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

The JTG definition for substantive impact focuses on 3 key areas (which can be considered in isolation or combination): i) Financially: a materiality threshold of anything with an impact or estimated impact of 1 billion Yen. Financial risk is judged by combining the following two factors: "magnitude of possible impact" on our business and "likelihood of its occurrence." ii) Attention in the mainstream media (national or international outlets, such as press, television, etc.). iii) Attention from shareholders who have a 1% or larger share in the business.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

As outlined in JT Group Environmental Policy "We ensure compliance with laws and regulations in the countries and regions where we operate.", we adheres to environmental laws and regulations considering international agreements and its own standards. We identify water pollutants based on the laws and regulations of the countries and regions where we operate, such as the Water Pollution Prevention Act in Japan. We use internal standards to identify and classify potential pollutants, representing Group's policy on pollutant identification and classification. These standards ensure compliance with local, national, and international legislation. Where legal requirements are absent, internal standards are guided by external frameworks like EU Water Framework Directive and expert advice. These standards set expectations and concentration thresholds for various water parameters. Our process for identifying and classifying pollutants involves recognizing any

discharge exceeding base thresholds as pollutants. Example metrics for natural water discharge include BOD(25 mg/l), COD(110 mg/l)and hydrocarbon concentration(10 mg/l). Pollutants are classified based on the risk they pose to the business, local communities, and ecosystems. We engage with stakeholders including internal and external experts and growers to provide insights into pollution risks related to our water use and to assist in identifying potential water pollutants that could impact water ecosystems and human health.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Nitrates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Nitrate—the oxidized form of dissolved nitrogen— is the main source of nitrogen for plants. It occurs naturally in soil and dissipates when the soil is extensively farmed. Thus, nitrogen fertilizers are applied to replenish the soil. Nitrate contamination occurs in surface water and groundwater, leaching into the soil and from there into the water supply from various sources including fertilizers. However, nitrogen is extremely soluble and can be leached into groundwater from where it enters into watercourses. This can cause a nutrient boost in the environment which can then alter the ecological balance, often linking to excessive algae growth. The algae may then produce toxins that adversely affect the aquatic ecosystem, reducing oxygen levels, impacting fish stocks and leading to loss of species and degradation of the waterway.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Reducing Nitrate pollution can be achieved through simple management practices. Because Nitrates are extremely water soluble, farmers are encouraged to prioritize practices that minimize risk of nitrate pollution. JTG works with growers to deploy soil management and water conservation initiatives. All leaf suppliers are expected to follow Good Agricultural Practices, an international standard which supports our commitment to sustainable farming through a cycle of continuous improvement. In addition, most of our contracted growers are required to act in accordance with our Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS). We have direct relationships with thousands of growers and engage with them on fertilizer management. This includes providing trainings and customized fertilizer application recommendations, optimizing the quantity, rate and timing of fertilizers applied to minimize fertilizer run-off into watercourses. We employ 580 Agronomy Technicians in our tobacco business, each providing extension services to our contracted growers. They visit each grower multiple times during the cropping cycle to ensure the growers understand how to implement best practices. To measure success, Agronomy Technicians record MAS observations which are then analysed to select the right improvement measures. We track the effectiveness of our response using internal evaluation of KPIs and on-site investigations.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Phosphates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Phosphates originate from many sources, including sewage and manure, and are also found in many artificial fertilizers. In a similar way to nitrate excess phosphate in watercourses can cause a nutrient boost which often equates to excessive algae growth. The algae may then produce toxins that adversely affect the aquatic ecosystem, reducing oxygen levels, impacting fish stocks and leading to loss of species and degradation of the waterway.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Reducing Phosphate pollution can be achieved through simple management practices. Farmers are encouraged to prioritise practices that minimize risk of Phosphate pollution. JTG works with growers to deploy soil management and water conservation initiatives. All leaf suppliers are expected to follow Good Agricultural Practices, an international standard which supports our commitment to sustainable farming through a cycle of continuous improvement. In addition, most of our contracted growers are required to act in accordance with our Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS). We have direct relationships with thousands of growers and engage with them on fertilizer management. This includes providing trainings and customized fertilizer application recommendations, optimizing the quantity, rate and timing of fertilizers applied to minimize fertilizer run-off into watercourses. We employ 580 Agronomy Technicians in our tobacco business, each providing extension services to our contracted growers. They visit each grower multiple times during the cropping cycle to ensure the growers understand how to implement best practices. To measure success, Agronomy Technicians record MAS observations which are then analysed to select the right improvement measures. We track the effectiveness of our response using internal evaluation of KPIs and on-site investigations.

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Pesticides

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Pesticides, which are commonly used in agricultural practices, can significantly impact both surface waters and groundwater through various mechanisms, primarily driven by their physical and chemical properties, environmental factors, and agricultural practices. When pesticide concentrations exceed certain critical thresholds, they pose a risk to environmental health and can disrupt ecological food chains. Rainfall, drainage, microbial activity, application method and rate, soil temperature and erosion as well as mobility, solubility and half-life of pesticides are some of the pathways and processes by which pesticides can contaminate these water sources. This contamination not only affects the environment but can also compromise water quality, making it unsafe for drinking and other uses by humans and animals.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use
☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances
☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements
☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Improved and responsible use and management of Crop Protection Agents (pesticides) is achieved through the engagement of our 580 Agronomy Technicians with thousands of our growers. During multiple visits per year, technicians provide trainings and customized CPA application recommendations, optimizing the quantity, rate and timing of CPAs applied to minimize risk of watercourse contamination. We have updated our internal standards for CPA residue for tobacco crops planted in 2022. The limit for HHP Criterion 1 pesticides (those presenting the greatest hazards to health and environment) is now set at the lowest concentration at which they can be reliably detected. If we detect in a tested sample that the residue level exceeds this limit, we do not purchase the tobacco. This commitment was communicated to all suppliers in February 2021. In 2023, we have established a due diligence process to start eliminating the CPAs falling under HHP Criteria 2 to 7 from our supply chain. Their identification, since complex, has involved a joint industry initiative organized by the Cooperation Centre for Scientific Research Relative to Tobacco through its Agrochemicals Advisory Committee. In 2024, we will establish a preliminary roadmap for the elimination of those HHPs by 2040. If JTG can eliminate the use of HHP Criterion 1 CPAs by 2024 and all HHPs by 2040 among JTG's direct contract leaf tobacco farmers, we will have succeeded in minimizing the impact of our activities on water.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, only within our direct operations

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

Select from:

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

(3.1.3) Please explain

Based on our water risk assessments, most water-related risks occur in our direct operations. While water risks do exist for our suppliers, none have been identified that might meet our definition of a substantive impact.

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(3.1.3) Please explain

We use plastic for packaging, cigarettes, RRP devices and accessories. This represents a relatively small quantity of plastic which does not pose a substantive impact on our business according to our definition of substantive impact given earlier in this disclosure (W4.1a).
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Jordan
☑ Malawi
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Serbia
☑ Armenia
☑ Austria
☑ Belarus
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Lebanon
☑ Morocco
☑ Myanmar
☑ Sudan
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Zambia
☑ Algeria
☑ Andorra
☑ Denmark
☑ Georgia
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Tunisia
☑ Ukraine
☑ Bulgaria

☑ Nigeria
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Mongolia
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Thailand
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Kyrgyzstan
☑ Tajikistan
☑ Netherlands
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Cambodia
☑ Ethiopia
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Indonesia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Singapore
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Iran (Islamic Republic of)
☑ United Republic of Tanzania
☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increased carbon tax may increase procurement cost of tobacco leaf and other materials and services as well as additional company expenditures due to tax increase for the Group's direct operations. If a carbon tax is imposed on raw or secondary materials or services used in each phase of the agricultural value chain (e.g. agricultural chemicals, agricultural machineries, processing machineries, storage and distribution), then JT Group will bear additional cost and/or it will be transferred onto raw material price. We monitor emerging carbon pricing related regulation such as carbon tax. It is likely that we will see increased carbon taxation levels in some countries where we operate, affecting our operating costs. For example, in Japan, where our group headquarters are located, the level is currently at 289 Yen/tCO2e. According to IEA World Economy Outlook 2018, the level of carbon tax in developed countries in 2050 is anticipated to be 250 USD/tCO2 under a 1.5C global warming scenario and when it is the case also in Japan, it will pose a significant cost increase to our business. This risk was identified through conducting a climate scenario analysis to identify long-term risks to 2050.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Increased cost of products due to increased cost of raw materials and company tax increased.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial figure impact of this risk in the long-term time horizon, is between 690 million and 17 billion Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This risk therefore represents a potential impact of less than 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

690000000

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

17000000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

In our climate scenario analysis, we assumed that under a 4C scenario carbon tax will increase to 36-43 USD/ton of GHG emissions, and based on 1.5C scenario, to 55-250 USD per tons of GHG emissions towards 2050, based on IEA World Economy Outlook 2018 and 2021 respectively. We calculate financial impact by multiplying forecast GHG emissions in 2050 in regions where carbon tax may exist, by the carbon tax level in those locations. GHG emissions in 2050 are predicted taking into account expected emission reduction and the company's sales growth. In the 4C scenario, the calculation was made assuming the EU Canada and China as the affected areas (105,502 tCO2e x 6,026 yen / tCO2e 3,468 tCO2e x 4,565 yen / tCO2e 6,613 tCO2e x 5,332 yen / tCO2e 690 million yen). In the 1.5C scenario, the calculation was made assuming developed, major developing, and other developing and emerging countries (420,276 tCO2e x 27,153 yen / tCO2e 183,520 tCO2e x 21,912 yen / tCO2e 230,000 tCO2e x 6,026 yen / tCO2e 17 billion yen).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1417000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost of responding to the risk was calculated as 44,375 Yen / tCO2e saved (marginal abatement cost from 2023 capital investment projects to reduce carbon) * carbon reductions needed to 2030 to meet our environmental Plan 2030 GHG target (191,649 tCO2e) / 6 years (for annual cost estimations) about 1,417 million yen.*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We manage this risk by reducing our energy consumption through capital investment and energy saving programs as well as renewable energy programs (onsite generation of renewable energy, green energy purchase). Case study: Emerging regulation and carbon pricing mechanisms are a potential risk for JTG, therefore, we continue to implement multiple initiatives to reduce our emissions and energy usage to mitigate the risk. For example, in Japan in 2023, we implemented a significant boiler upgrade for one of our large factories. This helps use to reduce emissions by 500 tCO2e annually and has a payback period of 3 years.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Malawi

☑ United Republic of Tanzania

☑ Zambia

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In Malawi, current risk of liabilities from anti-deforestation policies is minimal, but under stricter regulation nationally and downstream in the value chain, risk will rise by 2030 and 2050. Net afforestation will be required from 2030, which will further increase regulatory scrutiny of supply chains in the long-term. Comparatively, Tanzania and Zambia have stronger anti-deforestation policies at present although enforcement challenges persist. Enhanced regulations on deforestation and land-use change. While currently only applicable to imported wood-based products, global regulations are applicable to all sourcing regions, including those above. We expect those regulations to include indirect deforestation impact in the future and it is likely to impact the sourcing and production capacity of timber locally.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Deforestation-related legislation will significantly impacted our ability to source timber across all of our sourcing regions, thus impacting revenue across the business.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with regulators/policy makers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

We are currently unable to quantify the amount that it costs us to respond to risk associated with deforestation policy. We are in the process of quantifying and validating these values.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To address risk associated with deforestation policy, we have set no deforestation and no conversion targets to be met in 2025 for tobacco and paper supply chains, and in 2030 for the entire supply chain. This response involves monitoring deforestation in our sourcing areas and encouraging afforestation at some degraded sites in Japan.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Other acute physical risk, please specify **:**Severe weather events

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Turkey

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Kukuk Menderes

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Some of our facilities are located in areas which could be exposed to change in precipitation patterns that may cause increased frequency/severity of flooding. If a flood was to occur this could lead to loss of production capacity which in turn could lead to losses in sales and therefore revenue. An example of this occurring is in 2021 our factory in Turkey had a significant risk of flooding due to heavy rainfall and poor water discharging systems from the roof of the leaf storage warehouse. The event impacted stored tobacco some of which was destroyed leading to a financial loss. Some affected materials were reused after drying and before losing their form.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial figure impact of this risk in the long-term time horizon, is around 1,251 million Yen. JTG revenue for the

reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This risk therefore represents a maximum potential impact of around 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1250916000

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

1250916000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*Financial impact was calculated based on potential loss of production capacity of a typical factory such as the Turkey factory due to flooding resulting in loss of sales. If a flood like the one that occurred at our site in Turkey in 2021 were to occur in the future, the potential final impact is 1.251 billion yen assuming our typical factory is shut down for 7 days due to flood event. Calculation was done as Tobacco business revenue 2,479 bn yen divided by 38 finish goods factories / 365 * 7 1.251 bn Yen.*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

519000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

In the future, mitigation measures put in place will reduce the risk of flooding and therefore reduce any potential impacts on production capacity. Cost of management includes cost associated with water risk assessment, physical flood mitigation infrastructure and flood insurance premiums. In 2023 our main expense was on flood

*mitigation (642 000 USD) and insurance (3 050 000 USD). Total cost to mitigate the risk is therefore 429 Million Yen 90 Million Yen 0 (Cost of water risk assessment was minimal during 2023 as the process was already in place). The currency values were converted from USD to Yen using the standard JT Group currency conversions for 2023 ((3050000 USD 642000 USD) * 140.67 Yen/USD).*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As part of our water risk assessments of factories, we consider changing flood risks that could result from climate change. The outputs of these assessments are used to determine our mitigation measures. These include, for example, business continuity plans, physical flood mitigation infrastructure and insurance coverage. For example, in 2021, in our factory in Turkey, we installed a new drain system and reinforced existing drainage channels. In the future, these improvements will reduce the risk of flooding and therefore reduce any potential impacts on production capacity.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Other chronic physical risk, please specify **:**Change in yield of tobacco leaf due to climate change

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ India

☑ Japan

☑ Brazil

☑ United States of America

☑ United Republic of Tanzania

☑ Malawi

☑ Indonesia

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Changes in environmental conditions such as higher temperatures, erratic precipitation patterns, more frequent and intense extreme events (drought, floods), El Nino and La Nina intensity can impact availability and quality of key natural resources for sustainable tobacco leaf production and supply to JT Group, in addition to influencing crop management practices to cope with these environmental changes (e.g. management of pests and diseases occurrence). This could occur in one or more of our tobacco sourcing countries, for example Bangladesh and Brazil from where we procure around 30% of our total tobacco leaf volume. As a result, the cost of sourcing tobacco leaf can increase. This risk was identified through conducting a climate scenario analysis to identify long-term risks to 2050 and using a 4C and a 1.5C scenarios.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial figure impact of this risk in the long-term time horizon, is between 7.5 billion and 36.7 billion Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This risk therefore represents a maximum potential impact of around 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

7500000000

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

36700000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

We assume, that based on 4C scenario tobacco leaf yield will change by -15.3% to 1.8% by 2050, and based on a 1.5C scenario by -4% to 4% by 2050 in main target countries. The main target countries are Brazil, the United States, India, Tanzania, Malawi, Japan and Indonesia. We calculate financial impact by multiplying the procurement cost by country in 2018 by production growth rate and by the cost change rate assuming fluctuation of yield by country where we source leaf. The financial impact in the 4C scenario was 36.7 billion yen, and in the 1.5C scenario it was 7.5 billion yen. The main countries due to the cost increase were Brazil (4C: 15.9 billion, 1.5C: 2.5 billion) and India (4C: 7.1 billion, 1.5C: 0.3 billion).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Promotion of best practice and awareness in the value chain

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

253768680

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The primary financial costs for managing these risks come from Grower Support Programs. In 2023, the JT Group spent about 1.8 million USD (253,768,680 Yen) globally on Grower Support Programs (Converted to Yen using JT Group standardised currency conversions for 2023).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We manage this risk by developing action plans to reduce financial impact to our business which could include shifting leaf growing regions based on identified climate-related impacts, implementing climate change adaptation measures, e.g. smart agriculture and breeding, as well as measures to improve yield in growing regions, so as to mitigate potential decrease in procurement volumes and increased costs. Primarily, to date we have managed this risk via building strong relationships with our suppliers and having a geographically diversified supply chain (for example, the JT Group source tobacco leaf from over 30 different countries). Most importantly, the JT Group regards growers and key suppliers as some of its most important partners. Case study: Within the tobacco business, we support growers to manage climate risk and other forms of risk through selecting tobacco varieties with disease resistance relevant to local conditions, financial assistance during incidents of natural disaster and via reforestation / sustainable tree planting programs since 2012. In addition, we promote efficient use of materials by continually reviewing the manufacturing process and product specifications where possible. Moreover, in Japan, since 1978 we have operated a financial support system to compensate tobacco farmers' incomes whose tobacco plants/crops have suffered from natural disasters, based on the degree of the damages. The system offers financial support to tobacco growers so that they are not forced to cease production and therefore improves the stability of our supply chain. In 2023, the JT Group spent about 1.8 million USD globally on Grower Support Programs.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Turkey

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Some of our facilities are located in areas, for example, MENA countries, which could be exposed to change in precipitation patterns that may cause increased frequency/severity of flooding. This could lead to loss of production capacity which in turn could lead to losses in sales and therefore revenue. Company specific example: In 2021 our factory in Turkey had a significant risk of flooding due to heavy rainfall and poor water discharging systems from the roof of the leaf storage warehouse. The increased intensity of rainfall has been attributed to changing climate in the region.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial figure impact of this risk in the long-term time horizon, is between 1,168 million and 19,864 million Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This risk therefore represents a maximum potential impact of around 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1315000000

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

22360000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*Financial impact was calculated based on potential loss of production capacity of a typical factory due to flooding resulting in loss of sales. Assuming 38 finished goods factories in our tobacco business which had a revenue of 2,590,900 million yen in 2023. 17 out of 38 (45%) factories have a medium-high flood risk. As such for the purposes of risk calculation, assuming a typical medium-high risk factory is shut down for 7 days per year due to flooding, the potential estimated range of financial impact is 1.315 billion yen if only 1 factory flooded: ((2590900*0.45)/17/365*7) to 22.360 billion yen, if all 17 medium-high risk factories flooded ((2590900*0.45)/365*7).*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

519000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

In the future, mitigation measures put in place will reduce the risk of flooding and therefore reduce any potential impacts on production capacity. Cost of management includes cost associated with water risk assessment, physical flood mitigation infrastructure and flood insurance premiums. In 2023 our main expense was on flood mitigation (642 000 USD) and insurance (3 050 000 USD). Total cost to mitigate the risk is therefore 429 Million 90 0 (Cost of water risk assessment was minimal

*during 2023 as the process was already in place and the cost of flood mitigation implemented in 2023 was also minimal as no new flood infrastructure was needed). The 429 million Yen value was converted from USD using the standard JT Group currency conversions for 2023 ((3050000 USD 642000 USD) * 140.67 Yen/USD).*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As part of our water risk assessments of factories we consider changing flood risks which could be as a result of climate change. The outputs of these assessments are used to determine our mitigation measures. Case study: Flooding has been identified as a risk at some JTI factories. To mitigate against the flood risk measures have been implemented such as; business continuity plans, physical flood mitigation infrastructure and insurance coverage. One of example, in 2021 in our factory in Turkey we installed a new drainage system and reinforced existing drainage channels. Going forward, these improvements will reduce the risk of flooding and therefore reduce potential impacts on production capacity.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Wildfires

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ South Africa

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Wildfires currently pose a moderate risk to sites in Africa. Climate projections suggest that, on average, this risk level will remain the same across all sites. However, certain facilities will experience significant changes in risk levels. Wildfires may adversely affect our products and/or financial results through deterioration in these inputs' quality and/or increases in their prices/sourcing costs.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Wildfires may reduce the amount of timber and/or tobacco that can be sourced, thus reducing cash flow from this commodity.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Improve fire management systems in sourcing regions

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

7106086

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*The cost has been calculated based on the average cost to construct a firebreak and the average cost to maintain a firebreak, both on a per hectare basis, at JTIs woodlots. Based on fire break construction amounting to Y 7624.3 per hectare, firebreak maintenance amounting to Y 4543.6 per hectare, and firebreaks being created on 584 Ha of woodlots established by JTI. Total cost would be (7624.34543.6)*584 7 106 086 Yens.*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

JTI have already started managing the risk of fire in sourcing areas. In a given year, fire prevention practices must be adopted in the cooler months, from April to July, and ensure tree area is free of grass by the end of May. Action is also being taken to minimise potential fuel load in the surroundings of the nursery and woodlot: • Fire breaks at minimum 3 meters wide from the nursery and woodlot • Regular weeding, cleaning It is currently considered on a site by site basis to take into account the impact of local climatic conditions on the potential fire risk.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

7500000000

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

57160000000

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The "Amount of financial metric vulnerable" figures presented here take into account the financial impacts of substantive risks across all timescales, not solely in this reporting period. These are compared to our annual JTG revenue figure for the 2023 reporting period.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

1.2)

24132000000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The enforcement of the European Regulation on Deforestation-free products has the potential to impact revenue associated with sale of tobacco. Timber is used in the tobacco curing process and therefore, at present, the product deforestation free. We anticipate that 4% of our revenue in Western Europe from tobacco is at risk - this is the figure presented. We are currently unable to quantify the amount of revenue vulnerable to physical risks or the amount of CAPEX deployed towards these risks due to the complexity of gathering relevant information from contracted growers about the impacts of the risk. This is a priority for us moving forward.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

1250916000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

No capital expenditure was deployed towards mitigation of substantive water-related risks in 2023. Our capital expenditure is guided by our risk assessment processes, and particularly for water our water risk assessment. Several capital projects are planned to mitigate these risks in subsequent years.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify **:**Kukuk Menderes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

In 2021 our factory in Turkey had a significant risk of flooding due to heavy rainfall and poor water discharging systems from the roof of the leaf storage warehouse. Some affected materials were reused after drying and before losing their form. This rainfall's financial impact is related to destroyed materials (tobacco) only. See responses to 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 for an in-depth breakdown of this risk including an explanation of the potential cost impact figure.
[Add row]

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

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☑ No

(3.3.3) Comment

In the reporting year, JT Group was not subject to any fines, enforcement orders, or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations. Our risk assessment procedures, including the water risk assessment and the wider, group-level risk assessment ensure that compliance risks are identified early and are appropriately mitigated.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply
☑ EU ETS

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

EU ETS

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

1

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

12/31/2022

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/30/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

3312

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

341572

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

240450

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:
☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

We have provided our verified market-based scope 2 emissions in this table as this is the primary scope 2 metric we use internally and in external reporting and tracking. It is also the scope 2 metric that is 3rd party verified.
[Fixed row]

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

Our strategy for complying with our responsibilities under EU ETS is twofold. Firstly, we have established internal systems and procedures which ensure our ongoing compliance with the requirements of the scheme. Secondly, we retain an external consultant to review our processes, systems data and create annual emissions

reports as well as reports for new trading periods, considering latest legal requirements and compliance deadlines. All emission reports are verified by 2nd consultant who has the permission for verification. Our internal systems and procedures to ensure compliance with our responsibilities under EU ETS have been integrated into environmental (EMS) and energy management systems. Our EMS has been in place since 1998 when it was first implemented at our Trier site, and procedures under EU ETS were first integrated once EU ETS was introduced. Our EMS allocates responsibility for compliance to named individuals at the site level as well as oversight at a group level through our internal audit process. The environmental and energy systems are subject to external verification against ISO 14001 and ISO 50001 which in turn ensures compliance. We are monitoring compliance obligations on ongoing basis and changing the approach if appropriate. We are continuously looking for the way to reduce the amount of energy used. One example of this is the renovation of a fresh water station in Germany which was implemented in 2019 and has remained in operation since. Tobacco production requires warm water for regular cleaning of the tobacco drums. The old warm water station was using steam to heat the cleaning water, requiring significant gas consumption. The new fresh water station produces hygienic warm cleaning water (instantly on demand) by using heating water instead of steam. As a result 37 tons of CO2 are reduced annually from the reduced energy consumption and emissions.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Jordan
☑ Malawi
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Sudan
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Zambia
☑ Algeria

☑ Serbia
☑ Armenia
☑ Austria
☑ Belarus
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Ireland
☑ Lebanon
☑ Morocco
☑ Myanmar
☑ Nigeria
☑ Ethiopia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Mongolia
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Kyrgyzstan
☑ Tajikistan
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ Andorra
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Georgia
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Romania
☑ Tunisia
☑ Ukraine
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Cambodia
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Indonesia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ United States of America
☑ Iran (Islamic Republic of)
☑ United Republic of Tanzania
☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

There are a number of different drivers creating opportunities for further improvements in resource efficiency and therefore cost efficiency. For example, greater societal awareness of climate change risks has created demand for innovation, which is driving down cost of technology enabling resource use reduction. We also

consider that the regulatory drivers can become opportunity drivers for the JT Group. Rising of fuel /energy prices as a result of taxes may become a risk in an initial phase, but if we respond to the risks, we can gain bigger benefits than the initial phases. The JT Group is engaging in energy-saving initiatives with a group-wide cooperation, which include implementation of capital investment projects at our facilities and promotion of sustainability and carbon reduction across our value chain. By these efforts, we can reduce our future operational costs. Our tobacco business has initiated the development of formalized energy management systems with subsequent certification to ISO50001 across all manufacturing facilities. The overall objective was to deliver a further 5% reduction in absolute carbon emissions (on top of that achieved through capital investment projects) by 2020. Overall, we reduced emissions by 19% (2019-2023). In Europe, our tobacco business is obligated by the introduction of The European Union Energy Efficiency Directive (EED). The EED (updated in 2018) establishes a set of measures to enable the EU to meet its 32.5% energy efficiency.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial benefit figure of this opportunity in the medium-term time horizon, is between 60 million and 70 million Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This opportunity therefore represents a potential financial benefit of less than 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

60000000

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

70000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Introduction of fuel/energy taxes is generally predicted to lead to increase in energy costs. However, we expect that, by implementing energy-saving project/activities, our future financial implications by this opportunity in terms of energy and cost savings will result in the opposite results. We anticipate that the outcome of the energy audits in EU Markets and development of formalized energy management systems with subsequent certification to ISO 50001 are anticipated to deliver savings of approximately 60-70 million Yen annually across 38 of the tobacco production factories and EU markets. This estimation is based on a circa 1% energy cost saving on our total energy cost.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

15755040

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

In 2023 we conducted assessment against ISO 50001 at several locations, which cost us about 16 million Yen. For next 3 years we plan to spend about 86 million Yen for such assessments.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Realizing these opportunities will primarily come through the identification and implementation of energy reduction measures with associated cost savings. We reduce energy consumption at all our sites by capital investment, behavioural / process change and energy saving, through promotion of the EAP (Environment Annual Plan) and operating the EMS (Environmental Management System) of the JT Group. We are continuously investing in fuel and energy reduction activities. The costs associated with developing formalized energy management systems with subsequent certification to ISO 50001 are minimal and mainly relate to management time, training, certification and additional metering and measurements. Costs to date in relation to the EED mainly relate to internal time and external expenditure to establish our compliance strategy. Case Study: Process optimization has been identified as an opportunity for JT Group. To capitalise on this, multiple initiatives were implemented in 2023. For example, in Japan in 2023, we implemented a significant boiler upgrade for one of our large factories. This helps us to reduce emissions by

500 tCO2e annually and has a payback period of 3 years.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased security of production

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Brazil

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Forest management leading to increased availability and quality of timber presents an opportunity to decarbonise and generate more profit Through our ADET centres, we have developed Minimum Forestry Standards (MFS) – a set of forestry specifications and guidelines designed to achieve sustainability of wood supply for tobacco production and curing. When well adopted by growers, MFS results in improved tree seedling production and quality, and woodlot establishment with

improved productivity potential. We have been actioning this opportunity in Brazil to ensure optimal woodlot productivity, so that all trees planted are able to produce as much wood as the species allows. It also ensures adoption of forestry best practices whilst assisting the group to produce the required volumes of wood fuel for tobacco curing. In Zambia, the target set in 2020 was to plant 2.6 million trees to reach 100% renewable wood supply, and reach productivity values of 46 kg/tree after 7 years of transplanting.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

We anticipate that the implementation of our Minimum Forestry Standards and our target to increase our supply of renewable wood will have a positive impact on our revenue in the medium-term. When the productivity of our source timber increases we are able to source more timber per hectare and increase revenue over the same area.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

15333030000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*Relates to forestry program expenses in Brazil for trials, studies, surveys, assessments, training and material development. All of these directly relate to validation of the Minimum Forestry Standards practices for optimized Eucalyptus woodlot productivity at small-scale tobacco farms. This is an actual value. Total cost to realize the opportunity is converted from USD using standard JT Group currency conversions for 2023 (3050000 USD * 140.67 Yen/USD).*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Through our ADET centers, we have developed Minimum Forestry Standards (MFS) – a set of forestry specifications and guidelines designed to achieve sustainability of wood supply for tobacco production and curing. When well adopted by growers, MFS results in improved tree seedling production and quality, and woodlot establishment with improved productivity potential. This approach brings us closer to achieving sustainability in wood supply, helps avoid deforestation, and improves the conservation prospects for natural woodland. It will also increase economic sustainability of the tobacco curing process.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased brand value

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Japan

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Rivers around Japan

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The JT Group's main business is the tobacco business, but water resources are also essential to our processed food business. We believe that further strengthening water reduction efforts will help fulfil our responsibilities as a water-reliant company and ultimately lead to an opportunity to increase the value of our corporate and product brands. Although we have confirmed through water risk assessment that stable water can be procured for a long period of time, conservation of forests that recharge water is an important issue for processed foods and societies that rely on good water resources. For this reason, the JT group has been conducting afforestation and forest conservation activities (JT Forest) since 2005 in Japan, where most of processed food's site are located. In 2022 we concluded the agreement with 9 forests in Japan which covered 1,570ha. We are contributing to climate change issues and water resource conservation in the watershed through proper forest management. Specifically, in addition to financial contributions, employees are taking part in volunteer activities held at JT Forest and providing products manufactured by processed food. In addition, we are strategically developing products to promote environmental activities, such as selling products that show that part of the package sales is used for tree planting and forest conservation activities.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial benefit figure of this opportunity in the long-term time horizon, is between 1 bn and 4 bn Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This opportunity therefore represents a potential financial benefit of less than 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

334000000

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

334000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The survey results from the Consumer Affairs Agency show that consumers who choose eco-friendly products and services increased by about 2% in one year, and the change in environmental awareness of consumers is reflected in the market reliably and significantly. We believe that the ratio is increasing year by year. Here, we calculated the effect of increasing our market share by 1% against 2% (33.4 billion yen) of the total sales (about 1,670 billion yen) of Japanese frozen food companies.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

310000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Calculated cost of thinning JT forests as of 2030. Approx. 1450 ha (area of JT forest in 2023) x 101%7 (assuming an increase in area of 1% each year for seven years until 2030) x JPY 200 000 (assumed thinning cost per 1 ha) JPY 310,000,000

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The JT Group's core business is the tobacco business, but water resources are also essential in the processed food business. We believe that further strengthening our efforts to reduce water resources will help us fulfil our responsibilities as a water-dependent company and, in turn, provide an opportunity to enhance the value of our corporate and product brands. While water risk assessments confirm that stable water procurement is possible over the long term, the conservation of forests that recharge water is an important issue for processed food products and society, which depends on high-quality water resources. For this reason, the JT Group has been implementing afforestation and forest conservation activities (JT Forests) since 2005 in Japan, where many of its processed food plants are located, and has concluded agreements with nine forests in Japan covering approximately 1,450 ha by 2023. Through appropriate forest management, we contribute to climate change issues and the conservation of water resources in the basin. Specifically, in addition to monetary contributions, employees participate in volunteer activities held in JT forests and products are provided in the form of processed foods. In addition, the company is strategically developing products that promote environmental activities, for example by marketing products that indicate that part of the proceeds from the sale of the packaging will be used for afforestation and forest conservation activities.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of low-carbon energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- ☑ China
- ☑ Egypt
- ☑ Italy
- ☑ Japan
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Jordan
- ☑ Malawi
- ☑ Mexico
- ☑ Poland
- ☑ Serbia
- ☑ Armenia
- ☑ Austria
- ☑ Belarus
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Czechia
- ☑ Ireland
- ☑ Lebanon
- ☑ Morocco
- ☑ Myanmar
- ☑ Nigeria
- ☑ Ethiopia
- ☑ Malaysia
- ☑ Mongolia
- ☑ Portugal
- ☑ Slovakia
- ☑ Azerbaijan
- ☑ Bangladesh
- ☑ Kazakhstan
- ☑ Kyrgyzstan
- ☑ Sudan
- ☑ Brazil
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ France
- ☑ Greece
- ☑ Sweden
- ☑ Turkey
- ☑ Zambia
- ☑ Algeria
- ☑ Andorra
- ☑ Denmark
- ☑ Finland
- ☑ Georgia
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Hungary
- ☑ Romania
- ☑ Tunisia
- ☑ Ukraine
- ☑ Bulgaria
- ☑ Cambodia
- ☑ Thailand
- ☑ Viet Nam
- ☑ Indonesia
- ☑ Lithuania
- ☑ Singapore
- ☑ Netherlands
- ☑ Philippines
- ☑ Switzerland
- ☑ South Africa

☑ Tajikistan
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ United States of America
☑ Iran (Islamic Republic of)
☑ United Republic of Tanzania
☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

There are a number of different drivers creating opportunities for the use of renewable energy. For example, greater societal awareness of climate change risks has created a demand for innovation, and the cost of renewable energy generation is falling. We believe that regulatory drivers can become opportunity drivers for JT Group. Increase in carbon taxation may become a risk initially, but the way we respond to the risk may give us an opportunity; by increasing the proportion of renewable energy we buy or generate ourselves. Already, the JT Group purchase renewable energy and low carbon energy in Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Ethiopia, Greece, UK, Turkey, Switzerland, Canada, Germany, Serbia, Spain, Philippines, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Indonesia, Italy, Malaysia and generate renewable energy in Brazil, Canada, the Philippines, Turkey, Tanzania, Jordan, Thailand, Sweden, Japan, Malawi, Poland, Spain, Ethiopia. We are also looking for new opportunities to use renewable energy; currently, we have a commitment to use 50% of renewable electricity in our operation by 2030 and 100% by 2050 (as at the end of 2023 we were at 26%).

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Long-term

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

Select from:
☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial benefit figure of this opportunity in the long-term time horizon, is between 1.311 bn and 5.098 bn Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This opportunity therefore represents a potential financial benefit of less than 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

675578929

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

2627251389

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*Introduction of carbon taxes is generally predicted to lead to an increase in operational cost. We assumed that under a 4C global warming scenario, carbon tax will increase to 36-43 USD/ton of GHG emissions, and based on 2C scenario, to 125-140 USD per tons of GHG emissions in 2050, based on IEA World Economy Outlook 2018. JTG has a commitment to use 100% of renewable electricity by 2050. We calculate financial impact by multiplying current GHG emissions from electricity (133,405 tCO2e) by predicted tax in 2050 (Minimum impact 36*133405*140.67 675,578,929; maximum impact 140*133405*140.67 2,627,251,389) (140.67 exchange rate USD/Yen).*

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

111691980

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The CAPEX cost associated with these initiatives in 2023 was 544,000 USD (about 76.5 Million yen). Cost of procurement of additional renewable electricity in 2023 was 250,000 USD (about 35.2 Million yen). Total cost was 111,691,980 Yen (35,167,500 76,524,480).

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Realizing these opportunities will primarily come through the purchase and generation of renewable energy. Case study: To realise the opportunity of using lower emission energy sources in 2023 we implemented three new renewable generation projects. We installed photovoltaic systems at sites in Tanzania, Spain and Brazil. Combined, these projects avoid 181 tCO2e per year. We are continuously investing in renewable energy generation projects.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Reputational capital

☑ Reputational benefits resulting in increased demand for products/services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Iraq
☑ Oman
☑ Peru
☑ China
☑ Congo
☑ Egypt
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Libya
☑ Malta

☑ Nepal
☑ Qatar
☑ Spain
☑ Angola
☑ Brazil
☑ Guinea
☑ Israel
☑ Jordan
☑ Kuwait
☑ Latvia
☑ Turkey
☑ Albania
☑ Algeria
☑ Andorra
☑ Armenia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Finland
☑ Georgia
☑ Germany
☑ Morocco
☑ Myanmar
☑ Namibia
☑ Nigeria
☑ Romania
☑ Ethiopia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Maldives
☑ Mongolia
☑ Portugal
☑ Canada
☑ Cyprus
☑ France
☑ Gambia
☑ Greece
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Serbia
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Bahrain
☑ Belarus
☑ Belgium
☑ Croatia
☑ Hungary
☑ Iceland
☑ Ireland
☑ Lebanon
☑ Mayotte
☑ Tunisia
☑ Ukraine
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Cambodia
☑ Cameroon
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Argentina

☑ Australia
☑ Gibraltar
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Kyrgyzstan
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Montenegro
☑ Mozambique
☑ Tajikistan
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ Sierra Leone
☑ South Africa
☑ Guinea-Bissau
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Iran (Islamic Republic of)
☑ United Republic of Tanzania
☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
☑ Mauritius
☑ Singapore
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Uzbekistan
☑ Afghanistan
☑ Netherlands
☑ Philippines
☑ South Sudan
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Equatorial Guinea
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ Micronesia (Federated States of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The JT Group produces tobacco, processed food and pharmaceutical products. Through our research into consumer understanding of sustainability we have confirmed that there is increasing consumer interest and demand for products produced ethically and sustainably including lower carbon. 33% of consumers confirmed that products and processes that use / create minimal or no carbon is a consideration in their decision-making. Therefore, by differentiating our products from competitors by promoting our sustainable agriculture activities and by continuing to reduce the environmental impact in our own operations, we could increase revenue and market share of our existing products. Regarding sustainable agricultural practices, an example is Market Match, promoted to our growers in Zambia and Malawi, which encourages seasonal crop rotations by matching our growers to viable global market off-takers of non-tobacco commodity crops e.g. groundnuts, maize, or soya. The benefits of this are additional income, improved food security, and soil conservation.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Per our subsequent responses, the estimated financial benefit figure of this opportunity in the long-term time horizon, is between 1 bn and 4 bn Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This opportunity therefore represents a potential financial benefit of less than 1% of group revenue.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1420500000

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

4261500000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

It is difficult to estimate financial implications of changing consumer behaviour across our diverse product range and markets. However, if a 0.05-0.15% increase in consumer demand for our products and sales occurred, it would result in an increase in revenues of approximately 1-4 billion yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

852400000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The costs associated with our annual Integrated Report are 78.9 million yen and our environment-related community investment programs were approximately 422 million yen in 2023. Cost of our international Grower Support Programs is 254 million yen and to date costs for undertaking our LCA projects are approximately 97.45 million yen. An example of our response to changing consumer preference for more sustainable products is our 2016 acquisition of Natural American Spirit. (78.9 422 254 97.45 852.4 million yen).

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We provide information on our commitment to the environment and managing climate change related issues via our website and in external publications on annual basis. In addition, we continue to implement a range of environment-related community investment programs and projects. We also manage this opportunity by supporting and promoting sustainable agricultural practices within our value chain – especially with local growers. We have undertaken Life Cycle Assessment (LCAs) in 2020-2023 on some of our products to identify (and communicate where necessary) reductions in the environmental footprint of our products.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

6958751389

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

From 3.6.2, the maximum financial benefit figure of substantive climate-related opportunities is estimated to be 9.1 billion Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This opportunity therefore represents a potential financial benefit of less than 1% of group revenue.

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

JTI are currently unable to quantify the amount of revenue that is aligned with forest-related opportunities, including the increased security of production of timber for tobacco curing due to our work with smallholders to increase woodlot productivity. We are working toward calculating and validating a value for forest-related opportunity.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

334000000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

From 3.6.2, the maximum financial benefit figure of substantive climate-related opportunities is estimated to be 3.3 million Yen. JTG revenue for the reporting year was 2,841 Billion Yen. This opportunity therefore represents a potential financial benefit of less than 1% of group revenue.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

The Board of Directors shall be composed of a diverse group of individuals, with the number of directors maintained within a necessary and appropriate range of up to 15 members. In addition to considering factors such as gender, international perspectives, career backgrounds, race, ethnicity, and cultural backgrounds, the Board will also evaluate the specific skills required by the Company's Board of Directors, as separately determined by the Board. The Board of Directors shall possess high ethical standards, along with the knowledge, experience, and capabilities expected of business professionals.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

governance_policy.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply
☑ Director on board
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

☑ Board mandate

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

JT Group considers climate-related issues to be strategically important for our business. As such, high level board oversight is critical. The person directly responsible for climate-related issues is the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) of JT. This position reports directly to Representative Director and Executive Vice President of JT on corporate, sustainability management, pharmaceutical and processed food business. The Representative Director and Executive Vice President is Member of the Board also serving as Executive Officer. They are directly responsible for developing and implementing strategies and plans for Sustainability Management, including climate-related issues. Based on societal expectations, the board members determined that it is necessary to establish a long-term plan to tackle the environmental challenges we face as a company and the society. Also, to better understand long-term risks and opportunities from climate change, the board members decided that the business would carry out Climate Scenario Analysis and endorsed the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). In 2021, the board members decided to set our new net zero target, aiming to be net zero across our entire value chain by 2050, which was officially announced in 2022.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

☑ Board mandate

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

JT Group considers forest-related issues to be strategically important for our business. As such, high level board oversight is critical. The person directly responsible for forest-related issues is the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) of JT. This position reports directly to Representative Director and Executive Vice President of JT on corporate, sustainability management, pharmaceutical and processed food business. The Representative of Director and Executive Vice President is Member of the Board also serving as Executive Officer. They are directly responsible for developing and implementing strategies and plans for Sustainability Management, including forest related issues. In 2023, directors made a decision to update the forest-related targets in the JT Group Environmental Plan 2030.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Director on board
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

☑ Board mandate

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

JT Group considers water-related issues to be strategically important for our business. As such, high level board oversight is critical. The person directly responsible for water-related issues is the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) of JT. This position reports directly to Representative Director and Executive Vice President of JT on corporate, sustainability management, pharmaceutical and processed food business. The Representative of Director and Executive Vice President is Member of the Board also serving as Executive Officer. They are directly responsible for developing and implementing strategies and plans for Sustainability Management, including water related issues. In 2023, directors made a decision to update the water-related targets in the JT Group Environmental Plan 2030.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

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

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

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

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

☑ Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
☑ Staff-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

1) The Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) is in charge of JTG Sustainability Management. This position reports directly to the Representative Director and Executive Vice President of JT who is directly responsible for developing and implementing strategies and plans, including Climate-related issues. 2) We recognize climate-related issues are an important management issue to us as well as our stakeholders and this is why responsibility for these issues lies at such a senior level. 3) CSO is responsible for climate-related issue management and more broadly, sustainability management. In 2019, among other responsibilities, CSO had oversight of the establishment of the renewed JTG Environment Plan, including the setting of a science-based GHG emission reduction target subsequently validated by SBTi. In December 2020, the company also has endorsed the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD).The Sustainability function monitors and assesses climate-related issues, coordinates activities, gathers data and provides information to the JTG's Board of Directors. In 2021, new Net-Zero target was set, aiming to be net zero across our entire value chain by 2050. The near-term targets for 2030 was also set, which supports achieving the net zero by 2050, was validated by SBTi as being in line with 1.5 scenario in 2022. JTG is currently developing Net Zero and supportive targets, which will be approved in 2024. Climate-related management activities and performance are reported to the Board 4 times a year, so that the Board can provide supervisions with; Annual and Strategic Planning review, Annual operation plan approval, review of Sustainability Strategy and Board meeting in May to review previous year performance.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

1) The Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) is in charge of JTG Sustainability Management. This position reports directly to the Representative Director and Executive Vice President of JT who is directly responsible for developing and implementing strategies and plans, including Water-related issues. 2) We recognize forest-related issues are an important management issue to us as well as our stakeholders and this is why responsibility for these issues lies at such a senior level.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

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

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

1) The Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) is in charge of JTG Sustainability Management. This position reports directly to the Representative Director and Executive Vice President of JT who is directly responsible for developing and implementing strategies and plans, including Water-related issues. 2) We recognize Water-related issues are an important management issue to us as well as our stakeholders and this is why responsibility for these issues lies at such a senior level.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1

(4.5.3) Please explain

The remuneration for the directors who also serve as executive officers is composed of base salary, executive bonus, restricted stock remuneration plan and performance share unit plan (PSU). PSU is a performance-linked stock compensation system that aims to strengthen shared value with shareholders, to enhance company value over the mid to long term and to commit to achieving business results over the mid-term. For the performance evaluation period beginning in 2022, it was decided to introduce the rate of achievement of GHG emission reduction targets as an ESG-related indicator in addition to profit as a KPI for PSU. PSU account for about a quarter of the Stock Remuneration, which constitutes 38-43% of total remuneration, and are added or subtracted by 10% depending on the achievement of ESG-related indicator, so the incentive proportion is about 1% of the total remuneration.

Forests

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

No further comments.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

No further comments.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Board approval of climate transition plan

☑ Achievement of climate transition plan

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Performance Share Unit Plan provides monetary remuneration claims to allot the Company's ordinary shares and cash as a performance-linked stock compensation. The monetary remuneration claims and cash are calculated after the performance evaluation period that is aligned with the duration of the Company's three-year Business Plan that starts from the fiscal year. It is subject to provision in accordance with the rate of achievement of performance and other targets during the Performance Evaluation Period, which are determined through deliberations of the Advisory Panel on Nomination and Compensation of the Company. Thus, the monetary remuneration claims to allot ordinary shares of the Company and cash are provided to Eligible Persons for Performance Share Units after the Performance Evaluation Period expires, in principle.

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

The remuneration for the directors who also serve as executive officers, including the CEO, is composed of base salary, executive bonus, restricted stock remuneration plan and performance share unit plan (PSU). PSU is a performance-linked stock compensation system that aims to strengthen shared value with shareholders, to enhance company value over the mid to long term and to commit to achieving business results over the mid-term. For the performance evaluation period starting in 2022, we have decided to introduce an ESG-related index on top of profit as KPIs for PSU. This index is introduced in order for us (evaluate) and shareholders (evaluator) to seek agreement on what is conducive to corporate value. In 2022, we adopted our progress on initiatives to realize net zero as ESG-related index, specifically target attainment rates to reduce GHG emissions.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our JT Group organisation-wide environmental Policy includes a statement of commitment to reduce environmental impacts along our value chain through improved

product design and development, responsible procurement, efficient delivery of our products and services, and adoption of innovative technologies and approaches, amongst other things. We also require our suppliers and service providers to abide by our Supplier Standards and align with our Environment Policy. The JT Group Sustainability Target includes targets related to climate change action, committing to achieving net zero and transitioning to renewable energy by 2050.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement

☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

The_JT_Group_Environment_Policy.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our JT Group organisation-wide environmental Policy includes a statement of commitment to reduce environmental impacts along our value chain through improved product design and development, responsible procurement, efficient delivery of our products and services, and adoption of innovative technologies and approaches, amongst other things. We also require our suppliers and service providers to abide by our Supplier Standards and align with our Environment Policy.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems
☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to no-conversion of natural ecosystems by target date, please specify **:**No conversion of natural ecosystem in the tobacco business' own operations and supply chains for tobacco, paper and pulp based materials in high conservation value areas by 2025 and all natural lands by 2030
☑ Commitment to no-deforestation by target date, please specify **:**No deforestation of natural forests in the operations and supply chains for tobacco leaf, paper and pulp-based materials by 2025 and in our entire supply chain by 2030
☑ Commitment to the use of the High Conservation Value (HCV) approach
☑ Other forests-related commitment, please specify **:**Zero net deforestation of managed natural forests in the entire tobacco business supply chain by 2030

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement
☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs
☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

biodiversity_statement.pdf

Row 3

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our JT Group organisation-wide environmental Policy includes a statement of commitment to reduce environmental impacts along our value chain through improved product design and development, responsible procurement, efficient delivery of our products and services, and adoption of innovative technologies and approaches, amongst other things. We also require our suppliers and service providers to abide by our Supplier Standards and align with our Environment Policy.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems
☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Water-specific commitments
☑ Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances
☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution
☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes
☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities
☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Social commitments
☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions
☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation
☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement
☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs
☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Row 4

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our JT Group organisation-wide environmental Policy includes a statement of commitment to reduce environmental impacts along our value chain through improved product design and development, responsible procurement, efficient delivery of our products and services, and adoption of innovative technologies and approaches, amongst other things. We also require our suppliers and service providers to abide by our Supplier Standards and align with our Environment Policy.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

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

☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify **:**Declaration of Biodiversity by Keidanren

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Declaration of Biodiversity by Keidanren.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

☑ Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)

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

JTG algins its reporting on climate risks and opportunities to the recommendations of the TCFD. Member of the TNFD Forum. JTG has emissions reduction targets verified by the Science-Based Targets Initiative.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

Paris_Agreement_2023.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ No

(4.11.8) Describe the process your organization has in place to ensure that your external engagement activities are

consistent with your environmental commitments and/or transition plan

JT Group has a dedicated environmental team in Tokyo which is responsible for coordination of activities related to climate change strategy and engagement, including the engagement with policy makers. This team ensures that climate-related engagements throughout the business are in line with the Environment Plan 2030, which reflects our overall climate change strategy.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

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

Tobacco business subcommittee of the fiscal system council of the ministry of finance.

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Environmental impacts and pressures
☑ Emissions – CO2

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

Select from:
☑ National

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

Select all that apply

☑ Japan

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

Select from:

☑ Neutral

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

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

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

0

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

We regularly participate in the tobacco business subcommittee of the fiscal system council to review the tobacco industry's efforts to mitigate global warming. The measure of success of this engagement is the development of measures that can reduce GHG emissions in the tobacco business.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

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

JT forest

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Water pollution

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

Select from:

☑ Regional

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

Select all that apply

☑ Japan

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

Select from:

☑ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

☑ Participation in voluntary government programs

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

0

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

In the "JT Forest" project, we partner with local governments to lease and maintain forests, with daily management carried out by forest cooperatives. Their efforts focus on nurturing trees through weed control and pruning crowded branches to ensure sufficient sunlight for saplings. Additionally, we host "Forest Creation Days," where JT Group employees volunteer alongside local residents. The project's primary goal is to conserve water sources across Japan. For example, in Yunomae Town, Kumamoto Prefecture, the "JT Forest Yunomae" initiative involves tree planting and forest maintenance aimed at water source preservation. This activity aligns with Kumamoto Prefecture's "Guidelines for Collaborative Forest Creation with Companies and Organizations," which seek to maintain and enhance public functions such as water conservation. Water source conservation contributes to Sustainable Development Goal 6 by naturally filtering pollutants as precipitation seeps into groundwater, preventing soil erosion, and improving water quality by reducing the flow of pollutants into rivers and groundwater.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ GRI
☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water
☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Emission targets

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Governance: P98-125 / Sustainability: P34-63 / Risk factors: P128-131 / Non-financial performance review: P16-17 / Improving our environmental impact (Targets): P140-143

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

integrated2023_E_all.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

TCFD report JTI

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Biodiversity indicators

☑ Deforestation and conversion footprint

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

All included within pages 1 & 2

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

biodiversity_statement.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Biodiversity statement
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents the most extreme level of projected warming. It assumes a significant amount of fossil-fuel development in the jurisdictions in which we

operate, as well as policy focused on free markets and economic growth. The scenario assumes a significant change to the state of nature, and as such the assessment focuses on a projection of acute physical and chronic physical impacts. The physical risk assessment spanned four of our key tobacco growing regions (Turkey, India, Brazil and Malawi). Potential risks in surrounding countries are assumed equivalent to those assessed in these main countries.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our physical scenario analysis, we apply the same models and scenarios used for the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. These are four peer-reviewed and published datasets: - NASA-NEX GDDP (25km x 25km) - Aqueduct Floods (1km x 1km) - Aqueduct water stress (25km x 25km) - STORM dataset (25km x 25km) Our inclusion of the extreme warming scenario within our latest analysis reflects the fact that we consider ourselves to be vulnerable to substantive environmental impacts across our direct operations and supply chain. We are committed through our environmental policy to understand, assess and mitigate where necessary all key/priority risks to our business.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents the most extreme level of projected warming. It assumes a significant amount of fossil-fuel development in the jurisdictions in which we

operate, as well as policy focused on free markets and economic growth. The scenario assumes a significant change to the state of nature, and as such the assessment focuses on a projection of acute physical and chronic physical impacts. The physical risk assessment spanned four of our key tobacco growing regions (Turkey, India, Brazil and Malawi). Potential risks in surrounding countries are assumed equivalent to those assessed in these main countries.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our physical scenario analysis, we apply the same models and scenarios used for the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. These are four peer-reviewed and published datasets: - NASA-NEX GDDP (25km x 25km) - Aqueduct Floods (1km x 1km) - Aqueduct water stress (25km x 25km) - STORM dataset (25km x 25km) Our inclusion of the extreme warming scenario within our latest analysis reflects the fact that we consider ourselves to be vulnerable to substantive environmental impacts across our direct operations and supply chain. We are committed through our environmental policy to understand, assess and mitigate where necessary all key/priority risks to our business.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents the most extreme level of projected warming. It assumes a significant amount of fossil-fuel development in the jurisdictions in which we

operate, as well as policy focused on free markets and economic growth. The scenario assumes a significant change to the state of nature, and as such the assessment focuses on a projection of acute physical and chronic physical impacts. The physical risk assessment spanned four of our key tobacco growing regions (Turkey, India, Brazil and Malawi). Potential risks in surrounding countries are assumed equivalent to those assessed in these main countries.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our physical scenario analysis, we apply the same models and scenarios used for the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. These are four peer-reviewed and published datasets: - NASA-NEX GDDP (25km x 25km) - Aqueduct Floods (1km x 1km) - Aqueduct water stress (25km x 25km) - STORM dataset (25km x 25km) Our inclusion of the extreme warming scenario within our latest analysis reflects the fact that we consider ourselves to be vulnerable to substantive environmental impacts across our direct operations and supply chain. We are committed through our environmental policy to understand, assess and mitigate where necessary all key/priority risks to our business.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

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

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☑ 2030
- ☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents a "Middle of the road" scenario. There are intermediate challenges to mitigation. Progressive emissions reductions have reduced the severity and frequency of environmental extremes, particularly for developing nations.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our physical scenario analysis, we apply the same models and scenarios used for the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. These are four peer-reviewed and published datasets: - NASA-NEX GDDP (25km x 25km) - Aqueduct Floods (1km x 1km) - Aqueduct water stress (25km x 25km) - STORM dataset (25km x 25km) Our inclusion of the "Middle of the road" scenario within our latest analysis reflects the fact that we consider ourselves to be vulnerable to substantive environmental impacts across our direct operations and supply chain. We are committed through our environmental policy to understand, assess and mitigate where necessary all key/priority risks to our business. Based on our analysis of published future scenarios, we consider this scenario to be most reflective of the likely future real-world case, and therefore this is a key scenario within our analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify **:**Rising carbon prices

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents projected warming in line with the Paris Agreement. This scenario assumes stringent climate policies and carbon pricing, rapid technological innovation and changing consumer demands. Therefore, chronic physical risks are anticipated to be lower, but transition risk may be at much higher risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our transition risk analysis, we apply a hierarchy of sources to inform our scenarios. These include those developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). This scenario aligns with our science-aligned emissions reduction targets. We therefore consider this a priority scenario to include in our analysis that aligns with our ambitions as a business for the future world.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents a "Middle of the road" scenario. There are intermediate challenges to mitigation. Progressive emissions reductions have reduced the severity and frequency of environmental extremes, particularly for developing nations.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our physical scenario analysis, we apply the same models and scenarios used for the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. These are four peer-reviewed and published datasets: - NASA-NEX GDDP (25km x 25km) - Aqueduct Floods (1km x 1km) - Aqueduct water stress (25km x 25km) - STORM dataset (25km x 25km) Our inclusion of the "Middle of the road" scenario within our latest analysis reflects the fact that we consider ourselves to be vulnerable to substantive environmental impacts across our direct operations and supply chain. We are committed through our environmental policy to understand, assess and mitigate where necessary all key/priority risks to our business. Based on our analysis of published future scenarios, we consider this scenario to be most reflective of the likely future real-world case, and therefore this is a key scenario within our analysis.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify **:**Rising carbon prices

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents projected warming in line with the Paris Agreement. This scenario assumes stringent climate policies and carbon pricing, rapid technological innovation and changing consumer demands. Therefore, chronic physical risks are anticipated to be lower, but transition risk may be at much higher risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our transition risk analysis, we apply a hierarchy of sources to inform our scenarios. These include those developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). This scenario aligns with our science-aligned emissions reduction targets. We therefore consider this a priority scenario to include in our analysis that aligns with our ambitions as a business for the future world.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents a "Middle of the road" scenario. There are intermediate challenges to mitigation. Progressive emissions reductions have reduced the severity and frequency of environmental extremes, particularly for developing nations.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our physical scenario analysis, we apply the same models and scenarios used for the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. These are four peer-reviewed and published datasets: - NASA-NEX GDDP (25km x 25km) - Aqueduct Floods (1km x 1km) - Aqueduct water stress (25km x 25km) - STORM dataset (25km x 25km) Our inclusion of the "Middle of the road" scenario within our latest analysis reflects the fact that we consider ourselves to be vulnerable to substantive environmental impacts across our direct operations and supply chain. We are committed through our environmental policy to understand, assess and mitigate where necessary all key/priority risks to our business. Based on our analysis of published future scenarios, we consider this scenario to be most reflective of the likely future real-world case, and therefore this is a key scenario within our analysis.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify **:**Rising carbon prices

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents projected warming in line with the Paris Agreement. This scenario assumes stringent climate policies and carbon pricing, rapid technological innovation and changing consumer demands. Therefore, chronic physical risks are anticipated to be lower, but transition risk may be at much higher risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

For our transition risk analysis, we apply a hierarchy of sources to inform our scenarios. These include those developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). This scenario aligns with our science-aligned emissions reduction targets. We therefore consider this a priority

scenario to include in our analysis that aligns with our ambitions as a business for the future world.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

Since 2020 we have completed scenario modelling in 11 countries across 5 continents (Europe, North America, South America, Africa and Asia). Through these scenarios we have identified which physical climate risks have the potential to impact our operations by 2040. For example, we identified that sea-level rise will, for the most part, not impact our operations in either a 2C or 4C scenario. The modelling has helped us to understand this risk has the potential to affect one south-east Asian country and within this country sea level rise is projected to affect less than a third of our operational sites. IPCC's RCP2.6 and RCP8.5 scenarios were selected for modelling so the risk impacts could be assessed across both a

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

The scenario analysis highlighted two primary risks for the forest-related areas of the business. Wildfires currently pose a moderate risk to sites in Africa. Climate projections suggest that, on average, this risk level will remain the same across all sites. However, certain facilities will experience significant changes in risk levels. This may have a significant impact on both the growth of tobacco and the timber in our forests that is grown for curing tobacco. We note the impact this has on the resilience of our business and continue to monitor the risk to ensure the correct mitigation is in place. The other identified significant risk is transition risk related to deforestation policy. In Malawi, current risk of liabilities from anti-deforestation policies is minimal, but under stricter regulation nationally and downstream in the value chain, risk will rise by 2030 and 2050. Net afforestation will be required from 2030, which will further increase regulatory scrutiny of supply chains in the long-term. Comparatively, Tanzania and Zambia have stronger anti-deforestation policies at present although enforcement challenges persist. We acknowledge this as a business and have set company-wide deforestation targets to mitigate this risk, as well as implementing afforestation projects in Japan.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

Increased flooding at various production sites and in our leaf supply chain for example in Japan (where our group HQ is located). Acute Risk: We conducted scenario analysis using external data such as reports by Japan Meteorological Agency. As an example outcome, we identified that climate change may increase precipitation, typhoon intensity and occurrence of large tropical cyclones in Japan. These risks could impact the volume and quality of tobacco leaf we procure, which could result in disruption of our production site operations. In addition, the demand for water may become higher, as the amount of water available for withdrawal decreases due to increased water risks. In particular, the processed food business, which uses a large amount of water in its business activities, is vulnerable to variable water prices as supplies are potentially affected. In the reporting year, the following business decisions were implemented to combat risks associated with water: - roof waterproofing improvement - Underground water piping replacement - water pumping system replacement - warehouse water drain system improvement - water recycling (to melt snow at plants located in areas with heavy snowfall)
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

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

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

We do not currently have a policy to cease all spending on fossil fuel expansion. Due to the global nature of our business we have operations in many locations where omitting to cease spending on fossil fuels is not currently practical from a business continuity perspective including, reliability of energy supply, availability of alternative fuel sources in remote locations and poor electric vehicle infrastructure in many jurisdictions. As a business we have identified ways to reach our 2030 commitments without the need to eliminate fossil fuels completely. We will continue to review and update our climate transition planning alongside macroeconomic and microeconomic trends to remove fossil fuels where practically possible.

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

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

We have the opportunity to meet with each of our various shareholders throughout the year to collect feedback on our environmental goals and initiatives, including our transition plan.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ More frequently than annually

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

Scope 1 & 2 assumptions: - The number of fleet cars remains stable from 2023 to 2030, based on assumptions provided by GIP - The number of kilometres driven by the fleet remains stable from 2023 to 2030, based on assumptions provided by GIP - Renewals in 2029 and 2030 for vehicles contracted for 5 years in 2024 and 2025 are not taken into account. - Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) emissions from hybrid vehicles are included in ""Emissions from ICE"" - Emissions intensity of ICEs and Electric Vehicles (EVs) from 2023 is applied for future years - Costs have been estimated by assuming that the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) for green vehicles is 20% higher than that for ICE vehicles, in-line with the incremental cost increase outlined in the Green Procurement Guidelines. - Electricity consumption remains stable from 2023 to 2030, based on assumptions provided by GIP. - The study includes only the top 30 markets, ranked by electricity consumption. It applies a uniform assumption of increasing the portion of renewable electricity certificates/green tariffs across all these markets. As of June 2024, GIP is conducting a more detailed study, engaging directly with representatives from the markets. - Costs have been estimated by assuming that 1 MWh of renewable electricity will cost 15 more than the average grid electricity, in-line with the incremental cost increase outlined in the Green Procurement Guidelines. Scope 3 - base assumptions: - Volume growth is assumed to remain flat until 2030, as per data provided by Corporate Strategy - Emissions impact of portfolio change (combustibles vs RRP) reflected through NTM and Leaf volumes - The 2023 Scope 3 emissions for Leaf were derived using the 2022 emission intensity - JTI will perform LCAs for 2023 in Q3 2024, which will update the emissions intensity for 2023 - The top 20 NTM suppliers (by emissions) will meet their 2030 targets (internal, CDP, SBTi)

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

In the tobacco business, Scope 1 and 2 19% reduction from 2019 compared with target of 47% by 2030. Scope 3 emissions have increased 3% but we understand why and have a detailed action plan from now until 2030 that helps us to address this. This roadmap brings us within 2% of achieving our overall Scope 3 2030 target. We will work in the coming years to identify additional initiatives to close the 2% gap.

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

5.2_Environment _ JT Global Site.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

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

Biodiversity: we are in the process developing a nature strategy in line with JT Group's biodiversity statement. We have established a Nature Sub Operating Committee and are collaborating with external consultants to undertake a biodiversity ambition, readiness, and hotspot assessments. We are also updating our SBT to align with the latest FLAG requirements. Deforestation: is managed as part of our Nature Sub Operating Committee. Current deforestation commitments: • By 2030, replace all wood from natural forests used in the tobacco curing process of our directly contracted leaf growers with renewable fuel sources. • By 2025, ensure no deforestation of natural forests in the operations and supply chains for tobacco leaf, paper, and pulp-based materials; extend this to our entire supply chain by 2030. • By 2030, achieve zero net deforestation of managed natural forests in the entire tobacco business supply chain. Water commitments to: • Reduce water withdrawal in our own operations by 33% by 2030. • Ensure 100% of JTI's eligible production facilities are certified against the Alliance for Water Stewardship standard by 2030. • Have achieved: achieved a 20% reduction in water abstraction across all stages compared to 2021, with a 6% reduction in the growing stage and an 18% reduction in the production stage. We use these findings to further inform our water reduction and efficiency strategy.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

How have climate-related risks influenced the strategy: In 2022, JTI introduced a new Product Stewardship, Circularity, and Waste pillar within our Corporate Sustainability governance model. In 2023, JTI developed new Circularity Framework and targets for products and packaging, including RRP devices. In 2024, both JT Group and JTI disclosed their Sustainability Strategies with revised sets of targets including ones for circularity. We aim to reduce the environmental impact of our products and packaging and commit to continue investment in R&D, improve in-house LCA model to assess environmental and sourcing impacts throughout entire value chain, embed circular principles, and maintain responsible communication. We work with suppliers to ensure the availability of circular materials and implement a comprehensive plan facilitating work with all business functions. Case study: Since 2021, we have rolled out global initiatives to improve product and packaging circularity. We replaced aluminum inner liners in cigarette packaging with paper ones, enhancing recyclability and reducing emissions. We reduced the volume of cardboard used in packaging and reduced polypropylene overwraps, lowering fossil-based plastic use and emissions. While plastic in our packaging ensures product quality and safety, we aim to further reduce virgin plastics, partnering with suppliers and start-ups to introduce alternatives. We commit to making our packaging

recyclable. We integrate recycled materials into shipping cases and poly wraps. Our filters are made from biobased plastics derived from wood-based materials and we are researching more sustainable alternatives, including paper-based filters. We aim for battery removability and replaceability for 100% of RRP devices shipped to the EU. We educate consumers on responsible disposal through take-back schemes for Ploom devices and consumables and anti-littering campaigns, helping consumers make sustainable choices.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

How have climate-related risks influenced the strategy: JT Group decided to include Scope 3 (supply chain) emissions reduction targets in our JTG Environment Plan 2030 and the tobacco business Sustainability Strategy with time horizon to 2030. Case study: In the JTG Tobacco Sustainability Strategy we now have a target related to emissions reduction associated with purchased goods and services. We will reduce emissions associated with our purchased goods and services by 28% in 2030 comparing to 2019. This will be achieved through reduction from our leaf supply chain and reductions in our non-tobacco materials, such as packaging. Each of our direct leaf sourcing origins has developed an action plan to help achieve the 2030 target. Although in 2023 emissions slightly increased in Scope 3 category 1 (3%) due to increase in leaf volume sourced from higher emission origins and overall volume increase in not tobacco materials, we have a road map to achieve target through curing improvement process, using of renewable wood for curing, NTM supplier engagement program among others actions.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

How have climate-related risks influenced the strategy: JTG now gives increased consideration to the carbon impacts in product and packaging design and materials, in line with our commitment in our JTG Environment Plan 2030 to further reduce the environmental impacts of waste associated with our processes and products. Time horizon is 2030, in line with our JTG Environmental Plan. Case study: We are advancing our commitment by enhancing, evolving, and institutionalizing an in-house LCA process. Since 2019 our tobacco business R&D function invests in building LCA model to better understand the carbon impacts of our product and packaging and to identify the focus areas to reduce associated emissions. Going forward, R&D is implementing measures related to hotspots identified and is expanding the use of LCAs.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

How have climate-related risks influenced the strategy: JT Group revisited targets for emission reductions and renewables in the JTG Environment Plan 2030: We will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from our own operations by 47% by 2030 compared to 2019 and we will increase proportion of renewable electricity that we use to 50% by 2030 and 100% by 2050. We plan to achieve these targets by time horizon of 2030 through energy reduction initiatives, renewable energy generation and purchase as well GHG emission reduction from our fleet vehicles e.g. procurement of green fleet vehicles. Currently we already achieved 21%. Case Study: Through our Environment Opportunities Scheme, our factories have identified and invested in more than 274 projects with total investment of 72 million Yen. Total savings amounted about 324 million Yen. This had an overall simple payback of approximately 3 months. The total carbon saved is about 7,000 tCO2e per annum.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

JT Group conduct water risk related climate scenario analysis for both its own factories and key tobacco growing sites. This analysis identifies sites that are likely to experience climate change-induced flooding and are at higher flooding risk in future. The tool used to conduct this analysis is the WRI's Aqueduct Tool, supplemented with extensive site-level research by independent water security experts. JT Group implemented the assessment process with the intention of identifying possible climate-related water risks and implementing appropriate mitigation actions. We used the CSA results to consult with local teams and understand what mitigation options are being looked at or currently implemented to understand resilience. Adaptation and mitigation actions identified through the assessment are incorporated into the three-year annual and strategic planning processes. An example of resilience in our operations through risk mitigation can be found at one of our factories in North America. The factory roof was identified as needing upgrading in the short term to withstand higher winds and rainfall caused by extreme storms. Through our CSA, we have also identified some tobacco growing regions which are likely to experience climate-related water impacts in the future. The assessment has also informed the inclusion of climate-related risk as an enterprise level risk through our business.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

In Malawi, current risk of liabilities from anti-deforestation policies is minimal, but under stricter regulation nationally and downstream in the value chain, risk will rise by 2030 and 2050. Net afforestation will be required from 2030, which will further increase regulatory scrutiny of supply chains in the long-term. Comparatively,

Tanzania and Zambia have stronger anti-deforestation policies at present although enforcement challenges persist. To address this risk within the business, we have implemented our own deforestation policies, outlining no deforestation or conversion in our own operations and supply chains for tobacco, paper and pulp-based materials by 2025 and in our entire supply chain by 2030. We are also running several projects in Japan focused on conservation and afforestation to contribute to afforestation targets globally and minimise the impact of our business on forests. In relation to the new European Regulation on Deforestation, we are implementing internal reviews with our wood-based suppliers and setting up a monitoring system to better understand and prevent illegal import and usage of materials coming from area of deforestation.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

To combat wildfire risk in our forestry areas of operation, farmers in vulnerable regions are implementing fire prevention measures, such as building fire breaks. This operational change will not minimise the risk but will minimise the impact on our business.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Our forests offer significant opportunity to both protect the planet and financially benefit. Forest biodiversity is a focus area in our Global Supply Chain Leaf Sustainability Framework. For example, our forest rehabilitation project in Brazil has involved replacing 35 hectares of pine tress in the Pirai do Sul National Forest with native species to help restore the natural landscape. We also trained 33 local college students in ecological restoration. In Japan, we have implemented afforestation and forest conservation projects to further develop the company's operations in relation to forestry opportunities. This presents an opportunity to increase site biodiversity, and potentially diversify revenue through payments associated with ecosystem services (also known as PES). These payments are made to farmers or landowners who have agreed to take certain actions to manage their land or watersheds to provide an ecological service.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply
☑ Revenues

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply
☑ Water

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

Flood insurance within JT Group includes lost revenue. Insurance premiums are factored into annual operating costs. One of our third-party manufacturers previously experienced a flood at the factory which affected production in 2018. JT Group revenues were impacted for 7 months with estimated impact of 300 million yen. This was an insured loss. We view the potential magnitude of this impact to be medium. This is considered over a short & medium time horizon. Costs associated with EU-

ETS and cap and trade schemes, as with other operating costs, are included in the Annual and Strategic Plans (ASP) of relevant factories. For example, 230 million yen was included in the ASP plans for our German facility. If operating costs arise from the identification of risks, budget can be requested and approved through the BAP (Business Approval Process) system. We view the potential magnitude of this impact to be low. This is considered over a short time horizon.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Costs associated with EU-ETS and cap and trade schemes, as with other operating costs, are included in the Annual and Strategic Plans (ASP) of relevant factories. For example, 230 million yen was included in the ASP plans for our German facility. If operating costs arise from the identification of risks, budget can be requested and approved through the BAP (Business Approval Process) system. We view the potential magnitude of this impact to be low. This is considered over a short time horizon.

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

If capital expenditures arise from the identification of risks, budget can be requested and approved through the BAP (Business Approval Process) system. We also seek to identify opportunities that reduce carbon emissions and cost at the same time. One of the examples is our factory in Jordan. Thanks to solar steam generation, the factory can cover the majority of its thermal energy demands for tobacco processing and convert part of the solar energy into energy for building heating and for cooling. This reduces the factory's annual carbon footprint over 100 tons and energy cost. Although the direct financial impact for the Company is low, the environmental impact is viewed as medium and hence through improved reputation there is a potential for indirect financial impact to be medium. This is considered over a short & medium & long-time horizon.

Row 4

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Acquisitions and divestments

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Factored into the JT Group business integration planning processes, the costs for which are captured and approved through the BAP (Business Approval Process) system. In particular, we are expanding our geographical footprint and this could increase our carbon footprint. As the company is committed to tackling climate-related issues, we also consider how to reduce emissions at those acquired operations through our financial planning process. In addition, we specifically consider sustainability issues within our due diligence processes. In one of our recent acquisitions, we specifically considered and assessed climate-related risks (including natural disasters). For this particular acquisition it was viewed as a high impact. For the business overall it is viewed as medium impact.

Row 5

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Assets

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Some of JT Group's assets are at risk from climate-related flooding. We insure against this risk. The annual cost of insuring our direct operations against flooding is factored into our financial planning. In 2023, the cost of flood-specific insurance was about 429 million yen. We view the potential magnitude of this impact to be medium. This is considered over a short & medium time horizon.

Row 6

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Our forests offer significant opportunity to both protect the planet and financially benefit the company. Forest biodiversity is a focus area in our Global Supply Chain Leaf Sustainability Framework. For example, our forest rehabilitation project in Brazil has involved replacing 35 hectares of pine tress in the Pirai do Sul National Forest with native species to help restore the natural landscape. We also trained 33 local college students in ecological restoration. In Japan, we have implemented afforestation and forest conservation projects to further develop the company's operations in relation to forestry opportunities. This presents an opportunity to increase site biodiversity, and potentially diversify revenue through payments associated with ecosystem services (also known as PES). These payments are made to farmers or landowners who have agreed to take certain actions to manage their land or watersheds to provide an ecological service.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

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

-33.74

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

257.32

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

-9.99

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

6.8

(5.9.5) Please explain

The reduction in CAPEX in 2023 versus 2022 is due to several big projects that were implemented in 2022. CAPEX projects in 2022 included water and waste water piping updates in several factories in Asia; WWTP replacement in factories; a significant Rainwater collection system in Africa; and an irrigation system upgrade in

North America. In 2023 several factories invested in capital projects, however the total investment was lower than 2022. The most significant 2023 capital investments included improved hot water piping in four Japanese factories; and a large investment in roof waterproofing. We anticipate an increase in CAPEX in future due to significant wastewater treatment plants upgrades; piping improvements; and water systems improvements. Our water-related OPEX also reduced compared to 2022. The decrease in OPEX in 2023 was due to water withdrawal reduction (partially offset by higher water price in some countries) following our implementation of water efficiency initiatives.
[Fixed row]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Carbon

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:
☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply
☑ Drive energy efficiency
☑ Stress test investments
☑ Drive low-carbon investment
☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making

☑ Influence strategy and/or financial planning

☑ Setting and/or achieving of climate-related policies and targets

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment to scientific guidance

☑ Alignment with the price of a carbon tax

☑ Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme

☑ Benchmarking against peers

☑ Price with substantive impact on business decisions

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

An initial price has been set by considering a number of external factors and then analysing a portfolio of historical and future investment projects related to energy efficiency and renewable energy for our facilities. We have calculated the price per tonne of CO2e saved through these projects as a 5 year net present value average.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Evolutionary

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

An initial price has been set by considering a number of external factors and then analysing a portfolio of historical and future investment projects related to energy efficiency and renewable energy for our facilities. We will monitor external factors such as legislation, international standards, scientific guidance and carbon taxation development and review the price and change it where necessary to keep us on track to meet our carbon targets.

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

10529.6

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

10529.6

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

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Operations

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify :ICP is used for CAPEX projects, relating to energy efficiency/reduction and renewables. ICP is applied through business decision-making processes, including Business Approval Process, Enterprise Asset Management and Annual Strategic Planning.

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

50

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

The pricing approach is monitored and evaluated against our progress towards our emissions reductions targets as well as legislation, international standards, scientific guidance and carbon taxation development. The level of pricing is managed accordingly to ensure we continue to make consistent progress towards our targets.
[Add row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Plastics

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

(5.11.3) Primary reason for not engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.11.4) Explain why you do not engage with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Our various risk assessment processes have identified that our upstream supply chain and direct operations are where our material risks, impacts and dependencies lie. Engagement with shareholders is therefore not an immediate priority.

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Impacts or dependencies are defined as substantive when the GHG emissions from energy in the supplier location was classified as "extreme" through the Maplecroft tool. This corresponds to a score of 2.5 or less, out of a possible score of 10. Suppliers with low impact are given a score of 10, while those with high impact are given a score of 0. We use this method to determine the contribution of a suppliers GHG emissions from energy to our overall supplier-related scope 3 emissions.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

1394

Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Impacts or dependencies are defined as substantive when the level of deforestation in the supplier location was classified as "extreme" through the Maplecroft tool. This corresponds to a score of 2.5 or less, out of a possible score of 10. 10 is the score given to suppliers with low impact, and 0 is the score given to suppliers with high impact.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

550

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on water availability

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Impacts or dependencies are defined as substantive when the water stress in the supplier location was classified as "extreme" through the Maplecroft tool. This corresponds to a score of 2.5 or less, out of a possible score of 10. 10 is the score given to suppliers with low impact, and 0 is the score given to suppliers with high impact.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

269
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Business risk is determined through our group risk assessment process, including through our climate Scenario analysis. These processes identify potential substantive and priority risks which are used to identify priority suppliers for engagement on these issues. Also, based on contribution to emissions footprint.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We base our supplier prioritisation for engagement primarily on the outcomes of our environmental risk assessment, including the assessment of level of deforestation. Each supplier is given a score based on this criteria and we will focus our engagement with those who are scoring well. This scoring is primarily associated with our NTM suppliers.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We base our supplier prioritisation for engagement primarily on the outcomes of our water risk assessment, including the assessment of water stress through the Aqueduct and Maplecroft assessment tools.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

JTI supplier standards outline environmental requirements for suppliers that all suppliers must comply with. JTI reserve the right to review suppliers' compliance with these environmental requirements, which can be carried out by JTI employees or third parties. Where non-compliance is identified, suppliers shall cooperate with JTI and agree on and implement appropriate corrective action. In cases where these contractual requirements are breached, JTI may terminate the agreement with that supplier.

Forests

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

JTI supplier standards outline environmental requirements for suppliers that all suppliers must comply with. For forests, this includes compliance with forest-related environmental regulation, deforestation risk laws in the countries of operation. Therefore, this does not cover all of our countries of operation, rather those with strict

and enforced forest-related environmental regulations and with specific, enforced no-deforestation laws such as Brazil. JTI reserves the right to review suppliers' compliance with no deforestation environmental requirements, which can be carried out by JTI employees or third parties. In the case of forestry, farms are visited up to 7 times each year during the crop production cycle and reviewed based on their compliance. Where non-compliance is identified, suppliers shall cooperate with JTI and agree on and implement appropriate corrective action. In cases where these contractual requirements are breached, JTI may terminate the agreement with that supplier.

Water

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

JTI supplier standards outline environmental requirements for suppliers that all suppliers must comply with. JTI reserve the right to review suppliers' compliance with these environmental requirements, which can be carried out by JTI employees or third parties. Where non-compliance is identified, suppliers shall cooperate with JTI and agree on and implement appropriate corrective action. In cases where these contractual requirements are breached, JTI may terminate the agreement with that supplier.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization’s purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Implementation of emissions reduction initiatives

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

JT Group Supplier Standards require all suppliers to optimize use of resources (including water) and minimize wastewater. All critical suppliers are assessed using EcoVadis. Following this assessment, suppliers are provided with their own, customised sustainability scorecard, with actionable insights and improvement areas. This scorecard also allows the suppliers to benchmark themselves against industry peers. During the reporting year, JTI was not made aware of any non-compliant suppliers.

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ No deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

All critical suppliers are assessed using EcoVadis. Following this assessment, suppliers are provided with their own, customised sustainability scorecard, with actionable insights and improvement areas. This scorecard also allows the suppliers to benchmark themselves against industry peers. During the reporting year, JTI was not made aware of any non-compliant suppliers.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

JT Group Supplier Standards require all suppliers to optimize use of resources (including water) and minimize wastewater. All critical suppliers are assessed using EcoVadis. Following this assessment, suppliers are provided with their own, customised sustainability scorecard, with actionable insights and improvement areas. This scorecard also allows the suppliers to benchmark themselves against industry peers. During the reporting year, JTI was not made aware of any non-compliant suppliers.
[Add row]

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

2

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

Having identified key non-tobacco material suppliers that contribute significantly to our carbon footprint, we have been gathering information on their emissions, targets and actions plans to better understand how they will contribute to JTI's emissions footprint and Net-Zero commitments. Going forward, we will be engaging further with our suppliers, to identify opportunities for emissions reduction and to support them in building climate change management programs, where necessary. We have targeted a 28% emissions reduction from engaging with these suppliers and we will consider the engagement successful if this is met. We also measure the percentage of our emissions that are covered by supplier data, with a target of the top 80% of emissions to be covered. During the reporting year, there was a 33% increase in NTM suppliers that now use supplier-specific emissions factors, instead of spend-based (by total emissions). This supplier engagement helps JTI to reduce emissions in the value chain. In addition to the above, our Reduced-Risk Product devices (Vapes and e-cigarettes) belong to consumer electronics industry. JTI is a member of RBA, the world's largest industry coalition dedicated to responsible business conduct in global supply chains of electronics. The RBA Code of Conduct sets expectations of companies to identify the environmental impacts and minimize adverse effects on the community, environment, and natural resources, and more specifically to establish and report against an absolute corporate-wide greenhouse gas reduction goal. Energy consumption and all Scopes 1, 2, and

significant categories of Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions have to be tracked and documented. Companies are also expected to look for methods to improve energy efficiency and to minimize their energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. We engage regularly with our suppliers to discuss their performance and require that they undergo an independent 3rd party audit to verify their performance against RBA Code of Conduct. We have all our RRP suppliers audited, and the audit reports do not indicate any non-conformance related to above environmental topics. Should we identify non-performance of our suppliers pertaining to above expectations, we will engage further with them, request that corrective action plan is in place, and will follow up and monitor its implementation until identified non-conformance is addressed.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement **:**Emissions reduction

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Natural ecosystem restoration and long-term protection

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

The tobacco business is strongly committed to sustainability through its engagement with directly contracted tobacco leaf growers, guided by the Leaf Integrated Sustainability Framework. Addressing deforestation is a top priority, and this issue is managed through systematic, regular visits by Extension Services teams, who meet each grower at least seven times during the crop season. These visits provide tailored guidance on best practices for forest use and management, including the preservation of native forests and the implementation of agroforestry techniques. Such practices not only help mitigate deforestation but also enhance biodiversity and support ecosystem health. Aligned with the Principles of Sustainable Agriculture, the company's sustainability programs focus on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS). GAP training covers essential areas such as soil conservation, efficient water management, and responsible pesticide use, which are crucial for promoting sustainable farming. MAS provides clear guidelines for farm management, helping growers maintain environmental sustainability while improving crop yield and quality. The effectiveness of these initiatives is assessed through participation metrics and follow-up surveys, which track improvements in yield, quality, and compliance with sustainable practices. A significant aspect of the company's environmental strategy is the shift from non-renewable to renewable wood sources for tobacco curing. This transition is vital for reducing the environmental impact of tobacco production. The company has already achieved a 100% renewable wood supply in Brazil and is striving towards the same goal in Tanzania and Zambia. In 2022, these efforts led to a 31% reduction in the use of non-renewable wood, showcasing the success of the company's sustainability initiatives and their impact on reducing deforestation. By engaging closely with growers and promoting sustainable practices, the tobacco business not only addresses environmental challenges but also supports the economic stability and social well-being of tobacco-growing communities. These ongoing efforts are an integral part of the company's broader sustainability strategy, which aims to balance environmental stewardship with the long-term viability of agricultural communities, ensuring that sustainability goals benefit both the environment and the people involved in tobacco production.

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

issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement **:**No deforestation or conversion of natural ecosystems

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

The tobacco business engages with directly contracted tobacco leaf growers, under the 6 pillars of the Leaf Integrated Sustainability Framework. Water-related aspects (i.e. water use, management, protection and conservation) are addressed in a holistic manner at least 7 times throughout the crop season when each contracted grower is visited by the Extension Services teams. This way, we can positively influence the adoption of best agricultural practices for water use and management, to mitigate impact of water stress and reduce the risk of water pollution. Through providing extensive training and promoting Good Agriculture Practices (GAP), our Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS), soil and water management and conservation practices to our growers, they are able to reduce water use, and more efficiently manage, conserve and protect water resources. The metric used to measure success is the abstracted water intensity. Between 2019 and 2023, this decreased by 14%, highlighting that supplier engagement is already having a positive impact on water resource use. In addition to the above, our Reduced-Risk Product devices (Vapes and e-cigarettes) belong to consumer electronics industry. JTI is a member of RBA, the world's largest industry coalition dedicated to responsible business conduct in global supply chains of electronics. The RBA Code of Conduct sets expectations of companies to identify the environmental impacts and to implement a water management program that documents, characterizes, and monitors water sources, use and discharge; seeks opportunities to conserve water, and controls channels of contamination. It is expected that all wastewater is characterized, monitored, controlled, and treated as required prior to discharge or disposal. It is further expected that companies conduct routine monitoring of the performance of their wastewater treatment and containment systems to ensure optimal performance and regulatory compliance. We require that our suppliers undergo an independent 3rd party audit to verify their performance against RBA Code of Conduct. The audit reports do not indicate any non-conformance related to above environmental topics. Should we identify non-performance of our suppliers pertaining to above expectations, we will engage further with them, request that corrective action plan is in place, and will follow up and monitor its implementation until identified non-conformance is addressed.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Reducing total water withdrawal volumes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with smallholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

65315

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

All of our leaf suppliers are expected to follow Good Agricultural Practices (GAP). The concept of GAP is to produce a customized quality crop with increased productivity while protecting, sustaining or enhancing soil, water, air, and animal and plant life. GAP practices are also effective in forest conservation, as they encourage sustainable land management practices that reduce deforestation and protect natural habitats. Forest conservation is essential for sustainable leaf production, as healthy forests maintain soil quality, secure water sources, and preserve biodiversity, all of which directly contribute to stable crop production. The majority of our directly contracted growers are also required to follow our Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS). These growers are contracted to grow tobacco under our stewardship. In return, they receive credit for prescribed crop inputs as well as dedicated extension services from our Agronomy Technicians who work on the ground. This support includes recommendations delivered through a program of scheduled visits throughout the crop cycle. Contracted large-scale commercial growers do not require dedicated extension services from us. Success with growers' engagement is observed through an increased adoption of GAP and MAS Practices recommendations, applicable to local operating environment, with more responsible use and management of crop inputs and natural resources. MAS observations is a platform that enables us to check MAS adherence by contracted growers and identify gaps and challenges to be overcome in the following crop cycle. The same applies for Minimum Forestry Standards (MFS), where growers receive dedicated forestry-related technical assistance and training for woodlot and/or live barn establishment, and success is observed through increased adoption of MFS recommendations; improved tree survival rates, woodlot uniformity and ultimately wood yield/tree and wood yield/ha. A consistent adoption of MAS and MFS provides for multiple benefits for the general farm environmental quality. It also has a direct contribution to reducing natural forest degradation and deforestation.

Row 2

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on sustainable agriculture practices and nutrient management

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

65315

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

All of our leaf suppliers are expected to follow Good Agricultural Practices (GAP). The concept of GAP is to produce a customized quality crop while protecting, sustaining or enhancing soil, water, air, and animal and plant life. The majority of our directly contracted growers are also required to follow our Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS). These growers are contracted to grow tobacco under our stewardship. In return, they receive credit for prescribed crop inputs as well as dedicated extension services from our Agronomy Technicians who work on the ground. This support includes recommendations delivered through a program of scheduled visits throughout the crop cycle. Contracted large-scale commercial growers do not require dedicated extension services from us. This success of sustainable agricultural practices is measured via our target to reach 100% renewable wood supply in Tanzania and Zambia. We have already achieved this target in Brazil. Engaging with tobacco leaf growers and smallholders allowed us to achieve a 31% reduction in non-renewable wood in 2022. Success with growers' engagement is observed through an increased adoption of GAP and MAS Practices recommendations, applicable to local operating environment, with more responsible use and management of crop inputs and natural resources. MAS observations is a platform that enables us to check MAS adherence by contracted growers and identify gaps and challenges to be overcome in the following crop cycle. The same applies for Minimum Forestry Standards (MFS), where growers receive dedicated forestry-related technical assistance and training for woodlot and/or live barn establishment, and success is observed through increased adoption of MFS recommendations; improved tree survival rates, woodlot uniformity and ultimately wood yield/tree and wood yield/ha. A consistent adoption of MAS and MFS provides for multiple benefits for the general farm environmental quality. It also has a direct contribution to reducing natural forest degradation and deforestation.

Row 3

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

☑ Timber products

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Capacity building

☑ Offer on-site technical assistance and extension services

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

65315

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

All of our leaf suppliers are expected to follow Good Agricultural Practices (GAP). The concept of GAP is to produce a customized quality crop while protecting, sustaining or enhancing soil, water, air, and animal and plant life. The majority of our directly contracted growers are also required to follow our Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS). These growers are contracted to grow tobacco under our stewardship. In return, they receive credit for prescribed crop inputs as well as dedicated extension services from our Agronomy Technicians who work on the ground. This support includes recommendations delivered through a program of seven scheduled visits throughout the crop cycle. Contracted large-scale commercial growers do not require dedicated extension services from us. This success of sustainable agricultural practices is measured via our target to reach 100% renewable wood supply in Tanzania and Zambia. We have already achieved this target in Brazil. Engaging with tobacco leaf growers and smallholders allowed us to achieve a 31% reduction in non-renewable wood in 2022. Success with growers' engagement is observed through an increased adoption of GAP and MAS Practices recommendations, applicable to local operating environment, with more responsible use and management of crop inputs and natural resources. MAS observations is a platform that enables us to check MAS adherence by contracted growers and identify gaps and challenges to be overcome in the following crop cycle. The same applies for Minimum Forestry Standards (MFS), where growers receive dedicated forestry-related technical assistance and training for woodlot and/or live barn establishment, and success is observed through increased adoption of MFS recommendations; improved tree survival rates, woodlot uniformity and ultimately wood yield/tree and wood yield/ha. A consistent adoption of MAS and MFS provides for multiple benefits for the general farm environmental quality. It also has a direct contribution to reducing natural forest degradation and deforestation.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Other companies signed up to the same climate initiatives

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

JT Group recognizes the importance of engaging with other partners in the value chain. As part of its engagement strategy, JTG has joined the Japan Climate Initiative (JCI), we understand the importance of, and support, the Net-Zero commitment announced by the Japanese Government. To achieve this commitment an increase in renewable energy is required.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Through the Japan Climate Initiative (JCI) and in conjunction with the other initiative members, JTG placed a statement to request the Japanese government to strengthen its renewable energy target for 2030 from 22-24% to 40-50%. Our Tobacco business set up the target in 2023 to increase proportion of renewable electricity by 50% by 2025 and by 100% by 2040, thus accelerated the timing of target achievement. We have considered our associated scope 3 emissions using the proportion of our scope 3 total accounted for by our Category 3, as these are the Fuel and Energy related activities not included in Scope 1 or 2.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Communities where we operate

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

For many of the communities in which we operate, water remains a precious and scarce resource. That's why in December 2019 we launched our Global WASH (Water and Sanitation, Hygiene) initiative, with the ambitious goal of providing access to clean water and sanitation and hygiene for one million people by the end of 2025. Likewise, it is critical (vital) that we help communities to become more resilient. Water is vital for JT Group's operations; it is also equality important (vital) for the communities in where we operate. Through this engagement we strive to promote inclusive and resilient society. Our local teams, who have partnered with international and local organizations specializing in water and sanitation, hygiene, were able to work with relevant stakeholders in each river basin to bring innovative and sustainable solutions tailored to the specific WASH management needs of each area.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Since the launch of the JTI Global WASH initiative, we have reached over 500,000 people - over 50% of our goal. This is our primary measure of success in this engagement, reaching 1,000,000 beneficiaries. Collaborating with local teams alongside international organizations specializing in WASH, we have been able to bring innovative solutions tailored to the specific needs of communities of each area.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Ploom return scheme in Japan: we wanted to make it easier for consumers to recycle their devices and consumables to ensure that as few as possible end up as litter or in landfills. In 2019, we introduced convenient collection boxes in around 300 shops in Tokyo to collect used Ploom devices, capsules, and cartridges. In 2020, this program was extended to include other tobacco companies and we continue to participate. In 2021, the program was extended, launching throughout Japan. There are now around 1,200 collection points in all 47 Japanese prefectures.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

This customer engagement directly contributes to JTI circularity targets, provides consumers across whole Japan market with access to responsible product waste management. This engagement will be considered successful when 100% of Ploom devices and consumables are being returned, for 100% circularity. Within the reporting year, 74% of devices and 93% of consumables were covered by this scheme in Japan, highlighting that this customer engagement is having a positive impact. This covers less than 1% of associated Scope 3, which is measured using the Category 12: End of life treatment of sold products from out RRP devices. [Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Logistical change

☑ Route optimization

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

JTI UK has committed to set a reductions target for its UK customer distributions and has been working closely with its UK logistics supplier to ensure emissions reductions become a reality. JTI continues to maximise loads to depot and would be delighted if Sainsbury's were to collaborate with us on this continual journey. JTI has also set a global net zero ambition - neutrality by 2030 and Net Zero by 2050.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Reduction of our own supply chain emissions (our own scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**1-10 years

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

JTG would be interested in collaborating with SJ Sainsbury Plc to reduce emissions associated with logistics. The first stage of this collaboration would be an assessment of the amount of CO2e savings that could be achieved.

Row 2

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Logistical change

☑ Route optimization

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

JTG has committed to set a reductions target for its UK customer distributions and has been working closely with its UK logistics supplier to ensure emissions reductions become a reality. JTI continues to maximise loads to depot and would be delighted if Costco were to collaborate with us on this continual journey. JTI has also set a global net zero ambition - neutrality by 2030 and Net Zero by 2050.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Reduction of our own supply chain emissions (our own scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :1-10 years

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

JTG would be interested in collaborating with SJ Costco to reduce emissions associated with logistics. The first stage of this collaboration would be an assessment of the amount of CO2e savings that could be achieved.
[Add row]

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

(5.13.1) Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement

Select from:

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

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.13.3) Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives

JTG identifies priority environmental initiatives based on the results of our assessments of risks, dependencies and opportunities. Priority environmental initiatives are typically developed into business cases which if approved are incorporated into our Annual and Strategic Planning process. In the reporting year, JTG has prioritised alternative initiatives throughout its direct operations and supply chain, however it is likely that mutually beneficial initiatives through CDP Supply Chain engagement will become priorities in the future.
[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational control was chosen as the JTG-wide consolidation approach as we do not have partial ownership of sites, nor significant financial investments that would benefit the use of the equity share or financial control approach.

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational control was chosen as the JTG-wide consolidation approach as we do not have partial ownership of sites, nor significant financial investments that would benefit the use of the equity share or financial control approach.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational control was chosen as the JTG-wide consolidation approach as we do not have partial ownership of sites, nor significant financial investments that would benefit the use of the equity share or financial control approach.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational control was chosen as the JTG-wide consolidation approach as we do not have partial ownership of sites, nor significant financial investments that would benefit the use of the equity share or financial control approach.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational control was chosen as the JTG-wide consolidation approach as we do not have partial ownership of sites, nor significant financial investments that would benefit the use of the equity share or financial control approach.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a change in methodology

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

Methodology changes came about due to updates and reconfiguration of the company's emissions calculation system. Emission factors have been updated, and slight errors in the system around specific sites and emission factors have been fixed.
[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2, location-based
☑ Scope 2, market-based
☑ Scope 3

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

Base year emissions are recalculated in the event of a change in calculation methodology or reporting boundary that yields a change of 5% or more from previously calculated emissions totals.

(7.1.3.4) Past years’ recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Japan Ministry of the Environment, Law Concerning the Promotion of the Measures to Cope with Global Warming, Superseded by Revision of the Act on Promotion of Global Warming Countermeasures (2005 Amendment)

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

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*No further comment*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

367716.98

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

425624.11

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We calculate a location based figure for the purposes of CDP reporting and use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) for this purpose.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

368836.28

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We adopt a market-based approach and in Japan we use GHG emission conversion factors for each electricity supplier, as published by the Japanese government for the latest available year. In other countries, following the GHG protocol market-based reporting guidance, we first account for supplier-specific GHG emission conversion factors, where electricity has been contracted at specific emissions intensities. If supplier-specific tariffs are not applicable, we apply residual grid-mix factors, such as those published by Green-e and the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), where available. Finally, we use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the U.K. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as country grid averages to ensure that all our electricity consumption is accounted for within the emissions totals.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6293157.67

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We multiplied annual procurement volume (in terms of mass or cost) by procurement item by emission factor of each item, then aggregated those calculation results. For tobacco leaf, we used the emission factor that we originally created from tobacco farmers' primary activity data – this is based on internal lifecycle assessment (LCA). For JTI direct sourcing, the procurement volumes of leaf was based on the crop year. Whereas for JTI indirect sourcing, this is determined by the year it was purchased. For raw materials, except tobacco leaf, we used supplier specific emission factors for key suppliers and where data was reliable and available. For all other purchased goods and services, we applied the emission factors sourced from third-party databases, such as CEDA ("Comprehensive Environmental Data Archive"), an economic input-output database, Eco-invent, and "Database of GHG Emission Factors" of Japan's CFP Communication Program database.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

307029.73

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We multiplied the annual capital investment amount by business unit by emission factors per business unit, then aggregated the calculation results. We applied the emission factors provided by CEDA ("Comprehensive Environmental Data Archive"), an economic input-output database, "3EID (Embodied Energy and Emission Intensity Data for Japan Using Input-Output Tables)" published by National Institute for Environmental Studies and one of "available third-party databases" listed by GHG Protocol, the data of the "Fixed Capital Matrix (public/private)"

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

194517.32

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We multiplied annual consumption amount by type of energy in by emission factors, then aggregated the calculation results. For emission factors of electricity, we used country-specific emission factors, based on IEA (International Energy Agency) Emission Factors published in 2023, including upstream generated emissions, and emissions from line losses. For other emission factors, we used the data from the "Database of GHG Emission Factors" of the CFP Communication Program; or the data from DESNZ (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero).

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

396847.13

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emissions associated with transportation by “distributors within the JT Group” were not included in this Category 4 of Scope 3, as those emissions are included JT’s Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Therefore, the calculation scope we covered in this category is the emissions associated with transportations by “distributors outside of the JT Group”. Distribution for procurement: For the emissions associated with transportations by distributors outside of the JT Group, we applied primary logistic data provided by distributors, or the average transportation scenario created by the JT Group, then calculated the emissions by using the ton-kilometer method. We used the emission factors of the "Database of GHG Emission Factors" of the CFP Communication Program; or the data of DESNZ and the method of "The Revised Energy Conservation Law".

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14412

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We collected data on amount of production waste generated, recycled and waste disposed from our sites, then multiplied them by emission factors referring to the materials published by MOE, or emission factors for waste recycled and waste sent to landfill taken from DESNZ.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

146490.8

(7.5.3) Methodological details

"All but Tobacco Business: We aggregated payments for business travel expenses of each company in the JT Group excluding our international tobacco business, then calculated the emissions by multiplying the calculation results by emission factors per money amount. We used the emission factors of the ""3EID"" by National Institute for Environmental Studies, and the RFI figure, “2.7,” from the report (1999) by IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). Tobacco business: Emissions from air travels were calculated by identifying the total km per business travel, and then by multiplying them by the emission factors for short-, medium- and long-haul flights extracted from DESNZ. Due to data availability constraints, the data on rail and road (hired vehicles and taxis) are not included this time, however, we plan to include them in future calculations."

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42929.29

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculated emissions by making representative scenario assumptions (the average commuting times, types of vehicles and distances) by the means of commuting at each business location. For emission factors, we mainly used the data from the "Database of GHG Emission Factors" of the CFP Communication Program, or the data of DESNZ.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

700.02

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The leased assets that the JT Group uses are outside warehouses. We calculated the emissions associated with the outside warehouses, by multiplying the calculated emissions per the JT Group's warehouse by the spaces of the outside warehouses. For emission factors of electricity, we used country-specific emission factors, based on IEA (International Energy Agency) Emission Factors, including upstream generated emissions, and emissions from line losses.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

262075.11

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The emissions associated with transportation and sales are calculated by multiplying the ton-kilometer figure with emission factors. For transportation, the ton-kilometer value represents logistical data provided by distributors or an average scenario, and emission factors from DESNZ or CFP are applied. Sales emissions encompass both vending machines and stores, with vending machine emissions determined by estimating annual consumption per machine and multiplying it by the number of machines owned. The electricity consumption is then combined with grid consumption factors to determine emissions. Store emissions are calculated based on energy consumption related to the spaces occupied by tobacco products, using market-specific data. Overall, these calculations enable the assessment of emissions generated through transportation and sales activities.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1156.13

(7.5.3) Methodological details

"This category covers the followings: The emissions from processing of sold tobacco leaf in operations outside of our international tobacco business: Firstly, we assumed that these factories have a similar energy intensity, per unit of production, as the factories within our international tobacco business. Then we multiplied the total amount of leaf sold to third parties in the reporting year, by the energy intensity of factories that are within our international tobacco business. The emissions associated with products for business use which are provided by the Processed food business: We excluded this activity from the calculation, because of the difficulty in collection data etc."

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27155.2

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers: The emissions associated with cigarette combustion produced by the tobacco business: For the emissions from the combustion of cigarettes is split between biogenic carbon emissions and non-biogenic emissions. Biogenic CO2 emissions are accounted for as out of scopes. For the non-biogenic emissions, the CO2 emissions from non-biomass elements of the cigarette and the non-CO2e emissions of the biomass elements of the cigarette were calculated and multiplied by the number of cigarettes sold. The lifetime electricity emissions associated with charging our Reduced Risk Products (RRP): We aggregated annual electricity consumption amount and calculated the emissions by multiplying the aggregated energy consumption amount by emission factors. For emission factors of electricity, we used country-specific emission factors, based on IEA (International Energy Agency) Emission Factors, including upstream generated emissions, and emissions from line losses.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

69230.56

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In Japan, we used the data from the "Law for Promotion of Sorted Collection and Recycling of Containers and Packaging" for annual disposal volumes by type of wastes, then multiplied them by emission factors by type of wastes. We originally created the emission factors the emission factors by referring to the materials published by MOE. We multiplied annual disposal volume of each Non-Tobacco Material item (i.e. cigarette butts, cigarette cartons, bulk packaging) by the relevant emission factor. For the emission factors, we made some assumptions on % and weight of product used / disposed based on our research, and the emission factors for different types of materials sent to landfill or disposed of (taken from DESNZ).

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1242.14

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The JT Group owns buildings and leases part of them to other companies. We aggregated annual energy consumption amount and calculated the emissions by multiplying the aggregated energy consumption amount by emission factors. For emission factors of electricity, we used country-specific emission factors, based on IEA (International Energy Agency) Emission Factors, including upstream generated emissions, and emissions from line losses.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4046.35

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions from the operation of licensees. For the emissions associated with manufacturing and distributions of tobacco by such licensees, we assumed that a licensee has the same energy intensity, per unit of production, as our operations do at full capacity. We firstly calculated the emission factor per unit production for the year, and then calculated the licensees' emissions by multiplying the emission factor by the "number of cigarettes produced by licensees".

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We exclude this category from our calculation after assessing its relevance to JT's business. To determine its exclusion or inclusion, we referred to the "Relevance criteria for Scope 3 emissions sources" in the "Guidance for companies reporting on climate change on behalf of investors & supply chain members 2014," specifically Box 31. Criteria considered: (a) "Size": Companies in our investment destinations with significant emissions in the Investment category (e.g., Japan Filter Technology, Ltd., Fuji Flavor Co., Ltd.) were already included in our Scope 1 and 2 emissions, confirming their limited contribution to Scope 3 emissions. (b) "Influence": Many investment destination companies, such as finance and railroad companies, have little relation to JT's business, indicating limited potential for emissions reduction. (c) Other Criteria: Our investment destinations did not meet any additional relevant criteria. Based on these assessments, we excluded this category from our calculation.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No further comments

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No further comments
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

341572.371

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.

Past year 1

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

339923.448

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.

Past year 2

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

351613.066

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.

Past year 3

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

339294.864

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2020

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.

Past year 4

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

367716.984

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2019

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.
[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

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

364218.599

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

240449.963

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We calculate a location based figure for the purposes of CDP reporting and use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) for this purpose. We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We adopt a market-based approach and in Japan we use GHG emission conversion factors for each electricity supplier, as published by the Japanese government for the latest available year. In other countries, following the GHG protocol market-based reporting guidance, we first account for supplier-specific GHG emission conversion factors, where electricity has been contracted at specific emissions intensities. If supplier-specific tariffs are not applicable, we apply residual grid-mix factors, such as those published by Green-e and the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), where available. Finally, we use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the U.K. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as country grid averages to ensure that all our electricity consumption is accounted for within the emissions totals.

Past year 1

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

382959.965

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

275978.984

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We calculate a location based figure

for the purposes of CDP reporting and use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) for this purpose. We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We adopt a market-based approach and in Japan we use GHG emission conversion factors for each electricity supplier, as published by the Japanese government for the latest available year. In other countries, following the GHG protocol market-based reporting guidance, we first account for supplier-specific GHG emission conversion factors, where electricity has been contracted at specific emissions intensities. If supplier-specific tariffs are not applicable, we apply residual grid-mix factors, such as those published by Green-e and the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), where available. Finally, we use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the U.K. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as country grid averages to ensure that all our electricity consumption is accounted for within the emissions totals.

Past year 2

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

409825.718

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

295122.092

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We calculate a location based figure for the purposes of CDP reporting and use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) for this purpose. We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We adopt a market-based approach and in Japan we use GHG emission conversion factors for each electricity supplier, as published by the Japanese government for the latest available year. In other countries, following the GHG protocol market-based reporting guidance, we first account for supplier-specific GHG emission conversion factors, where electricity has been contracted at specific emissions intensities. If supplier-specific tariffs are not applicable, we apply residual grid-mix factors, such as those published by Green-e and the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), where available. Finally, we use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the U.K. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as country grid averages to ensure that all our electricity consumption is accounted for within the emissions totals.

Past year 3

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

410211.927

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

318678.826

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We calculate a location based figure for the purposes of CDP reporting and use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) for this purpose. We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We adopt a market-based approach and in Japan we use GHG emission conversion factors for each electricity supplier, as published by the Japanese government for the latest available year. In other countries, following the GHG protocol market-based reporting guidance, we first account for supplier-specific GHG emission conversion factors, where electricity has been contracted at specific emissions intensities. If supplier-specific tariffs are not applicable, we apply residual grid-mix factors, such as those published by Green-e and the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), where available. Finally, we use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the U.K. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as country grid averages to ensure that all our electricity consumption is accounted for within the emissions totals.

Past year 4

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

425624.111

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

368836.275

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2019

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We calculate a location based figure for the purposes of CDP reporting and use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) for this purpose. We calculate Scope 2 GHG emissions based on actual energy consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. We adopt a market-based approach and in Japan we use GHG emission conversion factors for each electricity supplier, as published by the Japanese government for the latest available year. In other countries, following the GHG protocol market-based reporting guidance, we first account for supplier-specific GHG emission conversion factors, where electricity has been contracted at specific emissions intensities. If supplier-specific tariffs are not applicable, we apply residual grid-mix factors, such as those published by Green-e and the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), where available. Finally, we use GHG emission conversion factors provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the U.K. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as country grid averages to ensure that all our electricity consumption is accounted for within the emissions totals.
[Fixed row]

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

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

6465650.31

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Average product method

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

33

(7.8.5) Please explain

Supplier specific data was collected from NTM and Leaf suppliers for formulation of supplier specific emissions factors. Calculation using these factors wade up 32.64% of Category 1 emissions.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

299269.82

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

175392.22

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

414380.33

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

8798.31

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

159084.95

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

28393.29

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

685.07

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Asset-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

276646.45

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2124.23

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Asset-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

41937.32

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Average product method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

113218.68

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

97.07

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Asset-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

11394.88

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Franchise-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We exclude this category from the calculation. To judge exclusion or inclusion of this category, we have checked whether our investment destinations, that are applicable to our Scope 3, have relation to JT's business or not, by referring to Box 31:,"Relevance criteria for Scope 3 emissions sources" in "Guidance for companies reporting on climate change on behalf of investors & supply chain members 2014". (a) "Size": Of our investment destinations, companies which have significant emissions in the Investment category (e.g. Japan Filter Technology, Ltd., Fuji Flavor Co., Ltd., etc.) were already included in our Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Thereby, we confirmed that those emissions do not contribute significantly to our total Scope 3 emissions. (b) "Influence": For our investment destinations, many companies have little relation to JT's businesses (e.g. finance company and railroad company). For that reason, we confirmed that we have little potential to reduce such companies' emissions. (c) Rest of the Criteria: We confirmed that our investment destinations do not fall under any of the rest of the Criteria.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

No further comments
[Fixed row]

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2022

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

5734395.49

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

232656.75

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

182408.7

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

459429.78

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

8222.42

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

47440.67

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

38902.71

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

630.04

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

268181.35

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

3114.08

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

25276.29

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

95941.88

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

90.72

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

6551.46

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

All calculations were completed using the updated 2023 methodology.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2021

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

5101388.55

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

259752.01

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

196423.17

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

380561.3

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

9886.71

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

14458.05

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

35773.58

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

425.64

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

263798.96

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

1742.82

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

17987.12

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

81805.02

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

79.86

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

4948.86

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

All calculations were completed using the updated 2023 methodology.

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2020

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

6018168.43

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

271817.57

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

186707.13

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

366848.97

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

10533.06

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

31830.96

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

39589.37

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

664.67

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

271307.57

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

1754.61

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

21273.56

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

80440.97

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

958.66

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

4794.99

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

All calculations were completed using the updated 2023 methodology.

Past year 4

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2019

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

6293157.67

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

307029.73

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

194517.32

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

396847.13

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

14412

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

146490.8

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

42929.29

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

700.02

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

262075.11

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

1156.13

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

27155.2

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

69230.56

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

1242.14

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

4046.35

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

All calculations were completed using the updated 2023 methodology.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Independent_Assurance_Statement_Environment.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Independent_Assurance_Statement_Environment.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

All

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

Independent_Assurance_Statement_Environment.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10234.145

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.66

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2023, the procurement of renewable energy through the use of non-fossil certificates and the increased use of renewable electricity generated (Solar PV) decreased emissions by 10,234 tCO2e.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

991.867

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.16

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

JT Group continue to invest in emissions reductions activities in our operations. Energy efficiency improvements in the production process, for example replacement of machinery, improvements to heating/ventilation/air conditioning systems, introduction of smart control systems.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17844.037

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Processed food business production volume reduced comparing to 2022 resulting in emissions reduction by 17,844 tCO2e.Emissions year on year change.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No further comment.
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.13.1) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

No further comment.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

No further comment.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

108549.76

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Field measurements

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Our Tobacco Business use bioethanol used in vehicles, and combustion of biomass and wood for energy. One of our Processed food business sites generates energy using rice husk and the figure stated is associated with the combustion.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

430.68

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Bioethanol fuel consumption in our vehicles is multiplied by an emissions factor of 0.911 kg/litre per litre of fuel, as published by DEFRA/BEIS.
[Fixed row]

(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

Timber products

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, but we intend to calculate this data within the next two years

(7.14.7) Explain why you do not calculate GHG emissions for this commodity

We are in the process of collecting and validating all of our timber-related data. There have been challenges associated with collecting this data accurately as it comes from our tier 2 suppliers. We are in the process of collecting and validating this volumetric data so that we can accurately calculate the associated emissions.

Tobacco

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4523330

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(7.14.6) Please explain

We calculate GHG emissions associated with different tobacco leaf types from our directly contracted growers using emission factors calculated by Life-Cycle Assessments. Regional averages from the LCAs are also applied to tobacco leaf sourced from third party suppliers. Emissions increased in 2023 comparing to 2022 due to sourcing from countries with higher emission factors and increased purchased volume. Action plan is in place to reduce these emissions.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

319819.17

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ HFCs

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

21753.21

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

Algeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

321.88

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

14.96

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

14.96

Andorra

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

40.22

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

160.38

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

22.63

Armenia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

170.13

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

12.78

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

12.78

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

617.71

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

823.83

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

391.66

Azerbaijan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

320.57

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

52.53

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

51.39

Bangladesh

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11565.1

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

3658.17

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

3774.75

Belarus

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

454.45

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

71.39

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

71.39

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

326.36

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

17.09

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

1.65

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

372.34

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

38.8

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

40.38

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4510.19

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

2324.81

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

74.63

Bulgaria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

175.45

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

71.49

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

87.4

Cambodia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1006.65

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

214.65

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

214.65

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3994.02

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

1587.27

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

589.78

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3756.53

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

13305.34

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

13304.59

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

565.22

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

84.84

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

127.43

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

72.15

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

0.53

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

2.71

Egypt

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1582.39

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

813.93

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

815.96

Ethiopia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9301.02

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

0.76

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

0.76

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1038.84

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

12.06

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

28.95

Georgia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

216.22

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

12.04

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

14.95

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35732.18

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

9716.31

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

12.59

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

479.12

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

1761.7

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

171.39

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

122.24

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

122.24

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

330.96

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

18.16

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

30.42

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1413.94

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

8785.26

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

191.37

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19784

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

3700.46

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

3700.46

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

84.99

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

106.98

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

119.34

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

172.43

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

31.51

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

0

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

102794.31

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

154132.21

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

137536.36

Jordan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

979.2

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

4013.04

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

4013.04

Kazakhstan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2820.88

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

4924.53

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

4924.53

Kyrgyzstan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

202.96

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

6.38

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

6.23

Lebanon

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

203.03

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

4.96

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

4.96

Lithuania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

49.28

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

3.85

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

26.68

Malawi

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6515.24

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

33426.35

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

440.88

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

988.69

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

196.62

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

187.32

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1302.07

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

26.8

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

27.81

Mongolia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

52.4

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

15.73

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

15.73

Morocco

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

571.15

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

71.45

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

75.66

Myanmar

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2710.58

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

355.26

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

355.26

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

170.27

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

66.13

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

39.52

Nigeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

365.24

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

8.33

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

8.33

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13491.09

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

30892.76

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

2033.85

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8828.65

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

42292.68

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

729.15

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

311.95

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

2.63

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

7.74

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2099.81

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

67.97

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

65.1

Republic of Moldova

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

177.15

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

21.65

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

20.99

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4573.96

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

5023.54

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

223.14

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

41574.68

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

22753.04

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

22753.04

Serbia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1142.36

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

2570.05

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

131.59

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

360.18

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

72.76

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

74.22

Slovakia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

333.38

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

28.34

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

36.62

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

452.45

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

211.07

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

210.44

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

987.44

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

2800.58

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

1611.34

Sudan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1037.86

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

913.35

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

913.35

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

305.88

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

51.31

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

36.89

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

527.68

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

340.08

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

51.27

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1764.89

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

14188.25

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

14188.25

Tajikistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0.11

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

0.11

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5530.61

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

18834.05

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

18833.82

Tunisia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

179.15

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

12.79

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

12.94

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22898.53

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

706.08

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

93.82

Ukraine

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3239.95

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

3355.94

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

3355.94

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

72.03

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

45.77

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

45.77

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1292.38

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

434.28

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

3.5

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8316.04

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

295.83

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

313.96

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3460.56

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

3476.88

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

3000.61

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35.66

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

5.99

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

5.99

Zambia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

454.14

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

43.02

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

61.84
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division

☑ By facility

☑ By activity

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Tobacco*	*262248.44*
Row 2	*Processed Food*	*73196.07*
Row 3	*Pharmaceuticals*	*5933.89*
Row 4	*Other*	*193.96*

[Add row]

(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Tokyo

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

79323.93

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

35.665422

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

139.745132

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Geneva

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

262248.44

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

46.222221

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

6.146136
[Add row]

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Manufacturing*	*253141.24*
Row 2	*R&D*	*8250.46*

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 3	*Use of company owned vehicles*	*75449.21*
Row 4	*Sales/office work*	*4732.01*

[Add row]

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.

Row 1

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

266128.92

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.

Row 2

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Distribution

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

75317.34

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

We calculate Scope 1 GHG emissions based on actual energy and fuel consumption at our sites and locations from invoices and meters. Where this information is not available, we use extrapolations based on actual data from a similar site or location to provide estimated energy consumption, which is then used to calculate associated GHG emissions. Production volumes, floor area, or full-time equivalent (FTE) data are the main benchmarks used to calculate intensity metrics used in the extrapolation process. Refrigerant emissions are reported as part of Scope 1 emissions by equating the necessary refrigerant replenishment to what would previously have leaked into the atmosphere. Liquid CO2 usage in production is also captured. Appropriate GWPs (Global Warming Potential) are applied to leaked volumes of each individual refrigerant type and to liquid CO2 consumption.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By facility

☑ By activity

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Tobacco*	*261004.73*	*133961.89*
Row 2	*Processed Food*	*94075.76*	*98834.96*
Row 3	*Pharmaceuticals*	*8689.52*	*7279.53*
Row 4	*Other*	*448.59*	*373.58*

[Add row]

(7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility.

	Facility	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Tokyo*	*103213.87*	*106488.07*

	Facility	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 2	*Geneva*	*261004.73*	*133961.89*

[Add row]

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Manufacturing*	*323590.11*	*204461.76*
Row 2	*R&D*	*19907.24*	*16296.76*
Row 3	*Warehousing/Logistics*	*209.37*	*192.13*
Row 4	*Sales/Office work*	*20512.88*	*19499.3*

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

341572.371

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

357373.419

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

240449.963

(7.22.4) Please explain

The consolidated accounting group includes all entities within the Japan Tobacco Group.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

The consolidated accounting group includes all entities within the Japan Tobacco Group, there are no other entities.
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary.

Row 1

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

JPPM Fuji Flavour

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Chemicals wholesale & distribution

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ Other unique identifier, please specify **:** The Corporate Numbers are 13-digit identifiers assigned by the National Tax Agency to companies and other organizations registered in Japan.

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

5013101000755

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1370.03

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1974.31

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1104.46

(7.23.1.15) Comment

https://www.houjin-bangou.nta.go.jp/en/index.html

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

JPPL Japan Filter Technology

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Paper products

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify **:** The Corporate Numbers are 13-digit identifiers assigned by the National Tax Agency to companies and other organizations registered in Japan.

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

6011001045259

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

932.97

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7586.88

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7902.79

(7.23.1.15) Comment

https://www.houjin-bangou.nta.go.jp/en/index.html

Row 3

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

JT Logistics

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Intermodal transport

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify **:** The Corporate Numbers are 13-digit identifiers assigned by the National Tax Agency to companies and other organizations registered in Japan.

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

9011001044828

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

351.87

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

240.98

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

236.91

(7.23.1.15) Comment

https://www.houjin-bangou.nta.go.jp/en/index.html

Row 4

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

JT Engineering

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Other professional services

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify **:** The Corporate Numbers are 13-digit identifiers assigned by the National Tax Agency to companies and other organizations registered in Japan.

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

1010601031169

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.11

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15.32

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15.32

(7.23.1.15) Comment

https://www.houjin-bangou.nta.go.jp/en/index.html

Row 5

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

TableMark CO., Ltd

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify **:** The Corporate Numbers are 13-digit identifiers assigned by the National Tax Agency to companies and other organizations registered in Japan.

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

8470001010919

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39272.004

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32884.528

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

37917.873

(7.23.1.15) Comment

https://www.houjin-bangou.nta.go.jp/en/index.html

Row 6

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Fuji foods Corporation

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Food & beverage wholesale

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify **:** The Corporate Numbers are 13-digit identifiers assigned by the National Tax Agency to companies and other organizations registered in Japan.

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

2020001030496

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3541.714

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3097.096

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2800.999

(7.23.1.15) Comment

https://www.houjin-bangou.nta.go.jp/en/index.html
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Ahold Delhaize's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

81800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

39.9571

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Gas and fuel used during our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Ahold Delhaize represents (0.02%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Ahold Delhaize's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

81800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20.4109

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity (market based) use through our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 2 (market-based) figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 2 (market-based) emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Ahold Delhaize represents (0.02%) Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Ahold Delhaize's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

81800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1016.8418

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Upstream Scope 3 categories

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our JTI scope 3 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 3 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Ahold Delhaize represents (0.02%) Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Salling Group A/S's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

67760000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

33.0989

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Gas and fuel used during our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Salling Group represents (0.01%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Salling Group A/S's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

67760000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

16.9076

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity (market based) use through our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 2 (market-based) figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 2 (market-based) emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Salling Group represents (0.01%) Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Salling Group A/S's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

67760000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

842.313

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Upstream Scope 3 categories

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our JTI scope 3 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 3 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Salling Group represents (0.01%) Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Empire Company Limited’s compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

837200000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

408.9494

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Gas and fuel used during our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Empire Company represents (0.16%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Empire Company Limited’s compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

837200000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

208.8998

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity (market based) use through our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 2 (market-based) figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 2 (market-based) emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Empire Company represents (0.16%) Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Empire Company Limited’s compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

837200000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10407.0903

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Upstream Scope 3 categories

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Taken from our JTI scope 3 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 3 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Empire Company represents (0.16%) Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to J Sainsbury Plc's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

1049000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

512.4079

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Gas and fuel used during our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Sainsbury represents (0.2%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to J Sainsbury Plc's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

1049000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

261.7485

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity (market based) use through our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and

assumptions made

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Sainsbury represents (0.2%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to J Sainsbury Plc's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

1049000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

13039.9399

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Upstream Scope 3 categories

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Sainsbury represents (0.2%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Costco Wholesale Corporation's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

548000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

268

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Gas and fuel used during our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Costco represents (0.1%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Costco Wholesale Corporation’s compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

548000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

137

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity (market based) use through our direct operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Costco represents (0.1%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a

Row 15

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Allocation based on the proportion of cigarette stick equivalents sold to Costco Wholesale Corporation's compared to total cigarette stick equivalents produced by JTI.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Other unit, please specify :Cigarette stick equivalents.

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

548000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6812.09

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

2

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Upstream Scope 3 categories

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Taken from our verified JTI Scope 1 figures. The breakdown can be found in section 7 of our 2023 public CDP response. We have allocated scope 1 emissions in proportion to cigarette stick equivalents that Costco represents (0.1%). Our emissions are generated creating the products we sell downstream. We have applied a 2% uncertainty to our allocation. This is due to the fact that some of our products are not cigarettes. E.g. shisha, snus.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

n/a
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ We face no challenges

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

No further comment.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

JTG already provides information about allocated emissions to our customers if requested, but we are continuously improving methodology of data calculation. [Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:*

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
	☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

225447.41

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1267421.68

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1492869.1

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

236463.11

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

569608.73

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

806071.85

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1583.33

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

7811.86

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

9395.2

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

491.29

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

491.29

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

16308.33

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

16308.33

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

480293.48

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1844842.28

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

2325135.76
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:*

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
	☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

225447.41

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

27911.24

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

164757.07

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

26797.53

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

5981.57

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

18477.16

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

18477.16

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

169598.51

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

168326.48

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

1272.04

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1079345.87

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1079345.87

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1492868.96

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

27911.24

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1430906.58

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

26797.53

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

7253.61

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No further comments.
[Fixed row]

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

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

45493.61

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

45487.61

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

44221.57

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

44215.57

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

1753379.81

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1753379.81

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

164757.17

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

164757.17

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

26939

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

26939

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

26798

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

26798

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

27712

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG sites in Germany purchase electricity from third parties which is sourced from renewable generation sources backed by Guarantees of Origin.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Romania

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Hydropower, Solar, Biomass

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

17288

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Romania

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG sites in Romania purchase electricity from third parties which is sourced from renewable generation sources backed by Guarantees of Origin.

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

1397

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2013

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG sites in Sweden purchase steam from third parties which is sourced from renewable generation sources backed by Guarantees of Origin.

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

10716

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Canada

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Hydro power based supply in Canada

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Serbia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

3449

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Serbia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG sites in Serbia purchase electricity from third parties and separately also purchase Guarantees of Origin which are retired on their behalf.

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

3700.72

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG's Batangas site in the Philippines has an on-site Solar PPA. Solar generated energy is purchased from an on site installation owned by a third party.

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

36894.28

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2017

(7.30.14.10) Comment

A JTG site in Asia Pacific purchases electricity from third parties which is sourced from renewable / low carbon generation sources backed by energy attribute certificates (iRECs/TIGRs).

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Poland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Wind, Hydropower, Solar, Biomass

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

64029

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Poland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG sites in Poland purchase electricity from third parties and separately also purchase Guarantees of Origin which are retired on their behalf.

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Greece

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

4829

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Greece

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in Greece purchase electricity from third parties and separately also purchase Guarantees of Origin which are retired on their behalf.

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Heat, steam and cooling combined

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

350

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Steam purchased by our site in Sweden generated from a renewable source.

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

8657.55

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Certified by JQA (Japan Quality Assurance)

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

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2012

(7.30.14.10) Comment

It is a certificate of the environmental value generated electricity and heat by renewable energy. It is certified by JQA(Japan Quality Assurance).

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

113

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in Belgium purchases electricity from third parties and separately also purchase Guarantees of Origin which are retired on their behalf.

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Austria

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

3871.83

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Austria

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in Austria purchases renewable electricity from a third party which is backed by RECs.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Switzerland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

12437.72

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in Switzerland purchases renewable electricity from a third party which is backed by RECs.

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

743.28

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

The generation of solar electricity at JTI Switzerland started in spring 2022. 2’262 solar panels have been installed on our factory roof, producing over 800,000 kWh.

Row 16

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

2088

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in the UK purchases renewable electricity from a third party which is backed by RECs.

Row 17

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydropower, Wind, Geothermal

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

1446

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2017

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in Turkey purchases electricity from third parties and separately also purchase Guarantees of Origin which are retired on their behalf.

Row 18

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

17108.09

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in Brazil purchases electricity from third parties and separately also purchase Guarantees of Origin which are retired on their behalf.

Row 19

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Ethiopia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier) from a grid that is 95% or more low-carbon and where there is no mechanism for specifically allocating low-carbon electricity

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

2536.28

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ No instrument used

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

Select from:

☑ Ethiopia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Over 95% of Ethiopia's electricity supply is generated from renewable sources, mainly hydro power.

Row 20

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

111.5

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG sites in Italy purchase electricity from third parties which is sourced from renewable generation sources backed by Guarantees of Origin.

Row 21

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

312.88

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG sites in Spain purchase electricity from third parties which is sourced from renewable generation sources backed by Guarantees of Origin.

Row 22

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

10967.73

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

JTG site in Indonesia purchases renewable electricity from a third party which is backed by RECs.

Row 23

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Sustainable biomass

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

54.59

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Certified by JQA (Japan Quality Assurance)

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

1997

(7.30.14.10) Comment

It is a certificate of the environmental value generated electricity and heat by renewable energy. It is certified by JQA(Japan Quality Assurance).

Row 24

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

5605.52

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ NFC – Renewable

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:
☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2015

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Several JTG sites in Japan are using NFC to procure renewable energy.

Row 25

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

311.37

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ NFC – Renewable

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2018

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Several JTG sites in Japan are using NFC to procure renewable energy.

Row 26

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

434.69

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ NFC – Renewable

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Several JTG sites in Japan are using NFC to procure renewable energy.

Row 27

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

257.75

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ NFC – Renewable

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Several JTG sites in Japan are using NFC to procure renewable energy.

Row 28

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

308.09

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ NFC – Renewable

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Several JTG sites in Japan are using NFC to procure renewable energy.

Row 29

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

808.1

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ NFC – Renewable

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Several JTG sites in Japan are using NFC to procure renewable energy.
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Algeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

29.00

Andorra

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

344

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

344.00

Armenia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

36

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

30

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

66.00

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3252

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

2177

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

5429.00

Azerbaijan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

121

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

121.00

Bangladesh

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6302

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

6825

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

13127.00

Belarus

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

136

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

155

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

291.00

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

113

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

113.00

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

128

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

128.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17323

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

51

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

27023

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

44397.00

Bulgaria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

147

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

63

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

210.00

Cambodia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

537

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

537.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13415

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

4

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1015

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

14434.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

47

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

47.00

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

155

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

71

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

226.00

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

5.00

Eygpt

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2023

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

2

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2025.00

Ethiopia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2536

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

3652

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

26670

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

32858.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

231

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

231.00

Georgia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

141

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

6

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

147.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

27804

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

28174

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

55978.00

Greece

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5151

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

5152.00

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

191

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

191.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

95

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

95.00

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11018

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

3

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

11021.00

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7665

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

24632

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

32297.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

78

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

78.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

112

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

112.00

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

181095

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

3900

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

184995.00

Jordan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10558

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

178

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

10736.00

Kazakhstan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10069

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

10069.00

Kyrgyzstan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

65

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

65.00

Lebanon

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

7.00

Lithuania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

44

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

35

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

79.00

Malawi

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7348

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

183

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1115

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

8646.00

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

317

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

317.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

66

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

66.00

Mongolia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

15

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

15.00

Morocco

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

99

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

99.00

Myanmar

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

801

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

2818

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3619.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

85

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

85.00

Nigeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

20.00

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

43456

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

8368

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

51824.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

64903

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

88

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

337

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

65328.00

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

17.00

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

149

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

149.00

Republic of Moldova

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

44

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

44.00

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

18426

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

18426.00

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

62577

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

24986

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

87563.00

Serbia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3626

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3626.00

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

190

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

190.00

Slovakia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

164

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

34

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

198.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

234

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

234.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6153

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

511

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

6664.00

Sudan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3443

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

458

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3901.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1451

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

140

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

510

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2101.00

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13181

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

4

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

13185.00

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24824

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

24824.00

Tajikistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

51

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

51.00

Tunisia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

30

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

30.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1668

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

41363

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

43031.00

Ukraine

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11576

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

416

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

11992.00

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

96

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

96.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2088

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2088.00

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

920

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

9299

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

10219.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6571

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

6571.00

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

11.00

Zambia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

485

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

485.00
[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.2048580953

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

582022.33

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

2841100

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

12

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.45.9) Please explain

Revenue increased 7%, emissions decreased 6%, which in total brough a 12 % reduction of intensity. Main activities to reduce emissions are installation of energy efficient equipment, improvements in the management of compressed air, and increasing the proportion of renewable energy used on-site, e.g. increased proportion of green electricity purchased.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.6898342369

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

396210

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

574355

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

6

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.45.9) Please explain

Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the relevant area of the business decreased 3%, mainly driven increase in renewable energy consumption and decrease in overall electricity consumption. Production also increased 3%. This bought about a 6% decrease in the carbon intensity of the product.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

115.95

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

1000 tons

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

n/a

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

2

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Driven by waste reduction initiatives.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

9531

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Terajoules

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

n/a

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

2

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Driven by energy reduction initiatives.
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply
☑ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Japan Tobacco Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

02/13/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

367716.984

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

368836.275

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

736553.259

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

47

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

390373.227

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

341572.371

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

240449.963

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

582022.334

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

44.64

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Based on the SBTi criteria, a more ambitious GHG emissions target has been set in 2021. This target has been validated by the SBT initiative in 2022, published in 2023.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

This target forms part of our JT Group Sustainability Targets, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Targets to increase the proportion of renewable electricity that we use to 50% by 2030 and 100% by 2050. Initiatives include improving energy efficiency in production, for example through replacement of machinery for more efficient equipment. There has been a 21% decrease in total S1&2 emissions since 2019. Our tobacco business accelerated efforts in relation to renewable electricity and set up new target in 2023: 50% by 2025 and 100% by 2040.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Japan Tobacco Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

02/13/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6293157.666

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6293157.666

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

6293157.666

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

81

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

81

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

28

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

4531073.520

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6465650.306

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6465650.306

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

6465650.306

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-9.79

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Based on the SBTi criteria, a more ambitious GHG emissions target has been set in 2021. This target has been validated by the SBT initiative in 2022, published in 2023.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

This target forms part of our JT Group Sustainability Targets, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

To achieve there is a focus on leaf and non tobacco materials supplier engagement to reduce emissions for purchased materials. Emissions have increased 3% since 2019, however JTI are still on track to achieve this target.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 3

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 3

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and we have committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative in the next two years

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

02/13/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 14 – Franchises
☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods
☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel
☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)
☑ Scope 3, Category 8 - Upstream leased assets
☑ Scope 3, Category 13 – Downstream leased assets
☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
☑ Scope 3, Category 10 – Processing of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

367716.984

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

368836.275

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6293157.666

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

307029.733

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

194517.315

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

396847.135

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

14412

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

146490.802

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

42929.291

(7.53.1.21) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

700.019

(7.53.1.22) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

262075.112

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1156.133

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

27155.204

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

69230.562

(7.53.1.26) Base year Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1242.137

(7.53.1.27) Base year Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4046.346

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7760989.455

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

8497542.714

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in

Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.42) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.43) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.44) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.47) Base year Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.48) Base year Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2050

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

90

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

849754.271

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

341572.371

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

240449.963

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6465650.306

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

299269.819

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

175392.222

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

414380.33

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

8798.312

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

159084.946

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

28393.292

(7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

685.067

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

276646.454

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2124.234

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

41937.319

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

113218.678

(7.53.1.71) Scope 3, Category 13: Downstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

97.069

(7.53.1.72) Scope 3, Category 14: Franchises emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

11394.881

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7997072.929

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

8579095.263

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-1.07

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

JT Group will reduce its emissions and commits to be Carbon Neutral for its own operations by 2030 and achieve Net-Zero Greenhouse Gas emissions across its entire value chain by 2050.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

This target forms part of our JT Group Sustainability Targets, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Neutralise all residual Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030 after a 47% reduction in Scope 1&2 emission from a 2019 baseline. Neutralise all residual scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions in 2050 after a 90% reduction in total emissions for a 2019 baseline.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

☑ Net-zero targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

02/13/2022

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

908286

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

16

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

50

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

26.11

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

29.74

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Company-wide, no exclusions

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

This target forms part of our JTG Environment plan 2030, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Purchase and generate more renewable electricity. Renewable energy % currently 26.11%.

Row 2

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 2

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

02/13/2022

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

908286

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

16

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2050

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

26.11

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

12.04

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Company-wide, no exclusions

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

This target forms part of our JTG Environment plan 2030, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Purchase and generate more renewable electricity. Renewable energy % currently 26.11%.

Row 3

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 3

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

02/12/2024

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

626820.32

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

35

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2025

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

50

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

32.65

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

-15.67

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Specific to Japan Tobacco International Division

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

This target forms part of our JTI Sustainability framework, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Purchase and generate more renewable electricity. Renewable energy % currently 32.65%.

Row 4

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Low 4

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

02/12/2024

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business division

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

626820.32

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

35

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2040

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

32.65

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

-3.62

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Specific to Japan Tobacco International Division

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

This target forms part of our JTI Sustainability framework, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Purchase and generate more renewable electricity. Renewable energy % currently 32.65%.
[Add row]

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

02/13/2022

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

☑ Abs2

☑ Abs3

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/30/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and we have committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative in the next two years

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)
☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

JT Group will reduce its emissions and commits to be Carbon Neutral for its own operations by 2030 and achieve Net-Zero Greenhouse Gas emissions across its entire value chain by 2050.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

This target forms part of our JT Group Sustainability Targets, contributing to JTG's overall environmental strategy.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization at the end of the target

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

Neutralise all residual Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030 after a 47% reduction in Scope 1&2 emission from a 2019 baseline. Neutralise all residual scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions in 2050 after a 90% reduction in total emissions for a 2019 baseline.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

The Board of Directors is responsible for the development and management of the sustainability strategy, and the net-zero target is reviewed annually in the process of its implementation to determine whether it needs to be revised.
[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*19*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*20*	*48296.69*
Implementation commenced	*24*	*24482.5*

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Implemented	*13*	*8219.87*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solar PV

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

181

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

19412460

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

76524480

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No further comment.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Machine/equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

559

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

28415340

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

165005910

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No further comment.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Low-carbon electricity mix

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

7087

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

35167500

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No further comment.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Compressed air

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

40

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

281340

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

35167500

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ >25 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No further comment.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

59

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1688040

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

27571320

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No further comment.

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Smart control system

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

53

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1547370

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

14629680

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No further comment.

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Waste heat recovery

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

240

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

11250000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

13500000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No further comment.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The JT Group Business Approval Process (BAP) for CAPEX and OPEX requires detailed calculation of capital investment, associated project costs, savings and payback as well as for example impacts on utilities, energy and emissions.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

To help compare various GHG reduction projects, in terms of anticipated emissions reduction, the cost of that reduction, and also project payback, we have adopted a tailored MACC tool. This helps us better plan and prioritize projects and focus our GHG reduction efforts.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Marginal abatement cost curve

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Through our Environment Opportunities Scheme, our factories have identified and invested in more than 274 projects with total investment of 72 million Yen. Total savings amounted about 324 million Yen. This had an overall simple payback of approximately 3 months. The total carbon saved is about 7,000 tCO2e per annum.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Other

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Through our Environment Opportunities Scheme, our factories have identified and invested in more than 274 projects with total investment of 72 million Yen. Total savings amounted about 324 million Yen. This had an overall simple payback of approximately 3 months. The total carbon saved is about 7,000 tCO2e per annum.

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

An internal carbon price has been set in 2022 and for our manufacturing sites has been integrated into project investment assessment. The inclusion of the ICP has allowed multiple projects to be approved which would previously have not met our criteria. These projects contribute to our emissions reduction in-line with our near-term reduction targets and longer-term Net-Zero commitment.
[Add row]

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Row 1

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:
☑ Afforestation

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Wood is a valuable resource across our value chain and it's essential that we promote the management of this natural resource responsibly, ensuring a sustainable supply of renewable wood for tobacco growing and our operations, while striving to conserve and rehabilitate forests. In countries where we directly contract tobacco growers that use wood as a resource, we establish and implement Forestry Programs. These programs are geared to secure a renewable and sustainable supply of wood for tobacco curing and/or as construction material. We developed, review and update on an annual basis our Minimum Forestry Standards (MFS) - a set of guidelines and technical recommendation on best forestry practices per production areas in Vertically-Integrated Origins. 100% of leaf production team and 100% of contracted tobacco growers in countries where wood resources are used for tobacco production receive technical assistance on best forestry practices and wood production from seed collection and management, to seedling production, woodlot establishment, care and maintenance up to harvesting.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply
☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

JTG is committed to promote wood resources production to achieve a renewable and sustainable supply of wood for tobacco production. Contracted tobacco growers either implement afforestation and adopt forestry best practices to increase wood production and/or are required to purchase from sustainable and compliant sources. Forestry technical assistance and field days at demonstration plots. Regular trainings are conducted to build capacity amongst internal employees that provide technical assistance to the grower base. A clause in the contract between JTG and a grower requires that the grower must ensure wood for tobacco production comes from renewable and sustainable sources. JTG also has dedicated Forestry Research and development at Agronomy Development & Extension Training (ADET) centres in Brazil and Zambia, focused in maximizing small-scale woodlot productivity.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

No further comment.

Row 2

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Fertilizer management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Good fertilizer management rests on the principles of using the correct fertiliser from the right source, at the right application rate, at the right time and with the right placement. Each production system/area has a specific fertilization program that contributes to the production of targeted crop style and improve productivity. Research and development conducted at JTI's Agronomy Development and Extension Training (ADET) centres validate fertilizer application recommendations. 100% of contracted growers receive technical assistance in this matter.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

JTG is committed to encourage contracted growers to adhere to the Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS) and implement good agricultural practices. The technical recommendation includes a specific section related to responsible and sustainable use and management of fertilizers based on soil profiles and requirements. JTG provides technical assistance and training to contracted growers through dedicated visits and field days. JTG pre-finances and delivers crop inputs in a grower pack to contracted growers, that includes recommended fertilizers per type and quantity. Directly contracted growers are visited a minimum of 7 times during the crop production cycle by the extension services team.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

No further comment.

Row 3

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Low carbon energy use

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Improved curing efficiencies, and optimized use of crop inputs are crop husbandry activities related to low carbon energy use. These are well addressed in our Good Agricultural Practices Protocol, Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS) and Minimum Forestry Standards (MFS), which sets of technical guidelines and recommendations, as well as best practice to which a contracted grower should adhere. 100% of contracted growers receive technical assistance in this matter. Improving curing efficiency through innovation, development and enhancing curing barn facilities results in reduced fuel consumption. Thus, when curing fuel source is wood, it reduces the requirement of wood resources for tobacco production and curing, and consequently reduces emissions that come from sourcing wood from unsustainable sources.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

JTG is committed to encourage contracted growers to follow to the MAS (Minimum Agronomic Standard) and implement best agronomy practices. This includes specific sections related to responsible and sustainable use and management of wood resources, wood production, tobacco curing efficiency, responsible and appropriate use and management of crop inputs (fertilizers, Crop Protection Agents - CPAs etc.). JTG provides technical assistance and training to contracted growers through dedicated visits and field days. Directly contracted growers are visited a minimum of 7 times during the crop production cycle by the extension services team.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

No further comment.
[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Forestry Programs implemented to secure a renewable and sustainable supply of wood resources for tobacco curing contribute to Yield increases - through adoption of the Minimum Forestry Standards, growers enable every tree seedling produced and tree transplanted to grow to their potential. The MFS practices are customized

to local environmental and management requirements, enabling to harvest more wood per tree. Indirectly, when well implemented, Forestry programs contribute to reduce drastically the risk of deforestation (avoided deforestation), which secures biodiversity protection. In addition to Forestry programs geared at wood production, we also implement localized projects for forest conservation and enhancement, promoting the production of seedlings and transplanting of native, diverse species and promoting the adoption of conservation practices such as removing exotic invasive species from areas of permanent protection, removing livestock from near water sources (springs, river banks, streams) which contribute to a more diverse and resilient environment.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

As the impacts from this management practice have been positive, there has been no need to respond to these impacts.

Row 2

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Fertilizer management involves a preliminary understanding of soil profile and requirements for crop production, pH and other chemical and physical aspects, which then reflect in a customized fertilization program. Upon adoption of the fertilization program recommendations, fertilizer use is optimized and this tends to positively impact crop yield, positively impact soil quality by maintaining nutrient balance and appropriately managing soil pH, promoting microbial activity, and reducing soil degradation. By adopting the recommendations in the customized fertilization program, growers also reduce the risk of nutrient runoff and leaching, enhancing water-use efficiency, protecting groundwater quality, and mitigating depletion of water resources.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

As the impacts from this management practice have been positive, there has been no need to respond to these impacts.

Row 3

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Yield

☑ Other, please specify **:**Carbon footprint

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Through establishing more efficient curing barns and furnaces, promoting adequate curing barn care and maintenance, and adopting optimal curing management practices, growers reduce significantly the need for fuel for curing. When wood is the fuel for curing and it's consumption is low, this directly reflects in reduced risk of deforestation and reduces the carbon footprint of our tobacco leaf supply chain. Also, improved curing processes reflect in higher yield (and in most instances, quality of leaf) and reduced losses by the grower, which then has an indirect effect on increasing income generation. By adopting the customized practices of the Minimum Agronomic Standards (MAS), which includes variety selection, customized crop inputs package and recommendation on use/application (e.g. fertilizers, Crop Protection Agents), growers are able to increase their yields through a more efficient and responsible use of resources and inputs. These practices collectively contribute to more sustainable and productive agricultural operations.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

As the impacts from this management practice have been positive, there has been no need to respond to these impacts.
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Tobacco product

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

In an effort to make Winston Blue moments even better in Switzerland, we've developed a number of tangible ways to waste less and protect more. First, we have reduced overall the amount of materials we use in our Winston Blue packaging through reduction of board and protective file thickness, substituted foil inside the pack with paper which made packs easier to recycle in paper recycling streams. Also we had relooked the way we create our filters and introduced a paper-based filter solution reducing the amount of plastic in every Winston Blue by 80%. Our Swiss factory runs on low-carbon electricity and is certified for environment and energy management (ISO 14001 and ISO 50001 respectfully). We also choose FSC-certified, responsibly sourced cardboard and paper materials for our packaging. With all the changes together, the CO2 emissions per pack are reduced by more than 55%. Those are our first steps to improve the environmental impact of our products and packaging and we aim to move further increasing the scale.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**LCA, aligned with ISO 14040, ISO 14044, & ISO 14067

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

1000 Cigarette Sticks

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Regular monoacetate filter cigarettes (The "Typical" product of JTG's tobacco business).

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:
☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

906.6

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

Working with our sustainability consultants, we conducted a full product carbon footprint or LCA to assess the carbon benefits of switching our regular cellulose acetate-based filters with paper-based cigarette filters. The Product Carbon Footprint (PCF) calculations carried out follow the ISO 14067 standard and include all cradle-to-gate emissions sources per best practice approaches to PCF. To calculate the PCF of paper filters, supplier emissions data from one of our main suppliers of paper filters was used to calculate the emissions. To calculate the PCF of acetate filters, LCA data was used from an existing study of a comparable product. For both PCFs, LCA databases were used to fill any data gaps.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

0.025
[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Timber products

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Specific suppliers

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Non-tobacco material (NTM) volume data from NTM suppliers.

(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Challenges associated with traceability

(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☑ No, the volume excluded is unknown

(8.1.1.10) Please explain

We are in the process of collecting and validating data. There have been challenges associated with collecting this data accurately as it comes from our tier 2 suppliers. We aim to collect and validate this volumetric data within the next two years.
[Add row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Timber products	*746072.92*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*746072.92*

[Fixed row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Misiones, Salta, Jujuy, Corrientes

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

410.21

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical & subtropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Bangladesh

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Chittagong, Khulna, Dhaka, Rangpur

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

33215.6

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Paranhana, Rio Grande do Sul, Santa Catharina

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

309467.74

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Atlantic Forest, Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Ethiopia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Amhara, Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3995.89

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical & subtropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Madura, Lombok, Grampol and many others

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

115.67

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Malawi

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Malawi - Blantyre, Malawi - Chiradzulu, Malawi - Chitipa, Malawi - Dedza, Malawi - Dowa, Malawi - Kasungu, Malawi - Lilongwe, Malawi - Machinga, Malawi - Mangochi, Malawi - Mchinji, Malawi - Mulanje, Malawi - Mzimba, Malawi - Ntcheu, Malawi - Ntchisi, Malawi - Phalombe, Malawi - Rumphi, Malawi - Zomba

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1901.63

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical & subtropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mozambique

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

East Tete, West Tete, Nyassa, Zambezia, Manica

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

16596.9

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical & subtropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Philippines

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Isabela, San Fernando

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

9994.16

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Spain

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Extramadura

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1872.22

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Mediterranean forests, woodlands and shrub.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United Republic of Tanzania

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Tabora, Chunya, Aringa, Mpanda

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

198071.7

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical & subtropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Changmai, Petchuburi, Sokotai

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

232.73

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical and subtropical moist and dry broadleaf forests.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Zambia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Eastern Province, Central Province, Western Province

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

37563.03

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical & subtropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Zimbabwe

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Manicaland, Mashonaland (Central, West, East)

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

132635.45

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Biome: Tropical & subtropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.
[Add row]

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Timber products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a no-conversion target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Timber products

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No-conversion

(8.7.1.2) Your organization’s definition of “no-deforestation” or “no-conversion”

Deforestation: No-deforestation refers to no gross deforestation of natural forests as a result of conversion to agriculture or other non-forest land use; conversion to a plantation; or severe or sustained degradation Conversion: No-conversion refers to no gross conversion of natural ecosystems as a result of change to land use or profound change in the natural ecosystem's species composition, structure, or function.

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

☑ 2020

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

☑ Compliance with initiative, please specify **:**In line with organisational commitment to SBTi

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

☑ 2025

[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

☑ Yes, this target contributes to our no-conversion target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

☑ Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Natural ecosystem restoration and long-term protection

☑ Other natural ecosystem restoration and long-term protection target metric, please specify **:**% of renewable wood used in supply chain

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2017

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2015

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

5

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2030

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

18

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

13.68

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

☑ Planetary Boundaries

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We will replace all wood from natural forests used in the tobacco curing process of our directly contracted growers with renewable wood resources by 2030. This is an organisation-wide target. There are no exclusions from this target at present.

(8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

To achieve the target, the group plans to produce quality tree seedlings to establish and grow Live Barns, according to specification, whilst also increasing the quality of the timber grown to increase its long-term sustainability (increase kg productivity of each woodlot). Renewable wood supply is already 100% in Brazil. Based on our 2023 tree planting activities in Tanzania, Cambia and Brazil, we estimate 103% renewable wood supply in crop year (CY) 2030, based on actual tree planting captured with the Agroforestry App in CY2023 (Nov 2022-Feb 2023).

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

We define renewable wood as wood biomass derived from planted trees and established woodlots for the purpose of wood production (fuel, construction material, cellulose) – either owned and planted by growers or sourced from commercial third-party wood producers. This target is currently being implemented in countries where tobacco is primarily sourced and cured: Zambia, Tanzania and Brazil. This target contributes to JTI's Minimum Forestry Standards target which aims to ensure adoption of forestry best practices from tree seedling production through to live barn operation. The aim is to help the group reduce risk associated with emerging forestry-related compliance, minimise company-wide impact, and take the opportunity to increase land productivity sustainably.
[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Timber products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:
☑ No, but we plan to establish one within the next two years

(8.8.4) Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system

Select from:
☑ No standardized procedure

(8.8.5) Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system

We are in the process of developing a traceability system. We collect information from our smallholders and suppliers on their sourced volumes of timber, and we are aware of their origins. However, this process has not yet been standardized or formalized globally. We are looking to validate this system in the next two years.
[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

We are in the process of developing a system to assess the DCF status of timber. DCF status is something we discuss with our smallholders and suppliers, but it is not yet a formalised process. We will be aligning our internal processes for assessing DCF status in the next two years and creating a standardized procedure across the company.
[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.10.1) Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years

(8.10.2) Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.10.3) Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

Monitoring our deforestation footprint and conversion footprint is a priority for JTI. We are in the process of aligning our processes for monitoring this, and expanding this into areas where we do not currently have the monitoring capabilities. We aim to have a standardized procedure in the next two years.
[Fixed row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes.

Timber products

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Working with smallholders

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

41

(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.11.1.4) Main measures identified to manage or resolve the challenges

Select all that apply

☑ Development of certification and sustainability standards across entire landscapes/jurisdictions

☑ Greater alignment between company goals and goals at landscape/jurisdictional level

☑ Greater community support to facilitate sustainable agriculture

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

As well as securing a long-term supply of quality tobacco leaf for our business and meet no-deforestation/no-conversion targets, we want to create shared value for both our growers and our business. We do this by providing extension services, including crop inputs aimed at increasing productivity, which also improve our social and environmental impact. By enabling growers to become more productive and efficient in the way they grow, harvest, and cure tobacco leaf, we support them to become more profitable and to use resources - including - timber resources in a more responsible way. Overall, engaging with smallholders enables us to have greater influence and success in the adoption of good agricultural practices and best forestry practices by growers, as well as raising awareness on forest protection and conservation, and compliance. In Brazil, for instance, 100% of wood used in tobacco production is DCF, achieved through the integrated production system and extension services/engagement provided, and monitored at Industry level by the Tobacco Industry Union and tobacco farmers union, as well as by law enforcement authorities. This facilitates an increase in our DCF volumes of timber. In other leaf supplying countries such as Zambia and Tanzania, where land and wood resources rights are not strictly followed and enforced, our challenge relies in securing a DCF supply of wood and verify/trace supply.
[Add row]

(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.

Timber products

(8.12.1) Third-party certification scheme adopted

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years

(8.12.5) Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.12.6) Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted

We are in the process of developing our traceability systems for timber. Once these are in place we will be able to share information through CDP supply chain. [Fixed row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

Timber products

(8.13.1) GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated

Select from:

☑ No, but plan to do so in the next two years

(8.13.2) Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.13.3) Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change

We do not manage a significant amount of land in our direct operations (0.1% of our leaf). We are in the process of developing our traceability systems for our timber supply chain. Once these are in place we will be able to share information through CDP supply chain.
[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

☑ Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

☑ Environmental protection

☑ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting

☑ Human rights protected under international law

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

☑ Ground-based monitoring

(8.14.5) Please explain

We aim to respect human and labour rights of smallholders who work on the land we source timber and tobacco from. To do this, we facilitate industry alignment on UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. In regards to the Brazilian Forest Code, this is a strategic priority for us as the majority of our timber is sourced from this region. We plan to address this within the next two years. We will be asking suppliers to comply with this requirement to only farm 20% of the land they own.
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

(8.15.1) Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ No, we do not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives, but we plan to in the next two years

(8.15.2) Primary reason for not engaging in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(8.15.3) Explain why your organization does not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Engaging in landscape initiatives is part of our ambition in the short-term. Currently, we are not engaging in these initiatives as part of our sustainable forestry strategy. Currently we do not have a standardized approach or aligned processes for this; it is difficult to monitor across all of our sites and involves extending engagement across all of our sites.
[Fixed row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging with non-governmental organizations

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

We support the Keidanren Declaration for Biodiversity and Guideline Targeting a Nature Positive World in 2030, as part of the Keidanren Nature Conservation Council - a fund for supporting nature conservation efforts, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region. This forms part of our commitment to protecting forests and other ecosystems in areas where we source from.

Row 2

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging with communities

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Minimum Agronomic Standards These standards outline JTI's standards on planting native species and those with a higher yield (to increase productivity over a smaller area, limiting impact). They form part of our aim to reach no deforestation and no conversion in 2030. As well as securing a long-term supply of quality tobacco leaf for our business, we want to create shared value for both our growers and our business. We do this by providing extension services, including crop inputs aimed at increasing productivity, which also improve our social and environmental impact. By enabling growers to become more productive and efficient in the way they grow, harvest, and cure tobacco leaf, we support them to become more profitable and to use resources in a more responsible way. These growers are contracted to grow tobacco under our stewardship. In return, they receive credit for prescribed crop inputs as well as dedicated extension services from our Agronomy Technicians. This support includes recommendations delivered through a program of scheduled visits throughout the crop cycle.

Row 3

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Engaging with communities

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Minimum Forestry Standards These standards outline: • To produce a strong live barn structure, able to support heavy load; ideal for stalk cut • To ensure optimal live barn operation; trees planted are able to grow to their best capability and as the species allows • To ensure adoption of forestry best practices from tree seedling production through to live barn operation They form part of our aim to reach no deforestation and no conversion in 2030. As well as securing a long-term supply of quality tobacco leaf for our business, we want to create shared value for both our growers and our business. We do this by providing extension services, including crop inputs aimed at increasing productivity, which also improve our social and environmental impact. By enabling growers to become more productive and efficient in the way they grow, harvest, and cure tobacco leaf, we support them to become more profitable and to use resources in a more responsible way. These growers are contracted to grow tobacco under our stewardship. In return, they receive credit for prescribed crop inputs as well as dedicated extension services from our Agronomy Technicians. This support includes recommendations delivered through a program of scheduled visits throughout the crop cycle.
[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with regulation

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Project implemented as part of target to replace 100% of wood from natural forests used in the tobacco curing process of our directly contracted growers with renewable wood resources by 2030. The project is ensuring forestry best practices from tree seedling production through wood harvesting. The project also takes into account the species that are planted to ensure they can cope with local climatic conditions and contribute to the biodiversity integrity of the land. By taking an integrated and holistic approach, where forestry focused on wood production plays a fundamental role in business sustainability, we also contribute to natural forest protection and rehabilitation, and support local communities.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2018

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2030

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

673

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

3029

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

14.235

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

51.9253

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:
☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

98750340

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply
☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practice

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

We are monitoring the progress of the tree planting scheme by looking at the productivity (e.g. kg) per tree that can be used for tobacco curing, as a method to decrease rate of deforestation and increase the sustainability of the wood used for curing. We are also measuring the percentage of renewable wood using in tobacco curing. In Brazil, monitoring has revealed that we are now using 100% renewable wood in this region. Project area in target year calculated assuming 100% adoption of recommended tree spacing (3mx2m), which equals 1666 trees/ha land. Estimated that 5 million trees will have been planted from 2018 to 2030.

Row 2

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Compliance with regulation

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

Project implemented as part of target to achieve 100% renewable wood supply for tobacco curing in Zambia by 2030. Based on 7-year production cycle, in 2023 approximately 2MM trees were planted, to be harvested in 2030. The project is ensuring forestry best practices from tree seedling production through wood

harvesting at grower (farm)-level and the establishment of larger commercial woodlots. The project also takes into account the most suitable forestry practices suitable to the fast-growing species that are planted. By taking an integrated and holistic approach, where forestry focused on wood production plays a fundamental role in business sustainability, we also contribute to natural forest protection and rehabilitation, and support local communities.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based in area with direct operations

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2018

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2030

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

2891

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

10442

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Zambia

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

13.1339

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

27.8493

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

414976500

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practice

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

We are monitoring the progress of the tree planting scheme by looking at the productivity (e.g. kg) per tree that can be used for tobacco curing, as a method to decrease rate of deforestation and increase the sustainability of the wood used for curing. We are also measuring the percentage of renewable wood using in tobacco curing. Project area in target year calculated assuming 100% adoption of recommended tree spacing (2mx2m), which equals 2500 trees/ha land. Estimated that 26.1 million trees will have been planted from 2018 to 2030.

Row 3

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Natural regeneration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

This project aims to support watershed forest conservation and satoyama (the border zone between mountain foothills and arable flat land) regeneration through healthy tree growth and the creation of diverse broadleaved forests. In order to achieve this, the group are clearing trees, pruning, thinning, planting and undercutting. It is an 18 year project, already underway, with the aim of diversifying and conserving the land.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based elsewhere

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2008

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2026

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

13.39

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

13.39

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

35.529478

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

137.38002

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

16422000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

The project's primary goal is to ensure the healthy growth of trees and develop a diverse broadleaf forest to preserve the watershed. Between 2008 and 2018, efforts

included planting 1,800 broadleaf trees, as well as thinning, pruning, and creating planting sites and access paths. Additional activities involved undergrowth clearing, fertilization around newly planted trees, thinning of cypress forests, and support for satoyama restoration. Monitoring is conducted annually ground inspections to assess the forest's condition. We will continue activities such as nurturing broadleaf trees and aim to create a sustainable forest by showcasing the multifunctional benefits of forests, including their role as water sources and their contribution to ecosystem preservation.

Row 4

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

This project based in Japan plans to reforest a mixed needle and broadleaf forest on clear-cutting areas (54 hectares in size) over a 20 year period. This project involves harvesting, clearing, thinning, supplemental planting and construction of working paths in the area to limit further destruction. The overall aim is to create a healthy, diverse forest in an area that has been damaged due to deforestation and conversion.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based elsewhere

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2005

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:
☑ 2025

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

54

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

54

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:
☑ Japan

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

33.814992

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

135.634962

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:
☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

37889000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

This project aims to regenerate mountain forests by replanting a mix of broadleaf and coniferous trees in areas that had become barren after the main felling of coniferous trees (such as cedar and cypress) and where replanting had previously not been possible. Over a period of ten years starting from 2005, approximately 180,000 trees, including cherry, maple, oak, and cypress, were planted. Since 2015, the project has included the management of tree growth and thinning in the newly planted areas. Annual ground surveys are conducted to assess the project's effectiveness, and with each passing year, the mountainside is gradually being greened.

Row 5

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement to sustainability of production practices

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

This project based in Japan plans to support afforestation in clear-cut forest areas to foster sustainable forest resources in the region, over a 5 year period. To date, the project has focused on planting of economic forests (cedar) in clear-cut areas and protection against deer damage.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based elsewhere

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2022

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2027

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

758

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

758

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

33.557729

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

134.0592

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:
☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

9000000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply
☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

The project's goal is to support sustainable forest management, enhance ecological functions, and broaden community involvement in forestry. Over a five-year period, the project will plant 15 hectares of trees annually and implement measures to protect against wildlife damage. It also includes hosting yearly "forest creation activities," which engage businesses and local residents, aiming to integrate forestry into everyday lifestyles and expand the network of individuals connected to forest management. Monitoring is conducted annually, focusing on vegetation health, tree growth, and overall biodiversity.

Row 6

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

☑ Project 6

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

This Japan-based mixed reforestation project aims to recharge water sources, prevent sediment run-off and create coexistence with diverse living organisms. Over its 15 year course, the project has involved reforestation, undergrowth clearing, thinning, and installation of bird and animal protection fences. This has resulted in healthy forest and biodiverse habitat in the region.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

☑ Project based elsewhere

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2009

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ 2027

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

80.91

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

80.91

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Japan

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

32.274037

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

130.63298

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

40287000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

☑ Improvement of water availability and quality

☑ Net gain in biodiversity and ecosystem integrity

☑ Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

This project aims to enhance water retention, prevent soil erosion through the promotion of mixed-species forests and improving ecological functions and fostering rich biodiversity. The project focuses on thinning cypress and cedar trees while planting and nurturing fruit-bearing broadleaf trees to support diverse wildlife, including Japanese deer and the Yamane, a natural monument. Monitoring includes assessments of forest health, tree growth, and habitat conditions to support sustainable forest management and conservation efforts.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:
☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawal data are collected from all JT Group sites using actual data, whenever they are available, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal data are collected from all JT Group sites using actual data, whenever they are available, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available. Total volumes are monitored monthly at processing and manufacturing facilities.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawal data are collected from all JT Group sites using actual data, whenever they are available, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal data are collected from all JT Group sites using actual data, whenever they are available, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available. Volumes by source are monitored monthly for processing and manufacturing facilities.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Monitoring is typically by direct sampling and analysis.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal quality data are assessed at JT Group facilities where water quality is an important aspect for our production. The monitoring frequency is decided by individual facilities. Where water quality is critical for production and product quality, we typically monitor this monthly. At other locations, the quality of water withdrawn is periodically monitored. Monitoring is typically by direct sampling and analysis.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge data are collected from JT Group sites using actual data, whenever they are available, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge data are collected from all JT Group sites using actual data, whenever they are available, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available. Total volumes are monitored monthly for processing and manufacturing facilities.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Data in relation to water discharge destination are collected from all JT Groupe sites, whenever available. If the destination is not known, it is assumed that the wastewater is sent for municipal treatment. In the absence of volume data, it is assumed that water discharge is the same as water withdrawal.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Data in relation to water discharge destination are collected from all JT Group sites, whenever available. If the destination is not known, it is assumed that the wastewater is sent for municipal treatment. In the absence of volume data, it is assumed that water discharge is the same as water withdrawal. Volumes by destination are monitored monthly for processing and manufacturing facilities.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The data are mainly collected from sites where actual data are available and in some cases, extrapolated for sites where actual data are not available.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Final treatment method is determined at JT Group site level by destination of water discharged. The data are mainly collected from sites where actual data are available and in some cases, extrapolated for sites where actual data are not available. Volumes by treatment method are monitored monthly for processing and manufacturing facilities.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge is monitored at our factories before and after on-site treatment, where installed. In 2018 our Tobacco business introduced an internal guidance with a list of parameters and minimum expectations (concentrations) for direct discharge in natural waters, against which factories monitor such discharges. Related to exceedances of standard effluent parameters, we collect data from a site when it does not meet the water discharge parameters prescribed in the relevant local regulations.

(9.2.4) Please explain

JT Group's operations are located in jurisdictions that have regulatory requirements with differing water discharge parameters. The monitoring frequency is decided by individual facilities dependent on local regulatory requirements and site procedures. for production facilities, this is typically monthly. Our factories are required to monitor water discharge before and after on-site treatment, where installed. In 2018 our tobacco business of JTI introduced an internal guidance with a list of parameters and minimum expectations (concentrations) for direct discharge in natural waters, against which factories monitor such discharges. In relation to exceedances of standard effluent parameters, data are collected from a site when it does not meet the water discharge parameters prescribed in the regulations relevant to that location.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge quality is monitored quarterly by a third-party conducting measurements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, measurements were taking place at some of our sites where applicable, on a quarterly basis.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Monitoring is done by reviewing local regulations and implementing relevant requirements. Only some sites have water heaters affecting water temperature, so 100% of these sites monitor this aspect. Where temperature is a regulatory parameter or critical variable in discharged water, we monitor it monthly, in line with other wastewater monitoring. At other locations, monitoring frequency varies from monthly to annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Monitoring is conducted by reviewing local regulation and putting in place the relevant monitoring requirements. Where temperature is a regulatory-prescribed parameter and/or a critical variable in water discharged, we monitor this monthly, in-line with other wastewater monitoring. At other locations, the monitoring frequency varies between monthly and annually.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We apply the following formula for water consumption: Water consumption Water withdrawals - Water discharges. Water withdrawal and discharge are collected using actual data, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We apply the following formula for water consumption: Water consumption Water withdrawals - Water discharges. Water withdrawal and discharge are collected using actual data, or using extrapolation where actual data are not available. Total volumes are calculated monthly for processing and manufacturing facilities.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water recycled/reused data are monitored at JT Groupe’s manufacturing facilities and leaf operations using actual data.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water recycled/reused data are monitored at JT Group's manufacturing and processing facilities. Frequency of monitoring is monthly. Where possible this is monitored by direct measurement.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Fully functioning WASH services are deemed to be provided where a facility is providing workers with drinking water and sanitation facilities, and the facility hasn't received any upheld claims from workers relating to their access to drinking water or sanitation facilities.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Fully functioning WASH services are deemed to be provided where a facility is providing workers with drinking water and sanitation facilities, and the facility hasn't received any upheld claims from workers relating to their access to drinking water or sanitation facilities. Dedicated departments at sites monitor functioning and management of wash services at least once a week and implement improvements if required. We monitor by direct inspection, for example, when we carry out assessments/audits of our locations and by checking claims if they arise.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

8523.31

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water withdrawal is lower than in 2022 - 8% reduction (reduction from 5% till 20% considered as lower based on JTG thresholds). This is despite a slight production increase (about 3%) over our facilities. These data points are recorded in our internal data system. For future years, water withdrawals are expected to decrease due to ongoing water efficiency initiatives for example replacement of equipment with less water consuming or processes improvement, with investment in water-smart technologies in our factories. This forecasted reduction is in line with our target to reduce water withdrawal associated with our tobacco business by 33% compared to 2019.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

4815.88

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Due to higher water efficiency we have been able to reduce water discharge by 7% between 2022 and 2023, seeing a decrease in 31 factories including some of the most water intensive such as a site in Russia which saw the highest volume of water withdrawn in 2022 and reduced it by 42% in 2023.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

3707.43

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water withdrawn and water discharged have both decreased in 2023 versus the 2022 calendar year. Consumption is considered to equal withdrawals minus discharges. Withdrawals decreased by a greater amount than discharges and therefore consumption decreased.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

598.51

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**No significant change in geographic withdrawal patterns

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Maximum potential volume reduction already achieved

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

7.02

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

JT Group assessed all sites within our direct operations using WRI Aqueduct. All sites that were rated high to extremely high risk in the "Baseline Water Stress" mapping were considered to be in water stressed areas. We also included locations in "Arid and Low Water Use" areas. JT Group has not acquired any new sites this year thus withdrawals from water stressed areas are about the same compared to the previous reporting year. We calculated our five-year forecast by extrapolating from our three year forecast of water withdrawals, which is updated annually. JT Group does not plan significant changes in the nature or geographical spread of our business operations over the next 5 years. As a result, our withdrawals from water stressed areas are not forecasted to significantly change.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Timber products

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:
☑ No, but we intend to obtain this data within the next two years

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

We are in the process of collecting and validating all of our timber-related data. There have been challenges associated with collecting this data accurately as it comes from our tier 2 suppliers. We are in the process of collecting and validating this volumetric data so that we can accurately calculate the proportion of our sourced volume that originates in areas of water stress.

Tobacco

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:
☑ 26-50

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

While water stress is likely to increase in some regions in which the Group operates, analysis has not identified any substantial risks in any region in the coming years. The overall proportion is therefore unlikely to change significantly in the coming years. Aqueduct assessment found that water stress in Turkey could increase by 1.4 times by 2030. The volume of leaf supplied by Turkey is currently about 4% of the Group's total volume, therefore while this is not a substantial business risk, this is one of the trends in water stress which will be most closely monitored by JT Group in the future. Leaf tobacco is procured from raw material suppliers based in Turkey, the USA and other countries, where water stress varies by location. So, if the proportion of leaf tobacco procured were to change, the volume procured from stressed regions could also change. Where possible, JT Group sources from multiple areas within a country to reduce the potential impacts of current and future water stress. Using the metric of tobacco sourced from water stressed areas and other assessments such as our risk assessment, we know that water stress is increasing globally. This is one reason why supplier water risk is included in our Environment Plan 2030. Our JTG Environment Plan 2030 included a commitment that by 2022 we would have implemented a water risk management process in our manufacturing supply chain. In 2023 this process was in place and allowing ongoing management of water-related risks across the Tobacco business manufacturing supply chain. Using Verisk Maplecroft risk indices, to date, the tobacco business has assessed over 2,500 of its key suppliers, in relation to water-related risks, including water quality, water stress, flood, drought and climate change. Tobacco business has now expanded the scope of water-related risks, to include water pollution, and has integrated water-related risk into its core business processes, through inclusion in the 'Suppliers ESG Screening and Risk Management Process'. In terms of tobacco leaf suppliers, JTI works together with other tobacco companies to refresh and revise the Sustainable Tobacco Program (STP). The STP is an industry-wide platform enabling businesses to collaborate on human rights, environmental issues, and other sustainability challenges, and to drive sustainable agriculture through a continuous improvement process. Water is one of the 8 focus areas of the STP.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1674.77

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

An overseas factory in our food business uses the water including rainwater and river water for some purposes, for example, production, cleaning and cooling facilities/machinery. In 2023, the production volume of products that use a lot of river water decreased slightly.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

JT Group production and office spaces require water that is non-saline. Currently, it is not economically feasible for JT Group to source brackish/saline water and then desalinate the water, hence we withdraw solely non-saline water from other sources.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

4272.74

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

JT Group invest in new technologies at our factories to replace older, less efficient machinery, with more efficient ones. This is in line with our water withdrawal reduction target 33% by 2030 in our tobacco business.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

All water withdrawn from Groundwater sources is renewable. Our water risk assessment highlights any sites where significant water scarcity risks are present. At these sites, JT Group does not source any water from groundwater.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

No water enters our organizational boundary as a result of our production. The growing and farming of Tobacco leaves does not generate any significant volume of water.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2575.8

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

In the food business that consumes the most water in the group, the production volume of products that use a lot of municipal water decreased. We also understand that third party sources are not located in water stressed areas.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2386.5

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to fresh surface is lower. Any year-on-year change is related to the reduction of water use due to production volume changes at those factories where we discharge water to fresh surface water as well as water use reduction initiatives. The year-on-year difference in 2023 vs 2022 is 7%.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

15.6

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

JT Group have one site which discharges water to brackish surface water/seawater, making this discharge destination relevant. The volume of discharge is much higher in 2023 % 7704% compared to 2022 due to an increase in production volume at that site, although in absolute terms it represents 15.4 megalitres which is less than 1% of our annual discharges. 2023 was an unusually high year at this site for both production volume and water withdrawal/discharges.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

5.2

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

This destination is relevant as three sites discharge water to groundwater. The volume is lower (-7%) in 2023 compared to 2022, this is due to a reduction in water use at those factories where we discharge water to groundwater due to a production volume decrease at several of these sites and water reduction measures implemented.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2408.6

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

This figure has reduced by 10% between 2022 and 2023. This is due to lower production volume at those sites and water reduction measures.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

504.2

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 11-20

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

One JTI site in Brazil (reported in 2021) has a wastewater treatment plant that includes a Biological Aerated reactor, Secondary Sedimentation and chlorination. Two other sites in Japan, one site in Turkey, one site in Iran, one site in Indonesia and one site in Bangladesh also do tertiary treatment on site. The sites comply with local regulatory standards and minimum waste water parameters set by JTG, whichever are more stringent. On-site treatment systems are installed when requested by local regulation or adequate treatment is not ensured by communal waste water treatment systems according to JTG's voluntary set parameters.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3304

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Several JTI sites have wastewater treatment plants using secondary treatment including aerobic treatment of wastewater. The sites comply with local regulatory standards and minimum waste water parameters set by JTG, whichever are more stringent. On-site treatment systems are installed when requested by local regulation or adequate treatment is not ensured by communal waste water treatment systems according to JTG's voluntary set parameters.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

23

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Facility closure

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 11-20

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Several JTI sites have septic tanks which treat wastewater to a primary level before discharging third to third-parties for further treatment. The sites comply with local regulatory standards and minimum waste water parameters set by JTG, whichever are more stringent. On-site treatment systems are installed when requested by local regulation or adequate treatment is not ensured by communal waste water treatment systems according to JTG's voluntary set parameters. The reduction in 2023, is driven by a 89% reduction of discharged water at a site in Japan which closed in March 2023.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

137.4

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Some JTI sites discharge wastewater untreated to the natural environment. For example, a JTG site in Germany discharges a small amount of cooling water back into the ground via an on-site lagoon. Discharges are lower in 2023 compared to 2022, this is mainly due to decreased production at one of two of our sites. The discharge complies with regulatory requirements and is below the criteria set by JTG for Waste water parameters.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

839

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

32% of JT I sites discharge wastewater to a third-party without treatment including all office and R&D sites. This is then treated by the third-party. These sites are in areas where the communal waste water treatment systems are adequate to meet JTG's voluntary waste water treatment requirements.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

8.3

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This amounts for the discharge to tankers at some of our facilities which stayed stable due to the nature of the tankers.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

52.35

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☑ Nitrates

☑ Phosphates

☑ Priority substances listed under the EU Water Framework Directive

(9.2.10.3) List the specific substances included

Cadmium Lead Nickel

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Emissions to water volumes have been calculated at two sites in Central Europe from all sites monitoring in 2023.
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

1

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

In 2021 our factory in Turkey had a significant risk of flooding due to heavy rainfall and poor water discharging systems from the roof of the leaf storage warehouse. Some affected materials were reused after drying and before losing their form. This rainfall's financial impact is related to destroyed materials (tobacco) only.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

No further comments.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Torbali factory

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify :Kukuk Menderes

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

38.196571

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

27.349252

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

227.88

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

227.88

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

51.51

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

51.51

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

176.37

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

At this facility, 1,769m3 of water were recycled internally instead of being discharged. We are aiming to increase this amount in future years.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

While internal controls are in place for each water aspect of this question, the third-party verification covers total water withdrawals and total water discharges.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

While internal controls are in place for each water aspect of this question, the third-party verification covers total water withdrawals and total water discharges.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

While internal controls are in place for each water aspect of this question, the third-party verification covers total water withdrawals and total water discharges.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

While internal controls are in place for each water aspect of this question, the third-party verification covers total water withdrawals and total water discharges.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISO/IEC 17025:2017

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

While internal controls are in place for each water aspect of this question, the third-party verification covers total water withdrawals and total water discharges. [Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ No, CDP supply chain members do not buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	2841.1	*0.33*	*Small decrease due to continual improvement in water efficiency at JTG facilities.*

[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

Timber products

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

0.01

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Freshwater withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.9.6) Please explain

This is our first year collecting and reporting timber-related data through CDP. We would expect that the intensity has fallen over previous years due to water efficiency projects being implemented in both the leaf processing and cigarette production phase which have reduced the water withdrawals required. We expect the intensity to decrease in future years as our scope of timber reporting expands. We currently exclude non-tobacco material (NTM) volume data from our disclosure, but expect to include this in future years. This will significantly reduce the intensity figure reported here. Conversely, in terms of a like-for-like comparison, we would anticipate our water efficiency programs to have a downwards impact on this intensity metric. The intensity metric is used internally to gauge the success of the group's water reduction efforts, including targets such as our 2030 target to reduce absolute water withdrawal for tobacco business by 33%. If water intensity falls, it indicates that our water policy and associated efforts are providing a genuine benefit to our water stewardship. With our withdrawal reduction target in place, it is predicted that water intensity will steadily decrease in future years due to the planned implementation of water withdrawal reduction initiatives. These initiatives include wastewater re-use projects, replacing older technology with newer, more efficient options, and engagement with staff on water reduction initiatives. As an example, Jordan is the world's second most water-scarce country and water is therefore a resource that must be managed carefully. We studied our water use and distribution systems and found several opportunities for improvement, stressing a clear message that every drop counts. The water recovery project introduced innovations so that we now use water efficiently and maximize recovery and recycling of used water. As a result, some 3,500 cubic meters of water are recovered each year, reducing our need to withdraw water.

Tobacco

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

210.66

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Freshwater withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :millions of cigarettes

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.9.6) Please explain

The intensity metric decreased by around 2% compared to 2022, which is considered about the same based on JTG approach (less than 5%). This is due to water efficiency projects being implemented in both the leaf processing and cigarette production phase which has reduced the water withdrawals required. We anticipate reduction in water intensity as we implement water efficiency programs. We have a strategy in place to reduce water intensity; The JT Group Environment Plan 2030 has a target to reduce water withdrawal associated with our tobacco business by 33% from 2019 to 2030. We have an Annual and Strategic Planning (ASP) process which is carried out annually and measures progress against annual targets for the next three years. Sites are required to set specific actions showing how they can contribute to achieving our longer-term targets relating to water efficiency at the site, business and company level. The intensity metric is used internally to gauge the success of the group's water reduction efforts, including targets such as our 2030 target to reduce absolute water withdrawal for tobacco business by 33%. If water intensity falls, it indicates that our water policy and associated efforts are providing a genuine benefit to our water stewardship. With our withdrawal reduction target in

place, it is predicted that water intensity will steadily decrease in future years due to the planned implementation of water withdrawal reduction initiatives. These initiatives include wastewater re-use projects, replacing older technology with newer, more efficient options, and engagement with staff on water reduction initiatives. As an example, Jordan is the world's second most water-scarce country and water is therefore a resource that must be managed carefully. We studied our water use and distribution systems and found several opportunities for improvement, stressing a clear message that every drop counts. The water recovery project introduced innovations so that we now use water efficiently and maximize recovery and recycling of used water. As a result, some 3,500 cubic meters of water are recovered each year, reducing our need to withdraw water. We also do not foresee a major change over the next few years in the volume of our leaf procurement/cigarette production, and as such the denominator of our metric is likely to stay approximately the same. Combined with a fall in the numerator, the intensity metric is predicted to decrease in coming years.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

(9.13.1) Products contain hazardous substances

Select from:
☑ No

(9.13.2) Comment

Fine quality tobacco is by far the main ingredient in tobacco products. Many of our brands also contain small quantities of other ingredients added to the tobacco blend to maintain an overall product quality and consistency over time. None of JTI's tobacco products contain any hazardous substances as per Candidate List of Substance of Very High Concern for Authorization above 0.1% by weight (EU Regulation).
[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

In our processed food business, we handle products designed to minimize water usage during customer use. These products, defined as having a low water impact, help reduce the amount of water required in everyday food preparation. For example, our No Dish Series and packaged rice eliminate the need for dishwashing, significantly reducing water consumption. Similarly, frozen noodles can be cooked in a microwave, removing the need for boiling and further conserving water.

(9.14.4) Please explain

In our processed food business, water may be used during the product use phase by customers. As the business grows and the customer base expands, there is concern that water consumption could rise accordingly. To address this, we will prioritize offering products that have a low impact on water and contribute to reducing water consumption throughout the value chain.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

There are no further water aspects which are highlighted/prioritized in the JT Group Environment Plan 2030. The targets given relate to the most substantial water aspects of the business.
[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in total water withdrawals

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

02/12/2024

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

3561454.14

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/30/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

2386174.27

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

2854508

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

60

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

JTI reduction on water withdrawals of 33% from 2019 to 2030, with no exclusion within the scope of the business.

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We always analyse opportunities based on cost efficiency throughout our business prioritising alignment to our JTG environment plan 2030.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Updated target aligned with the JTG environment plan 2030 as old target was already achieved.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Country/area/region

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Increase in the proportion of local population using safely managed drinking water services around our facilities and operations

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

11/30/2019

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/30/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

1000000

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

500000

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

50

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covers all locations where JTI operates where we identify water scarcity and risks. We are expanding the scope year on year as further identifications occurs.

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

For many of the communities in which we operate, water remains a precious and scarce resource. That's why in December 2019 we launched our Global WASH (Water and Sanitation, Hygiene) initiative, with the ambitious goal of providing access to clean water and sanitation and hygiene for one million people by the end of 2025. Since the launch of the initiative, we have reached over 500,000 people – over 50% of our goal. Our WASH initiative has been changing the lives of people in Mexico, Ethiopia, and Bangladesh. Thanks to our local teams who have partnered with international and local organizations specializing in water and sanitation, hygiene, we were able to bring innovative solutions tailored to the specific needs of each area.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Increase in the proportion of local population using safely managed drinking water services in the areas where JTI operates.

Row 3

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Increase in the proportion of wastewater that is safely treated

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

02/13/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/30/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

99.5

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covers all of JTG business divisions with no exclusions.

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

NA

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

To reduce water pollution, the JT Group aims to maintain 100% compliance with discharge standards. Maintaining 100% compliance with discharge standards is one of the indicators for evaluating legal compliance; 99.51% of our wastewater in 2023 met discharge standards. Note that we have answered 0 in the "base year" column to make the automatically calculated "% of target achieved relative to base year" column value 100%. A very minor amount of wastewater (0.49%) was discharged not meeting discharge specification. Factories have action plan in place to avoid such situation in the future.
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.1.2) Target type and metric

Plastic packaging

☑ Reduce the total weight of plastic packaging used and/or produced

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is reusable

(10.1.3) Please explain

As a part of our JT Group Sustainability Targets we have a target: We will reduce our packaging (including plastic) and ensure that the remaining is 88% reusable or recyclable by 2025, rising to 100% by 2030. Our tobacco business have a set of targets to reduce the amount of virgin plastic used in product and packaging, and to improve recyclability of packaging.
[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG doesn’t produce plastic polymers.

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG commercialize plastic goods or components (cigarette filters, RRP devices). We are working to develop filter alternatives that strive for excellence in taste performance. Our commitment lies in continuous innovation and designing for circularity to minimize waste, enabling adult smokers to choose from a variety of options, including those made from more sustainable materials. Cigarette filters are made of biobased plastics — cellulose acetate (CA) — derived from wood-based material rather than from fossil fuels such as oil or gas. Our Company is dedicating significant resources — human, capital and time — to the ongoing research and development of more sustainable alternatives to current CA filters, including exploring options like paper-based filters. We continue researching for recycled plastics integration into our device and trying to find sustainable alternatives for materials we use to produce them.

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG doesn’t use durable plastic goods and/or components.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG doesn’t produce or commercialize plastic packaging.

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG uses plastic packaging materials for some products. Use of plastic packaging is necessary to sustain quality of product and shelf life. We are continuously looking for alternatives to reduce and replace plastic and have done some progress already. For instance, we have reduced the thickness of polypropylene overwraps. Since 2021, we are reducing our annual use of fossil-based plastic by around 500 tons, and are avoiding GHG emissions by up to 769 tons of CO2e. We are looking into no plastic substitutes for polypropylene film. Information on the volumes of plastic packaging is disclosed in subsequent questions.

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG doesn’t provide or commercialize services or goods that use plastic packaging (e.g., retail and food services).

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG does not provide waste management and/or water management services.

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

JTG does not provide any financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities.

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

No further comment.
[Fixed row]

(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content.

Durable goods and durable components sold

(10.4.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

49542

(10.4.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ % virgin fossil-based content

(10.4.3) % virgin fossil-based content

0.1

(10.4.7) Please explain

0.1% of total plastic sold by JTI is virgin fossil based, which is used in reduced-risk devices (RRD) (calculation covers 73% of JTI RRP devices by volume, for which detailed information could be gathered in timely manner. We are currently collecting information for rest of the products to be able to report in the future). JTI's cigarette filters are made of biobased plastics — cellulose acetate (CA) — derived from wood-based material rather than from fossil fuels such as oil or gas.
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

31257

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ % virgin fossil-based content

(10.5.3) % virgin fossil-based content

99.99

(10.5.7) Please explain

Plastic in our packaging mix is currently only 7% by weight. Plastic has a number of benefits that we need to take into account packaging-wise to ensure the quality and safety of our products, such as facilitating hygiene and product freshness, and avoiding contamination. So, while we aim to reduce the use of virgin plastic further and single-use plastics, we have to ensure that we are making the best decisions possible without compromising on the quality and safety of our products. Our R&D and Procurement departments are currently partnering with suppliers and innovative start-ups to investigate new materials that have similar safety and quality attributes to plastic that we could use in our packaging in the future. In the future, JT Group intends to shift towards using packaging from renewable or recycled sources.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

Select all that apply
☑ % technically recyclable

(10.5.1.3) % of plastic packaging that is technically recyclable

100

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

JTG makes sure that plastic materials used in the packaging is technically ready for recycling (can be recycled only if correct infrastructure is in place). JTG conducts recyclability assessments with support from third parties to understand recyclability potential of packaging structures in specific markets to be able to improve it and make claims.
[Fixed row]

(10.6) Provide the total weight of waste generated by the plastic you produce, commercialize, use and/or process and indicate the end-of-life management pathways.

	Total weight of waste generated during the reporting year (Metric tons)
Production of plastic	*0*
Commercialization of plastic	*80799*

[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water protection

☑ Land/water management

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Other, please specify :As part of our commitment to Nature in 2022-2023, we conducted a qualitative assessment, including dependency and impact evaluation on biodiversity. We also defined our deforestation and land conversion commitments.

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ Response indicators

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

JT G is in the process of assessing locations in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

JT G is in the process of assessing locations in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

JT G is in the process of assessing locations in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

JT G is in the process of assessing locations in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

JT G is in the process of assessing locations in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

JT G recognize that some of origins where we source tobacco from is close to area important for biodiversity and information is available on local level. JT G is currently conducting analysis to have consolidated company view.
[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Other data point in module 7, please specify :Total energy consumption

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

JT Group obtained verification of its total energy consumption data for 2023.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Independent_Assurance_Statement_Environment.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Waste data

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

JT Group obtained verification of its total waste generated in operations data for 2023, which is used in relation to calculation of Scope 3 Category 5 emissions.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Independent_Assurance_Statement_Environment.pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ Water withdrawals– total volumes

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

These data points were verified under ISAE3000 (Revised) by Bureau Veritas.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Independent_Assurance_Statement_Environment.pdf

Row 4

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ Water discharges– total volumes

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

These data points were verified under ISAE3000 (Revised) by Bureau Veritas.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Independent_Assurance_Statement_Environment.pdf
[Add row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

	Additional information
	No further comments

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute