British American Tobacco PLC

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

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

.

02/12/2025, 02:13 pm

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:
☑ GBP

(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

British American Tobacco (BAT) is a FTSE top-10, multi-category consumer goods business with more than 46,000 employees worldwide, and a large tobacco and non-tobacco supply chain. Spread across six continents, our regions are the United States of America; Americas & Europe (AME); and Asia Pacific, Middle East & Africa (APMEA). BAT Group generated revenue of 27.28 billion in 2023. Our corporate purpose is to create A Better Tomorrow. For us, this means Building a Smokeless World and becoming a predominantly smokeless business, with 60% of our revenue from Non-Combustibles by 2035. By providing smokers with access to smokeless products, we can drive forward Tobacco Harm Reduction and, ultimately, make cigarettes a thing of the past. Our consumer-centric brand portfolio contains smokeless product brands Vuse (Vapour), glo (Heated Products) and Velo (Modern Oral). Our Non-Combustible portfolio also contains Grizzly (Traditional Oral). Our main combustibles brands are Dunhill, Kent, Lucky Strike, Pall Mall and Rothmans. Key brands in the U.S. include Newport, Natural American Spirit and Camel.
[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

11/30/2023

(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:

☑ 5 years

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

Select from:

☑ 5 years

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

Select from:

☑ 2 years

[Fixed row]

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

27283000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

XS2391779134

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

GB0002875804

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

110448107

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

LSE: BATS JSE: BTI NYSE: BTI

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

0287580

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

213800FKA5MF17RJKT63

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

536025000

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

☑ Cuba

☑ China

☑ Fiji
☑ Mali
☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ Malta
☑ Samoa
☑ Spain
☑ Sudan
☑ Angola
☑ Jordan
☑ Latvia
☑ Malawi
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Zambia
☑ Albania
☑ Algeria
☑ Austria
☑ Belarus
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Jamaica
☑ Nigeria
☑ Réunion
☑ Honduras
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Paraguay
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Ghana
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Kenya
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Guyana
☑ Poland
☑ Serbia
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Uganda
☑ Belgium
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Germany
☑ Romania
☑ Ukraine
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Cameroon
☑ Colombia
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Mozambique

☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ South Africa
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ North Macedonia
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Democratic Republic of the Congo
☑ Uzbekistan
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Switzerland
☑ Solomon Islands
☑ Papua New Guinea
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Trinidad and Tobago
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, for all facilities

(1.8.2) Comment

We are able to provide geolocation data (longitude and latitude) for all our facilities. This information is collected via our environmental reporting system from the sustainability teams or environment, health and safety teams of all our reporting units across the Group. The information is reviewed annually.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Algeria - Oran

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.698861

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.487678

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Argentina - Pilar

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.401315

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-58.973165

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ASC - Clarksville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.62052

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.2225

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ASC - Memphis

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.009637

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-89.855667

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ASC - Taylor Bros

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.0536

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.3197

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bangladesh - Dhaka

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

23.781017

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

90.396588

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bangladesh - Kushtia GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

23.887236

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

89.108156

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bangladesh - Manikganj

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

23.85

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

90.0111

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bangladesh - Savar

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

23.968946

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

90.263229

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Brazil - SCS GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-29.780771

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-52.406185

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Brazil - UDI

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-18.871928

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-48.302384

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chile - Casablanca

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.305433

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.408689

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chile - San Fernando GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.553171

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.963962

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Croatia - Kanfanar

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.113235

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.835235

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Croatia - Virovitica GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.821986

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

17.406851

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Cuba - Brascuba

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

23.024167

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.778333

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 17

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fiji - Nadi GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-17.777648

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

177.48411

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fiji - Suva

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-17.7134

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

178.065

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Germany - Bayreuth

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.962284

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

11.599446

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Honduras - San Pedro

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

15.469132

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-88.030404

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 21

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hungary - LCO

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

46.066944

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

18.275644

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 22

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hungary - MO

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

46.072985

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

18.237845

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 23

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hungary - MYO/RYO

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

46.072985

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

18.237845

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 24

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Indonesia - Malang

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-7.96

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

112.63

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 25

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Italy - Trieste

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.649526

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.776818

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 26

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Jordan - Amman

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.75091

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

35.956938

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 27

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Kenya - Nairobi

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-1.305661

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

36.855717

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 28

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Kenya - Thika GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-1.03326

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

37.06933

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 29

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Korea - Sacheon

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.068981

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

128.060752

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 30

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Malaysia - Johor Bahru

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.43389

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.59772

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 31

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mexico - Monterrey

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.686275

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-100.339819

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 32

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mexico - Tepic GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

21.46644

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-104.868645

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 33

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mozambique - Maputo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-25.937373

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

32.574974

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 34

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Nigeria - Ibadan

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

7.30816

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

3.869119

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 35

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pakistan - Akora factory & GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.994182

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

72.144859

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 36

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pakistan - Jhelum

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.58

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

73.41

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 37

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

PNG - Madang

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-5.223455

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

145.801987

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 38

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Poland - Augustow

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.85475

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

23.01591

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 39

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Poland - CHIC - eSMOKING Liquids Production

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.416636

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

17.88641

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 40

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

RJRT - Tobaccoville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.255886

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.367906

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 41

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

RJRT - Whitaker Park

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.135178

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.257875

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 42

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Romania - Ploiesti

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.945225

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

25.98228

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 43

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Russia - St Petersburg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

60.019694

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

30.082945

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 44

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Samoa - Apia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-13.824278

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-171.802023

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 45

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Serbia - Vranje

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.546186

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

21.901282

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 46

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Singapore - Senoko

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.45903

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.80263

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 47

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Solomon Islands - Honiara

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-9.64571

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

160.156194

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 48

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

South Africa - Heidelberg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-26.5118

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

28.3746

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 49

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sri Lanka - Colombo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

7.8731

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

80.7718

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 50

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sri Lanka - Kandy GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

7.8731

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

80.7718

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 51

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sudan - Wad Madani

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

14.394197

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

33.501905

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 52

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sweden - Malmo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

55.55417

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.06177

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 53

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Switzerland - Boncourt

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

47.49997

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

7.01551

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 54

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Trinidad - Port of Spain

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.650148

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-61.429968

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 55

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Turkey - Samsun

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.507833

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

36.110417

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 56

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ukraine - Prilucky

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.605933

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

32.386361

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 57

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Uzbekistan - Samarkand

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.4202

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

67.0345

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 58

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Uzbekistan - Urgut GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.2544

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

67.1512

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress and is considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 59

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Venezuela - Caracas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.493373

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

0

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 60

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Venezuela - Valencia GLT

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.201865

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-67.960569

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).

Row 61

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Vietnam - Dong Nai (PMD)

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.959716

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.931925

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 62

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Vietnam - Ho Chi Minh City (SMD)

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.762622

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.660172

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 63

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Zambia - Lusaka

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-15.410066

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

28.29708

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Not a water stressed site

Row 64

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Zimbabwe - Harare

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-17.872138

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

31.018537

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This site falls under an area of water stress but is not considered to be a high priority site. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those located in basins with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume (calculated using conversion factors into million stick equivalent).
[Add row]

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

Production

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

Select from:

☑ Value chain (excluding own land)

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

Select from:

☑ Do not own/manage land

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

The land use in our leaf supply chain takes place in third-party owned properties, either farmers that we contract directly or third party leaf processing companies from which we source tobacco.

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)

1018756.6

(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

☑ Pulp

☑ Paper

☑ Primary packaging

☑ Tertiary packaging

☑ Secondary packaging

☑ Wood-based bioenergy

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

(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 a significant commodity for BAT. Wood is used for curing the tobacco leaves and to build the curing barns. Pulp and paper related materials like primary and secondary packaging, fine/specialty papers and cellulose acetate tow are sourced to be utilized in our products. BAT buys around 330,000 tons of tobacco leaf each year. This is either sourced directly from 91,000 contracted farmers, or indirectly from an estimated 154,000 farmers via third party suppliers in 28 countries. In 2023, 62.8% of leaf suppliers used wood to cure the tobacco supplied to BAT. This tobacco is used in our combustible and tobacco heated products. Those two categories contributed to 89% of our revenue in 2023 and hence that's the portion of revenue which is dependent on tobacco as an agricultural commodity. In addition, the majority of BAT products utilize pulp and paper-based materials (e.g. packaging).

Cocoa

(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)

500

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

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Cocoa

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Small volume

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

BAT sources approximately 500 tons of cocoa which is used in the production of products. This is less than 0.1% of global cocoa volumes. As part of our annual impact assessment on deforestation, due to the very low amount of cocoa that is utilised in BAT product, cocoa use by BAT does not result in a material risk of deforestation.
[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:

☑ 81-90%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

BAT does not own tobacco farms. We buy around 330,000 tons of tobacco leaf each year, grown by 91,000 directly contracted farmers and an estimated 154,000 farmers from third party suppliers in 28 countries. This volume of tobacco is used for our combustible and tobacco heated products. These two categories contributed to 89% of our revenue in 2023 and hence that is the portion dependent on tobacco as an agricultural commodity.

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

BAT have developed a high-level value chain map which shows 1) the processes and movement of inbound materials 2) the processes in our factory related to the production of cigarettes, other tobacco products (OTP) and New Category products and 3) the downstream activities related to retail. As part of the biodiversity risk assessments we have conducted, we have mapped the geolocation for all our directly contracted farmers (including smallholder farmers), BAT factories, and have mapped pulp and paper to the mill it is sourced from. We have also used the same geolocation data to map our value chain to the relevant water basin using the Aquaduct database for water related risks. As part of our Supply Network Operation's (SNO) logistics control tower (a centralized digital platform that provides end-to-end visibility, control and management of the entire supply chain), we use a value chain mapping tool called "Everstream". This has the addresses and geo-locations for our supply chain from the tier 1 supplier warehouse, including the route of shipments the external ports, airports, all BAT factories, and warehouses to the first customer delivery address. The mapping for tier 2 and tier 3 suppliers is in progress.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.5) Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mapping plastics in our value chain will be completed in the next two years in line with the CSRD requirements.

(1.24.1.6) Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain

We began with mapping plastics in our packaging upstream supply chain (now complete) and are currently mapping plastics within our product. Following this we will move to mapping plastics within our downstream supply 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 3 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 100%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

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

As part of the identification and assessment phase, the time-horizons of short (0-12 months), medium (1-5 years) and long-term (5 years) are utilised. The time horizons are used to consider the period over which the consequences (magnitude) of the Impact, Risk or Opportunity (IRO) in focus, should it occur, are experienced. The most appropriate time horizon is then assigned to each IRO and scored considering the time horizon assigned to it. These time horizons align with the Group's enterprise risk management (ERM) methodology, which is used to assess the Group's business risks (e.g. principal risks) and sustainability-related IROs. The time horizons align with those required under the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS), which is the framework used as the basis for BAT's CSRD disclosures.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

As part of the identification and assessment phase, the time-horizons of short (0-12 months), medium (1-5 years) and long-term (5 years) are utilised. The time horizons are used to consider the period over which the consequences (magnitude) of the Impact, Risk or Opportunity (IRO) in focus, should it occur, are experienced. The most appropriate time horizon is then assigned to each IRO and scored considering the time horizon assigned to it. These time horizons align with the Group's enterprise risk management (ERM) methodology, which is used to assess the Group's business risks (e.g. principal risks) and sustainability-related IROs. The time horizons align with those required under the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS), which is the framework used as the basis for BAT's CSRD disclosures.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

As part of the identification and assessment phase, the time-horizons of short (0-12 months), medium (1-5 years) and long-term (5 years) are utilised. The time horizons are used to consider the period over which the consequences (magnitude) of the Impact, Risk or Opportunity (IRO) in focus, should it occur, are experienced. The most appropriate time horizon is then assigned to each IRO and scored considering the time horizon assigned to it. These time horizons align with the Group's enterprise risk management (ERM) methodology, which is used to assess the Group's business risks (e.g. principal risks) and sustainability-related IROs. The time horizons align with those required under the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS), which is the framework used as the basis for BAT's CSRD disclosures.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water
☑ Plastics
☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain
☑ Downstream value chain

(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

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ EcoVadis

☑ Encore tool

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ IBAT for Business

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

☑ WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter

☑ IBAT – Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool

☑ TNFD – Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures

☑ LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare) approach, TNFD

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management
☑ Internal company methods
☑ ISO 31000 Risk Management Standard

International methodologies and standards

☑ Alliance for Water Stewardship Standard
☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard
☑ Life Cycle Assessment

Databases

☑ Other databases, please specify

Other

☑ Desk-based research
☑ External consultants
☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis
☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

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

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress
☑ Water stress
☑ Soil degradation
☑ Change in land-use
☑ Groundwater depletion
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Changing wind patterns
☑ Temperature variability
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Changing customer behavior
☑ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

Reputation

☑ Impact on human health

Technology

☑ Transition to reusable products
☑ Transition to recyclable plastic products
☑ Transition to increasing renewable content
☑ Transition to increasing recycled content

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The central ERM team oversees BAT's bi-annual risk review and reporting exercise and applies a standardised risk assessment methodology (outlined in our Risk Management Manual) embedded at Group, functional, direct-reporting business unit (DRBU) and individual market levels. Risk data (from each business level) is collected in the Group's risk management system (SAP GRC RM) which applies intelligent aggregation of risk impact scores. The DRBU risk scores aggregate up to produce a regional risk score for each risk. The system also provides standardised risk management output documents which support the bi-annual risk assessment process and are used, in part, to drive risk debates at various Risk Management Committee meetings. Risk reviews are completed by multidisciplinary teams (e.g. manufacturing, leaf, supply chain, procurement, commercial). External assessments take place as required and may focus on specific areas (e.g. leaf growing) or end markets depending on risk mapping indications. Climate change risks & impacts are identified through internal and external risk assessments considering short, medium, and long-term (aligned with TCFD scenario analysis and materiality risk mapping). Local BAT site risk assessments are carried out bi-annually (min) and are linked with business continuity plans focusing on, but not restricted to, short and medium-term risks (depending on risk type). BAT's risk management process has four stages: "Identify" identifies potential events that could adversely impact achievement of business objectives, incl. failure to capitalise on opportunities. This involves identifying relevant strategy and objectives, identifying stakeholders and their objectives, and analysing the overall environment. Risks are identified by the relevant Leadership Team, Risk Management Committee or any senior manager involved in managing risks. "Assess and Evaluate" considers risks/opportunities to determine their impact and likelihood for prioritisation. This is done using two scales, both from 1- 3, that combined provide a total risk rating from 1- 9 which helps to understand the Group's risk exposure. Details are provided on impact, likelihood and total risk rating. The potential impact of a risk/opportunity is evaluated through Risk Impact Matrices. These measure potential impacts on a Group, functional, DRBU and individual market level relative to 5 Impact Categories - financial, reputational, safety, legal and environmental impact metrics. This evaluation is converted into a number (1-3, low to high) based on the relevant Risk Impact Matrix. The risk/opportunity is then evaluated based on the current net impact. This evaluation considers the reasonably foreseeable gross impact and the expected impact of current mitigation activities. The likelihood of the risk having the evaluated impact is rated from 1- 3 (low to high) based on assessment by the Risk Manager and Risk Owner. Examples of identification of risks/opportunities at facility level incl. making our factories more resilient to climate change impacts through investment in building fabric and energy systems, reducing energy consumption and potential exposures to climate change regulation. The assessment covers both physical and transitional risks and opportunities. "Manage" and "Monitor" involves assigning mitigation measures, ensuring their effectiveness, and monitoring & reporting risk related information at various Risk Management Committees.
[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

As part of BAT's Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) climate scenario analysis we evaluate the impact global warming may have on tobacco leaf yields. The methodology was developed based on HadGem2-ES. If our tobacco yields decline, there will be requirements to contract with a higher number of farmers and there will be higher sourcing costs (a risk to BAT The climate-related scenario analysis undertaken for tobacco agriculture takes into account the climate change impacts on water availability and also soil health (environmental dependencies), not just rising temperature and plant resilience. As part of the analysis different solutions are assessed to support realization of opportunities and mitigation of risks. This includes, increased irrigation, plant varieties with water deficit tolerance or deeper root systems, soil management and changing transplanting dates to cooler periods. As part of our water risk analysis we look at water quality, as our manufacturing operations are dependent on good quality water. We invest in treatment plants in areas with identified poor water quality.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

☑ Areas of high 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 water

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Identifying dependencies: The ENCORE database is used for sectoral-level screening on business activities across direct operations, upstream & downstream value chains (categorised as ISIC codes). Identifying impacts and risks: geospatial biodiversity risk assessments (BRA) were carried out for direct operations, which identified high priority sites requiring action to protect and restore biodiversity. BRAs were also carried out for directly contracted tobacco farmers to identify high priority locations for the protection & restoration of biodiversity, as well as the prevention of deforestation. The Biodiversity Extent, Condition and Significance approach (from the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Framework) assessed our Operations and tobacco footprint: Biodiversity extent, the biodiversity loss relative to a pristine condition, and the significance that loss has globally, based on the 'type' and 'relative value' of biodiversity present in that area. The significance is primarily measured using the Task Force on Nature-related financial Disclosure (TNFD) recommended International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Species Threat Abatement and Restoration (STAR) metric, split into STARt (abating threats) and STARr (restoring habitat). The Biodiversity Land occupancy footprint is expressed in MSA.ha. This metric shows the abundance of original species relative to their abundance in undisturbed ecosystems and used for prioritization for biodiversity management plan deployment. The top five 3rd party tobacco suppliers were also assessed, representing 67% of the tobacco volume we buy outside of the Group's own Leaf operations, we then apportioned the 3rd party's total footprint result by the percentage of tobacco we purchase from them. To measure and prioritise environmental impact of non-tobacco goods and services, a lifecycle assessment (LCA) approach following the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPEBS) Pressures Framework was used to assess 'magnitude' of biodiversity impact. We were able to conduct initial screening based on newly released guidance from TNFD for direct operations. This analysis identified a priority operation site if it met one of the following criteria: top 20% of estimated MSA.ha, or top 20% of STARt Score within 5km of priority area dependent on size of site. BAT's annual spend per goods sector and country fed into TNFD recommended EXIOBASE database estimates the environmental impacts associated with our procured goods. The data generated are used to estimate the pressures and impacts on biodiversity using LCA conversion factors and identify material – and therefore priority sectors. To help prioritise locations for water stresses we use the World Resource Institute's Aquaduct database. Priority factories are identified based on those with high and very high water stress, water depletion or drought risk from Aquaduct and account for greater than 1% of group production volume.

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

Select from:

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

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

Maps for Priority locations - CDP.pdf
[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:
☑ Direct operating costs

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:
☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

60000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply
☑ Frequency of effect occurring
☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

The Group follows a standardised methodology for risk management across the Group, embedded at Group, functional, direct-reporting business unit (DRBU) and individual market levels to identify, assess and monitor financial and non-financial risks faced at every level of the business. These risks encompass both direct operations and our supply/value chain. Risks are assessed biannually and prioritised at three levels by reference to their impact (high/medium/low) and likelihood (probable/possible/unlikely) as per our Group Risk Management Manual. Substantive financial or strategic impact refers to the significant and meaningful effect that risks can have on the financial or strategic aspects of the business. Risks are assessed both quantitively and qualitatively using a Risk Impact Matrix set out in the Group Risk Management Manual. In financial (quantitative) terms, substantive financial or strategic impact is defined as an impact between 60mn and 120mn (low), between 120mn and 250mn (medium) and in excess of 250mn (high) on Operating Profit, Net Finance Cost or Operating Cash Flow (representing the impact in any single year). Strategic impact refers to such factors as reputational, safety, legal, environmental social and governance impacts which are also included within the Risk Impact Matrix and are considered within each risk assessment. These metrics apply to Group risks, with reducing thresholds set at functional and DRBU levels. The time frame is used to consider the period over which the consequence of the risk, should it occur, impacts the business. Frequency of impact is considered through the assessment of the timeframe of each risk and reported in accordance with BAT's Risk Management Manual, this is used to consider the period over which the consequences of the risk, should it occur, impacts the business. Long-term risks could develop over several years after the initial event occurs, and therefore generally relate to strategic decisions. Short-term risks have their impact immediately after the event occurs and tend to cause disruption to normal operations. For example, the growth of illicit trade could be a long-term risk; the failure to achieve an expected price increase could be a short-term risk. Where a risk has a mixture of time frame the default definition should be the longest-term.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Direct operating costs

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

60000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

There are various criteria, both qualitative and quantitative, against which the opportunities for the business, related to environmental issues, may be measured. Each opportunity is assigned a time horizon (short, medium, long-term). The magnitude of the financial effects of the opportunity in each time horizon is determined by the Group's enterprise risk management framework. "Financial effect" refers to the positive impact on financial position, financial performance, cash flows, access to finance, cost of capital for the business. For the reporting period 1st December 2022 – 30th November 2023, and in financial (quantitative) terms, high impact is deemed as in excess of 250 million, with medium impact 120- 250 million, and low impact 60-120 million per annum. Opportunities below 60 million are not included in the Group registers but are managed and reported at regional and direct-reporting business unit (DRBU) level. Qualitative impact criteria are legal (including existing and emerging regulatory requirements), reputational, environmental, social and governance.
[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

Through our global environmental, health & safety management system (GEHSMS) aligned with ISO 14001, we have global standards & procedures for water management. Global water management & water and wastewater standards include risk identification, assessment, prevention, spill prevention & hazardous substance management to prevent water pollution. On-site wastewater is discharged according to local parameters, regulatory requirements and GEHEMS internal standards. These standards are integrated into our factories' environmental management systems and validated locally annually, then audited by Global EHS team. BAT identifies and classifies potential water pollutants using a workflow involving product safety, leaf sustainability and other departments. Substances prohibited by Regulation are listed & alternative options are explored. Mitigations are adopted based on safety data sheets and hazard statements. External assessments are commissioned when internal expertise is lacking. Controls include a list of banned substances, pollutant minimization strategies and technical assistance to leaf farmers for proper agrochemical use and waste management. Engagement with suppliers and farmers ensures adherence to standard operating procedures & responsible practices.
[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 fertilisers can result in negative environmental impacts if they enter water courses and wash into water bodies. Nitrates can cause intensive growth of algae which can block sunlight from reaching underwater plants and which can disrupt aquatic ecosystems. When the algae die, they are decomposed by bacteria, a process that consumes large amounts of oxygen in the water and results in “dead zones” where aquatic life cannot survive, reducing local biodiversity. Nitrate runoff from agricultural crops can result in contamination of drinking water.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Water recycling

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The success of our strategy to mitigate nitrate pollution is measured by assessing the soil and water management practices applied by the farmers. This includes ensuring correct usage of fertilizers, which is monitored by our field technicians during field visits. We engage directly with contracted farmers to promote the use of best practice approaches for agricultural practices including waste management collection processes to ensure proper end of life treatment. When visiting rural properties, our technical assistance team undertake inspections to verify how farmers are preparing and applying fertilizer in line with recommendations. They also inspect how crop protection agents are used, to monitor adherence with local regulations. Our research and development centres continually review and modify tobacco plants to reduce reliance on fertilizers and increase resistance to disease. Success is measured by the % of hectarage with best practice soil and water management applied. In 2023 this represented more than 80%, comparable with 2022 but which shows significant improvement compared to 67% in 2018. For our direct operations success is measured by % of water recycled. We have a range of different water treatment capabilities including water treatment plans, ultra filtration and reverse osmosis which enabled us to achieve 24.4% water recycling in 2023 across our operations sites and improve the quality of water discharged.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Phosphates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

PHOSPHATE fertilisers can result in negative environmental impacts if they enter water courses and wash into water bodies. Phosphates can cause intensive growth of algae which can block sunlight from reaching underwater plants and which can disrupt aquatic ecosystems. When the algae die, they are decomposed by bacteria, a process that consumes large amounts of oxygen in the water and results in “dead zones” where aquatic life cannot survive, reducing local biodiversity. The growth of algae can disrupt the natural food web by outcompeting native aquatic plants and altering the balance of species in the ecosystem.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The success of our strategy to mitigate phosphate pollution is measured by assessing the soil and water management practices applied by the farmers. This includes monitoring the correct usage of fertilizers which is carried outby our field technicians during field visits. We engage directly with contracted farmers to promote the use of best practice approaches for agricultural practices including waste management collection processes to ensure proper end of life treatment. When visiting rural properties, our technical assistance team undertake inspections to verify how farmers are preparing and applying fertilizer, to ensure this is in line with recommendations. They also inspect how crop protection agents are used, to monitor adherence with local regulations. Our research and development centres continually review and modify tobacco plants to reduce reliance on fertilizers and increase resistance to disease. Success is measured by the % of hectarage with best practice soil and water management is applied. In 2023 this represented more than 80%, comparable with 2022 but which shows significant improvement compared to 67% in 2018.

Row 4

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Pesticides

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Pesticides and other agrochemical substances can cause negative environmental impacts if they enter watercourses from areas where agricultural activities are performed and may be dangerous to the species inhabiting water bodies, acting in a similar way to fertilizers. If agrochemicals get into watercourses, they have the

potential to cause algae blooms in localized areas around operations, which can be up to many meters of size (10m). These algae blooms can starve the aquatic environment of oxygen, and adversely impact the local fish population.

(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

☑ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The success of our strategy to mitigate such impact is measured through the consistent maintenance of 100% compliance to regulatory standards, product testing & ensuring no products exceeding toxicity, no use of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHP), no agrochemicals containers found outside of the controlled disposal cabinet, which has restricted access with controls. BAT is an active member of CORESTA's Agrochemicals Advisory Committee, promoting the alignment & guidelines across the tobacco industry. BAT follows the WHO and the FAO of the UN guidelines on pesticide classification by hazard, & CORESTA Guide N27. By following these guidelines, BAT has programs to eliminate HHPs, incl. active ingredients listed by Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention & Montreal Protocol. BAT requires all suppliers to annually acknowledge receipt of their latest Leaf Suppliers Manual, which contains the agrochemicals & formulations not to be used in tobacco production. Suppliers submit the agrochemical list, containing all crop protection agents used in each step of tobacco production. They submit agrochemicals risk assessments by tobacco type and complete agrochemical residues testing in packed product as per the risk assessment approved by BAT. In 2023, 100% of total tobacco purchased & tested were free of quantifiable levels of HHPs. While the same standard applies to tobacco consumed within the US, the figures do not contain US and exotic tobacco data. We are working to integrate these.
[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?

	Environmental risks identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Plastics	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

(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
☑ Brazil
☑ Mexico
☑ Turkey
☑ Pakistan
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Indonesia
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Mozambique
☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Access to tobacco is crucial to BAT as it is a key component of our combustibles and New Categories businesses. In 2023, we sourced 330m kgs of tobacco from 28 different countries. Changes to precipitation and temperature caused by climate change impact tobacco production and our ability to procure sufficient tobacco leaf to meet our demand. Acute physical risks (including increased prevalence of flooding and extreme weather, such as hail, hurricanes, El Niño and other weather events) impact areas in which we grow and purchase tobacco. Chronic physical risks arising from ongoing changes to weather patterns impact overall viability of tobacco growing in those regions, either due to the climate no longer being suitable for tobacco growing or the land being repurposed by governments to prioritise food crops. In the short term, this risk is mitigated by sourcing each of the key tobacco types from several locations to reduce the impact of acute weather events, and through our duration policies which stipulate minimum stock levels (typically between 9 -12 months) to ensure we are able to mitigate the impact of crop failures in any given year. To assess chronic physical risk, an independent study was undertaken to understand the potential impacts of climate change across our largest 10 tobacco source countries (Brazil, US, Zimbabwe, Bangladesh, Pakistan, India, Mozambique, Turkey, Mexico, and Indonesia) which accounted for 87% of BAT's total tobacco purchase volume in 2023.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

As the impact of climate change becomes greater in terms of impact on the yield of leaf crops and the occurrence more frequent, the financial impact on BAT will increase in the medium to long term.

(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)

75000000

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

230000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The Hadgen2ES model developed by the Hadley Centre of the Meteorological Office UK was used to forecast the weather pattern for the period 2021 to 2050 for the growing regions in scope. In total we assessed 88 subnational jurisdictions accessing historical weather data of 3,100 weather stations and generating 5,400 weather forecast maps. The analysis was done covering the main growing regions where we source tobacco with anticipated growing conditions forecast for each decade from 2020 to 2050. In 2023, the analysis was expanded to include a 4C scenario on top of the 1.5C scenario previously developed. Climate related risks to tobacco growing conditions were assessed by examining the impact of possible changes in temperature, rain, and water balance in the soil. This forecasted a change in soil stress levels and anticipated growing yield. These yield projections were compared to current growing yields and the resultant lower yields would negatively impact farmer income. The financial effect assumes that farmer net income remains constant resulting in tobacco cost / kg increasing. By way of example, in a specific growing region farmer yield was approximately 1548 kg/ha in 2020 and has been estimated to decrease to 1457 kg/ha by 2030 resulting in a decrease in yield of 91 kg/ha by 2030 (5.9%). With volume of ca. 60,000 ha grown in the region and a tobacco cost of 3.50 cost / kg and farmer gross margin of 60% this results in lost margin to the farmer of 11.5m (91x60,000x3.5x60%). The calculation assumes farmer income would remain unchanged. The impact of the yield differences across all countries that BAT sources tobacco equates to a financial impact, on a 1.5C scenario, of 75m. Under a 4C scenario due to larger yield losses, the impact is up to 230m.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Agricultural practices

☑ Improve soil health

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

7400000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response is based on the amount BAT invests annually in Global Leaf Agronomy development activities and Agronomy Initiatives conducted in every operation all aimed to improve farmer resilience and the sustainability of their farms. The key components of this costs are the BAT employees. Costs also relate to partnerships with 3rd party companies, start-ups, universities and research institutes. These are needed to run trials with proof of concept for technology development, research varieties improvements for drought tolerance, higher yield and others. The total cost of 7.4 million is allocated as follows: 3.4 million is designated for employee salaries related to managing the projects and trials. 4.0 million is allocated to the project execution, including its structure and the involvement of third parties such as startups, universities, and other partners. (3.4mn 4mn 7.4mn).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Global leaf research and agronomy deployment is a key aspect of BAT's strategy for driving our environmental & social goals across the Leaf operations where we grow tobacco, ensuring the use of best practice and sustainability of the communities working with or supported by tobacco production. Our Global Leaf Agronomy Development (GLAD) Centre conducts world-class research, often in partnership with academic and research institutions, from lab development & testing to real-world field trials. Situated in Brazil, our GLAD Centre identifies solutions for deployment across our Leaf operations and strategic 3rd party suppliers, with 5 focus areas: 1. soil science and plant nutrition, water and emissions 2. leaf breeding, seed technology, seed production and industrialisation, 3. mechanisation & curing 4. crop protection, agriculture best practice 5. substrates, botanicals, bioprocess, leaf chemistry. Mitigation plans are in place for each country, with best practice workstreams initiated to include solar powered technology to lower the cost of drip irrigation, drought tolerance mapping, seed development and precision irrigation pilots. In 2023, drip irrigation was expanded in our operations in Mexico, Chile & Vietnam, reducing water consumption, improving efficiency of fertilizer (lower CO2 emissions due to nitrogen fertilizer) and reducing labour. An example of tailored innovation aimed at mitigating water risk can be found in Bangladesh and Pakistan. An alternative furrow irrigation was already deployed in 19,700 ha. The results from trials and commercial scale showed water usage reduction up to 8%-10% compared to traditional furrow irrigation. We plan to increase the adoption of this technique in our Bangladesh farmer base and look at affordable alternative solutions including drip irrigation technology. The Asian Agritech Hub is developing a low-cost drip irrigation system in Bangladesh, allowing the spread of the technology to farmers with low investment capacity.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

(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
☑ Italy
☑ Kenya
☑ Brazil
☑ Mexico
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Mozambique
☑ Croatia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Argentina
☑ South Africa
☑ United States of America
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

This risk relates to the fact that BAT is sourcing tobacco leaf from 27 suppliers that rely on wood usage to cure the tobacco leaves, equivalent to 59% of BAT total timber commodity reported in CDP. In most countries where our suppliers are located, it is illegal to cause any deforestation of primary and native forests. We are taking various actions to minimise the likelihood of that regulation not being complied with. In 2023, we launched our Biodiversity Operational Standard on how we expect suppliers to comply with local laws and to ensure deforestation-and conversion-free (DCF) status for the farmers and crop volumes. This standard states that the presence of deforestation is not accepted and that in cases of non-compliance, we will require a restoration plan. Should the farmers fail to comply with the standards then they may cause disruption to our supply chain due to the inability to procure tobacco from those farmers, impacting upon tobacco availability. It could also cause damage to BAT's reputation and influence investors to disinvest in BAT.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

As the regulation and due diligence around deforestation evolves and wood availability reduces because of climate change effects on crop yields, the financial impact on BAT will increase in the medium to long-term considering the demand for deforestation and conversion free products as reflected in the numbers within this section. In context of the BAT's total group profit and loss, the financial impact is small.

(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)

1180000

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

3500000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on the environment in which BAT buys tobacco and on an independent analysis of deforestation, 11% of our contracted farmers are estimated to be near high risk of deforestation based on their location. If we take an assumption that 10% to 50% of those might have that risk materialised then that will cause disruption to our supply chain for a volume of between 2.4 and 7.0 million kgs of packed tobacco on a given year based on a global average of throughput per farmer, since BAT will not be supporting purchases from those farmers. As our footprint is geographically diversified this initial risk can be mitigated by purchasing this tobacco elsewhere at

an assumed premium of 0.5 per kg resulting in a potential financial impact from 1.2m to 3.5m. We have based our minimum anticipated financial impact figure (1.2mn) on a scenario of 10% of our 11% contracted farmers at risk being materialized, representing 2.4 mn Kg of tobacco being purchased from other sources with a 0.5GBP price increase (2.4 x 0.5 1.2). The maximum anticipated financial impact figure (3.5mn) on a worst-case scenario of 50% of our 11% contracted farmers at risk being materialized, representing 7 mn Kg of tobacco being purchased from other sources with a 0.5GBP price increase (7 x 0.5 3.5). BAT has long term agreements in place to purchase tobacco, so when we must go to the open market to find tobacco then it is assumed to be more expensive.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater due diligence

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

3400000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The estimated cost in 2023 is based on a portion of the field technician's employment costs (15mn), on the basis that 20% of their time relates to forest related matters and training (3mn). This is because on the ground risk assessments and observations take time and require frequent visits along the crop cycle to understand area planted, wood used, its purpose and its source. Field technicians are essential to support execution of the required due diligence to comply with our stated targets. In addition to field technician employment costs, the cost of response to risk includes additional activities which are undertaken on a global scale. This includes outsourced deforestation risk assessments, and the development of biodiversity and forest specific operating standards to provide guidance to the operations we work with (0.4mn). The total cost of response to risk is 3mn 0.4mn 3.4mn. We believe this response is necessary and we do believe the increased due diligence will continue.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

BAT has a comprehensive monitoring system, which field technicians (FT) use to monitor farmers, gather data on the amount and source of wood, its legal compliance and DCF status. This allows us to understand the risk levels to make timely interventions. In 2023 our assessments found a total of 0.24 hectares of deforestation in small-holder's farmers, harvesting 8,335 Kgs of wood. This demonstrates that the FTs carry out the necessary on ground assessments, providing us visibility to act and respond. To mitigate deforestation identified BAT undertakes reforestation plans. In Brazil we incorporated the amount of forest cleared (0.1 ha) into a reforestation plan developed with a local NGO. This plan reforested 20 hectares which is equivalent to all the non-compliant cases arising since 2020 plus 10% of additional area to be restored in the same biome. In Venezuela, the total cleared area (0.14 ha) plus 10% was reforested by the farmers that had deforestation cases in the same area or biome. In 2023 100% of tobacco monitored under Thrive, representing 99.6% of BAT's tobacco purchases in 2023, was free of gross deforestation of primary native forest. Unannounced visits are also done to verify the cases are resolved, as well are done randomly to check compliance. We monitor suppliers' compliance with DCF status via BAT's Thrive, and Sustainable Tobacco programmes. We work continuously to achieve greater due diligence, creating new operating standards on biodiversity and forests to provide guidance to suppliers and farmers.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Drought

(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

☑ Chile

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water risks & opportunity assessments conducted globally use tools including WRI Aqueduct, IPCC projections, TCFD scenario analysis, AWS and our Risk & Insurance provider on Natural Catastrophes. BAT's Casablanca factory has been deemed to be a high-water risk area. As per WRI, by 2040 Chile is to be within Top 30 water risk countries. The water risk is primarily driven by "Extremely High" water stress, it is expected to further increase and remain Extremely High in 2030 and in 2040 under pessimistic, BAU & optimistic scenarios. In any projection water stress is to increase by 2 times. BAT's factory lies within the Maipo basin, the river sources the country's capital has seen decreases in water levels. Use in the basin includes agriculture (incl. water-intensive avocado growing), mining and local

communities. Water shortage may result from decreased water availability in municipal water line and groundwater as well as from quotation of water use for industry by authorities. The manufacturing capabilities on site are strategically important in the region, interruptions in production due to water shortage can result in alternative sourcing for the market. The main risks of operations are related to drought in Chile and water scarcity in Valparaíso. Chile is going through the most extensive drought in its history and the condition of water is critical at a national level. Drought decreases water resources and restrictions on industry consumption; prioritising human consumption.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Minor

(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)

480000

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

1500000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 480,000 to 1.5 Million for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Chile facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). BAT impact range can be broken down as: Potential financial impact (minimum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost". And Potential financial impact (maximum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost. Daily interruption assumes fixed cost factory overheads.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Develop drought emergency plans

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

450000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response figure refers to capex investment cost for the implementation of technical measures aimed at reducing water withdrawn and increasing the % of water recycled. These costs are based on equivalent costs for 2022 (120k) and 2023 (330k). These included improvements made to wastewater treatment plants, closed loop systems, reverse osmosis (R.O) technologies, rainwater and grey water harvesting. It also includes additional maintenance improvements with installation of variable frequency drives for pump replacements and re-use of cleaning water from the sites with the most water intensive processes. (330,000 120,000 450,000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The local BAT management's response has been focused on reducing water dependency on water withdrawals through the implementation of water saving initiatives in our factory. The team have identified all suitable options to prepare for drought which tie into local business continuity management plans. The plans are tested at

regular intervals. Ongoing analysis of plans and tests are updated accordingly. In terms of technical measures, the site teams focus of improving water efficiency, through reducing water withdrawn and increase water recycling with capex investments and opex spend. Savings have been largely helped from the implementation of the sites' energy and water management system, which includes Level 4 (equipment level) water metering. The short-medium relevant initiatives and projects will be reviewed and supported over the next 1-4 years. From a non-technical side, the site has maintained a water stewardship management system that was first certified by AWS in 2022. Since 2015, to further mitigate against water risks in the area, the Casablanca factory has implemented various initiatives and projects to reduce water consumption. These include: ENERCON (an energy and water management system), implementation of waterless urinals, reduced water pressure showers, dry cooler, reverse osmosis installation in boiler, replacement vacuum pumps with oil rings and replacement steam traps. These initiatives resulted in a 66.4% reduction in water consumption and an increase in recycling from 37% to 56.3%, considering the years from 2017 to 2023. In 2023, BAT Chile's goal was achieved to expand the sites recycling to over 55% with initiatives such as primary manufacturing department hot water heat pump installation, phase 2 water treatment plant, flash steam curing and rainwater recovery.

Plastics

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk19

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ End-of-life management

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Italy

☑ Malta

☑ Spain

☑ Greece

☑ Latvia

☑ Poland

☑ Cyprus
☑ France
☑ Belgium
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Netherlands

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The EU adopted a Directive on single-use plastics in July 2019 (the "SUP Directive") which, among other products, targets tobacco products with filters containing plastic. Our filters fall within the scope of that Directive and, as such, BAT will be subject to (and in some cases already subject to) Extended Producer Responsibility ("EPR") schemes in the EU, requiring the Group to cover the costs of collecting, transporting, treating and cleaning-up of filters. The SUP Directive also requires tobacco manufacturers to finance consumer awareness campaigns and to place environmental markings on packs of products with filters. Product regulations expose the Group to additional costs if product taxes such as Extended Producer Responsibility schemes and taxes on plastics are widely introduced around the world to drive reductions in emissions and waste. The anticipated effect will depend on the number of countries which implement product-related taxes and the associated tax rate.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:
☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ 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

We model a potential financial impact of up to 230 million per annum. For more information see pages 106 to 110 of the 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Other compliance, monitoring or target, please specify **:**Monitoring of regulatory landscape.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We monitor the regulatory landscape and take steps to ensure compliance with EPR legislation.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Other market risk, please specify **:**Increased Energy Costs

(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

☑ Fiji
☑ Mali
☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Samoa
☑ Spain
☑ Sudan
☑ Angola
☑ Brazil
☑ Latvia
☑ Malawi
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Albania
☑ Algeria
☑ Austria
☑ Belarus
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Ghana
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Kenya
☑ Malta
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Guyana
☑ Jordan
☑ Serbia
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Uganda
☑ Zambia
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ukraine

☑ Jamaica
☑ Nigeria
☑ Réunion
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Paraguay
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Mozambique
☑ South Africa
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ North Macedonia
☑ Solomon Islands
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Democratic Republic of the Congo
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Cameroon
☑ Colombia
☑ Honduras
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Uzbekistan
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ Papua New Guinea
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Trinidad and Tobago
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We have set a series of challenging targets under our low carbon transition plan to reduce our energy usage and associated emissions, and shield us, as far as possible, from energy cost inflationary pressures. Our goals of emissions reduction and reduced dependency on energy produced from fossil fuels complement each other, given almost 80% of the Group scope 1 and 2 emissions are being generated by our operating facilities. Under a sustainable transition (Network for Greening the Financial System (NFGS) divergent net zero scenario) there may be a significant increase in demand for green energy as companies seek to meet their public

commitments to reduce scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. This could lead to a risk that the costs of electricity and natural gas will increase (as surcharges are placed on fossil fuels to drive the decarbonisation policy agenda), impacting the cost of energy used in our sites. The cost of energy around the Group is circa 100m with purchased electricity and natural gas accounting for 89% of the energy incurred. In order to help mitigate against future energy prices, BAT is installing more efficient machinery and the leveraging of greener, renewable energy sources, will reduce the impact of future energy cost inflation. In 2023, on site solar panels were installed in a number of sites (e.g. Nigeria, Chile and Italy) whilst an offsite solar facility was installed in Turkey.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The financial impact will increase as the business grows, and future energy costs are predicted to rise at above inflation levels.

(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)

83000000

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

138000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The financial estimates are based on the Group's 4 largest energy types (natural gas, standard electricity, renewable electricity and diesel) which accounted for 89% of our total energy consumption (and 94% of energy costs) in 2023. Our future factory demand was estimated based on Group volume growth rates assumptions, with our combustibles volume assumed to continue to reduce at a rate marginally better than industry norms. New Category growth rates were set in accordance with our Group's plans to deliver 5bn in New Category revenue by 2025, with projected energy consumption requirements based on these assumed volume movements. Using detailed energy cost information from 2023, unit energy costs were computed for each manufacturing site. Based on future energy requirement, the 12 regional price indexes from the REMIND-MAgPIE model were used to project potential future energy unit costs at each of our factories. A further overlay in the analysis was performed to reflect the transition towards 100% electricity sourced in operations sites to be renewable by 2030, with an assumed premium of 2.3% vs. standard electricity grid tariffs as demand increases for renewable energy forms. The Network for Greening the Financial System (NFGS) scenarios were used in the analysis performed; the first represented the divergent net zero scenario which sought to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees, which saw a projected energy cost increase of 110m in 2040 compared to baseline as demand for electricity rises as the world seeks to decarbonise rapidly and policy setters apply climate related targets across all sectors. The second is based on a disorderly transition and a 2 degrees scenario which saw projected energy cost increases of 138m in 2040. The third scenario assumed current policies continued to be applied (climate inaction scenario), which saw a projected energy cost increase of 83m in 2040 compared to baseline. (1 x 138000000).

(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

20000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The costs to respond to the risk has been based on the average investment cost in energy efficiency and sourcing projects of 20m p.a. until at least 2030. (1 x 20000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To ensure the delivery of external commitments that BAT has made in relation to emissions reduction and carbon neutrality ambitions, glidepaths have been developed for our factories with plans designed to reduce emissions, drive energy efficiency, and move Group energy requirements towards renewable energy sources. The Group's use of renewable energy has increased from 11% in 2019 to 38% in 2023 demonstrating the extensive effort underway to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels and mitigate potential future energy price rises. In 2023, 24m was invested in energy sourcing and efficiency capital projects across the group. Projects delivered included solar heating, cooling, and PV equipment (e.g. Italy, Nigeria, Turkey). They also included boiler replacement (biomass, heat pumps and others) (e.g. South Korea, Germany) and an efficient building energy management system (e.g. Chile). In addition to projects to move energy consumption towards renewable sources, the Group continues to target improved efficiency of infrastructure through Integrated Work Systems (IWS) methodologies and footprint related projects, reducing idleness of infrastructure and optimising our use of energy. Product lifecycle analysis, greater recycling of our products through take-back schemes, and improved product design all assist in delivering production efficiencies and reduce the exposure of the Group to potential future energy cost increases. Where possible, energy hedging (typically over a period of 12 – 18 months) is used as a mechanism to mitigate the impact of short-term shocks to our manufacturing-based energy costs, with a risk mitigation framework stipulating level of coverage to be achieved through hedging. Similar mechanisms are being used by the Group to lock the cost of renewable energy over the medium term (mitigating the premiums in pricing expected versus standard electricity), through the use of virtual power purchase agreements.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(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

- ☑ Fiji
- ☑ Mali
- ☑ Peru
- ☑ Chile
- ☑ China
- ☑ Samoa
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Sudan
- ☑ Angola
- ☑ Brazil
- ☑ Latvia
- ☑ Malawi
- ☑ Mexico
- ☑ Norway
- ☑ Poland
- ☑ Albania
- ☑ Algeria
- ☑ Austria
- ☑ Belarus
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Ireland
- ☑ Jamaica
- ☑ Nigeria
- ☑ Réunion
- ☑ Romania
- ☑ Malaysia
- ☑ Pakistan
- ☑ Ghana
- ☑ Italy
- ☑ Japan
- ☑ Kenya
- ☑ Malta
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ France
- ☑ Greece
- ☑ Guyana
- ☑ Jordan
- ☑ Serbia
- ☑ Sweden
- ☑ Turkey
- ☑ Uganda
- ☑ Zambia
- ☑ Croatia
- ☑ Czechia
- ☑ Denmark
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Hungary
- ☑ Ukraine
- ☑ Bulgaria
- ☑ Cameroon
- ☑ Colombia
- ☑ Honduras
- ☑ Argentina
- ☑ Australia

☑ Paraguay
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Mozambique
☑ South Africa
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ North Macedonia
☑ Solomon Islands
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Democratic Republic of the Congo
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Uzbekistan
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ Papua New Guinea
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Trinidad and Tobago
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

A sustainable transition will increase product regulations, such as carbon pricing, as regulators and policymakers push for emissions reductions to mitigate climate change. As of August 1, 2022, 68 explicit carbon pricing mechanisms exist worldwide, covering over 70% of global GDP, a figure that is expected to grow. By the end of 2022, two BAT factories were included in Emissions Trading Schemes, and ten operations were subject to carbon taxes. Carbon taxes affecting suppliers could indirectly impact BAT through higher product costs. With procured goods accounting for 90% of BAT's Scope 1-3 emissions, upstream impacts pose significant risks. We work with 1,300 direct and 32,500 indirect product material suppliers, making their environmental performance critical to meeting our targets. In 2023, we made progress on our SBTi supplier engagement goal for 20% of suppliers by spend to set Science-Based Targets (SBTs) by 2025; by the end of 2023, 15% of suppliers had SBTs. In 2023 we continue to invest in supplier enablement, including engaging with our top 60 CO2e-emitting suppliers to share best practices, providing one-to-one training on renewable energy, and hosting sustainability-focused events in Bangladesh and Pakistan. Our efforts led suppliers to implement their own low-carbon initiatives, such as lower carbon generation, setting emission baselines, and tracking emissions, many for the first time in 2023.

(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:

☑ 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

The financial impact will increase as the size and scope of carbon taxes increase in future years.

(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)

130000000

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

221000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Detailed modelling was performed by an external consultant based on BAT's low carbon transition plan glidepath. The glidepath reflects the Group's 1.5C aligned absolute reduction targets that accommodates net zero criteria and definitions approved by the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) in July 2022. Forecast sales to 2050 were used to determine the relative proportion of emissions assigned to each country. The estimated carbon tax assumes that (i) all emissions are priced at location of consumption (i.e. mapped to sales projections) to reflect moves to point of consumption-based mechanisms like the EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism and (ii) scope 3 emissions are included on the basis that all value chain emissions will need to be covered within the economy to reach Net Zero. However, note that biogenic categories have been included but are not priced into the model. BAT used the REMINDMAgPIE 3.0-4.4 carbon tax projections at a country level to estimate the potential future tax charges. The financial numbers reflect two scenarios, the "Delayed Transition" scenario, resulting in an impact of 130m and the "Net Zero 2050" scenario, resulting in an impact of 220m. On average for Delayed Transition, the impacts assumes Scope 3 taxable emissions of 2.6m MT at an average carbon tax of 50 / MT emissions (130m) whilst for Net Zero the average carbon tax is higher at 85 / M (221m).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ New or tighter supplier performance standards

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

30000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The costs to respond to the risk are based on the average annual total capital investment between 2021-2023 of 30m on ESG initiatives undertaken by BAT. The investments cover both direct operations and product related initiatives which positively impacted CO2 emissions and it is envisaged that a similar level of investment would be required throughout the coming years as part of BAT's low carbon transition plan. (1 x 30000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

This planned reduction in emissions in our total supply chain relies upon aggressive scope 3 reduction initiatives, both internal (e.g. as technology to drive lower consumer and end of product life emissions) and external (e.g. suppliers reducing their own emissions), the exact nature of which has not been quantified. Key projects in 2023 included replacing carbon intensive assets with low carbon alternatives such as wood pellet biomass boilers in South Korea and replacing aluminium inner bundling with paper for our brands.

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

Chronic physical

☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

(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

☑ Brazil

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The main tobacco type used in BAT Products, representing more than 79% of our purchases, is Flue Cured Virginia which requires a source of fuel to cure the leaves. In Brazil specifically, one of the countries where we buy more than 28% of our global leaf requirements, farmers use exclusively sustainable wood to cure their Virginia crop and 73% maintain supply via on-farm production. Remaining volumes come from off-farm local wood suppliers. Wood is from various species of Eucalyptus. We know this production is at risk of being disrupted based on rising temperatures, rainfall patterns and overall water availability. In 2022 we conducted a study with an independent consultancy to understand the risk of climate change on timber species, and production in 6 countries (and all the 17 growing regions in those origins) that are dependent on use of wood in tobacco cropping), modelling weather scenarios to 2050. The findings from the study showed that E.saligna and E.benthami have a high-risk profile due to rising temperatures, overall climatic conditions and rainfall patterns. In Brazil in particular, these species are used to cure circa 2% of the crop (reduced from 5% in 2022 and 8% in 2021).

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

As the regulation and due diligence around deforestation evolves and the wood availability reduces because of climate change effects, the financial impact on BAT will increase in the medium to long-term considering the demand for deforestation and conversion free products.

(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)

470000

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

940000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This is based on the percentage of tobacco we purchase which is cured with E.saligna and E.benthami, which in 2023 represented around 2% of our purchases in our operation in Brazil (1.87mn kg). In the event we are unable to purchase tobacco from those regions due to loss of the specific Eucalyptus species plantations in that area, we might need to purchase from another source, estimated to cost 0.5/kg more. The range included within the financial effect figure calculates the implications of a loss of between 50-100% of the high-risk wood species (i.e. an impact to 50-100% of the tobacco volume sourced from that region). BAT has long term agreements in purchasing tobacco, so procuring tobacco from the open market is assumed to be more expensive.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with suppliers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

7400000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

BAT's Global Leaf Agronomy Development centre costs 7.4mn annually between investments and operating costs and as its core purpose is to improve farmer resilience and the sustainability of their farms. Activities are split into 4 strategic pillars - farmer profitability, carbon management, biodiversity, and water & climate change - with workstreams designed to support the delivery of our targets and therefore this is the cost of response. Using our network of leaf technicians and leaf leadership in the operations, improvement needs are identified and fed to the global leaf research centre, with technology solutions identified and technology deployment plans developed for long term and revised every year. The total cost of 7.4 million is allocated as follows: 3.4 million is designated for employee salaries for managing the projects and trials. 4.0 million is related to project execution, including structure and the third parties such as startups and universities. (3.4mn 4mn 7.4mn).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

In Brazil, in 2023 our local operation works with around 16,000 contracted tobacco farmers. An afforestation programme commenced in the late 1970's to promote wood production in the farms. To date more than 110 million saplings have been distributed to the farmers, resulting in more than 20,000 hectares of Eucalyptus currently planted. This generates more than 100% of wood self-sufficiency to the farmers that have planted the trees and 73% of the total wood used by the farmers

comes from on-farm plantations. In some cases, the smallholder farmers do not have enough area to grow production forests, and buy wood from local Eucalyptus providers, including other tobacco farmers that also produce wood as an alternative source of income. We track the wood from off-farm to make sure is from DCF sources. We mitigate the risk of climate change by producing in more than one region, minimizing the risk of severe weather. In 2023 we reduced the use of Eucalyptus species, which are more susceptible to climate change, to less than 2% of the wood used by our contracted farmers (from about 5% in 2022 and 8% in 2021). We continue to focus on farmer training on the use of sustainable wood for curing and construction and in 2023 100% of the 13,000 farmers using wood were trained on this topic. We will continue to ensure that the wood requirements for tobacco production in our supply chain can be sustainably met. In 2023 99.9% of wood used by our contracted farmers was from sustainable sources, (stable against 2022).

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Declining water quality

(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

☑ Indonesia

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Brantas

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water risks and opportunity assessments are conducted globally using WRI aqueduct tool, IPCC projections, TCFD scenario risk mapping analysis and inputs from AWS standard and our Global Risk and Insurance provider on Natural Catastrophes. These assessments aim to identify material risks and opportunities, which includes flood, drought, baseline water stress, water depletion and water quantity limitations, which then although BAT globally, regionally and at each specific location to consider relevant risk management and mitigation plans and to discuss and engage with local stakeholders. Our BAT factory in Indonesia is located in high water risk area. The water risk is primarily driven by water quality risk, mainly due to low levels of wastewater treatment and collection as well as due to issues with drinking water quality and sanitation. The BAT factory is located at river Brantas which is deteriorating due to water pollution because of the above factors and plastic pollution. The facility sources water from the ground and discharges the water to surface water upon treatment. Worsening water quality might result in a need to change or diversify water supply and change the water treatment technical arrangements and practices. As the worst-case scenario, impairment or interruptions in local production due to poor water quality can result in alternative sourcing for this market.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Upfront costs to adopt/deploy new practices and processes

(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:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Minor

(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)

504000

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

1520000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 504,000 to 1.52 Mn for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Indonesia facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). BAT impact range can be broken down as: Potential financial impact (minimum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost". And Potential financial impact (maximum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response figure refers to capex and investment costs. These relate to the implementation of technical measures aimed at further increasing the treatment levels of the water withdrawn, to improve the quality and also further increase the % of water recycled. The cost of response is based on projected costs for 2024 and

beyond relevant projects. These included improvements made to waste-water treatment plants and additional phases for reverse osmosis (R.O.) technologies. (1 x 500000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The local BAT management's response has been focused on reducing water dependency on water withdrawals through the implementation of water saving initiatives. Our factory team have identified all suitable options to prepare for further water quality issues and these tie into local business continuity management plans. The plans are tested at regular intervals. We have established a system of monitoring the quality of the water withdrawn and discharged to ensure it meets regulatory requirements as well as quality requirements required when recycled into our processes, which supports reducing the water we need to withdraw. We continue with capex investments and opex spend to increase efficiencies, which following investments in 2022 on increased wastewater treatment and reverse osmosis, resulted in a 16% reduction in water withdrawn (2022 v 2021) and a 22 p.p increase in water recycled. From a non-technical side, the site implemented and maintain a water stewardship management system that was first audited and certified by AWS in 2022, and retained in 2023.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk8

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Declining water quality

(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

☑ Kenya

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Galana

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water risks and opportunity assessments are conducted globally using WRI Aqueduct Tool, IPCC projections, TCFD scenario risk mapping analysis and inputs from AWS standard and our Global Risk and Insurance provider on Natural Catastrophes. These assessments aim to identify material risks and opportunities, which includes flood, drought, baseline water stress, water depletion and water quantity limitations, which then although BAT globally, regionally and at each specific location to consider relevant risk management and mitigation plans and discuss and engagement with local stakeholders. The BAT factory in Kenya is located in high water risk area. The water risk is primarily driven by water quality risk, mainly due to low levels of wastewater treatment and collection as well as due to issues with drinking water quality and sanitation. Our BAT factory is located at river Galana which is deteriorating due to water pollution, including pollution by heavy metals. The facility sources most of the water from the ground and discharges the water to municipality. Worsening water quality might result in a need to change or diversify water supply and change water treatment technical arrangements and practices. As the worst-case scenario impairment or interruptions in local production due to poor water quality can result in alternative sourcing for this market.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Upfront costs to adopt/deploy new practices and processes

(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:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Very minor

(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)

240000

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

722000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 240,000 to 722,000 for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Kenya facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). BAT impact range can be broken down as: Potential financial impact (minimum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost". And Potential financial impact (maximum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The method used to calculate the cost of response involves allocating capital expenditure (Capex) specifically for a water recycling project. This allocation is based on the average project cost for similar purposes at our facilities that already have some wastewater treatment capabilities. The goal of this project is to eliminate the necessity for alterations in the supply chain and operational delays. Additionally, the cost of redesigning leaf sourcing is included as part of the regular operations and expenses. (1 x 1000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The local BAT management's response has been focused on reducing water dependency on water withdrawals through the implementation of water saving initiatives in our facility. The team have identified all suitable options to prepare for drought which tie into local business continuity management plans. The plans are tested at regular intervals. We have established a system of monitoring the quality of the water withdrawn and discharged to ensure it meets regulatory requirements. This also ensures it meets quality requirements required when recycled into our processes, reducing the water we need to withdraw. Capex investments and opex is incurred on efficiencies. Following investments in 2022 to increase the capacity of the onsite reverse osmosis there was a 13% reduction in water withdrawn (2022 v 2021) and a 13.8p.p increase in water recycled, now up to 15.5% (2022 v 2021). From a non-technical side, the site implemented a water stewardship management system that was audited and certified by AWS in 2022 and maintained in 2023.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk9

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Bravo

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water risks & opportunity assessments conducted globally use tools incl. the WRI Aqueduct, IPCC projections, TCFD scenario analysis, Alliance for Water Stewardship and our risk & insurance provider on natural catastrophes. Assessments aim to identify material water-related risks & opportunities allowing locations to consider risk management & mitigation plans and discuss & engage with local stakeholders. Our factory in Mexico is located in high water risk area, the risk is mainly driven by "extremely high" water stress (WRI aqueduct), which we expect to further increase, remaining extremely high in 2030 & 2040 in pessimistic, business-as-usual optimistic scenarios. In any of the projections, water stress is to increase by 1.4 -2 times. Water demand is growing with development of agriculture, industries & electric power producers in the area. Our facility sources most of the water from municipality, thus might be affected by municipal quotas for water use aimed to share resources between users. An impairment or interruptions in local production due to water shortage can result in moving some production volumes to different factories or operational delays. The factory is located in Monterrey Nuevo Leon, in 2023 Monterrey continued to face droughts. Water reservoirs supplying the city & factory reached critical levels in 2022, causing disruption of supply to homes & industries. BAT Mexico was impacted, safety stocks in water tanks were reduced but production wasn't interrupted.

(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:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Minor, BAT have reasonable inventories of finished goods and can move volumes between factories if production is impacted.

(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)

820000

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

2460000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 820,000 to 2.46 Mn for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Mexico facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). BAT impact range can be broken down as: potential financial impact (minimum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost". And Potential financial impact (maximum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

5000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The method used to calculate the cost of response involves allocating capital expenditure (Capex) specifically for a water recycling project. This allocation is based on the average project cost for similar purposes at our facilities that already have some wastewater treatment capabilities. The goal of this project is to eliminate the necessity for alterations in the supply chain and operational delays. Additionally, the cost of redesigning leaf sourcing is included as part of the regular operations and expenses. (1 x 5000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We continue with CAPEX investments and Opex spend for efficiencies, scenario and materiality loss mapping and risk analysis on water recycling processes and prioritising heavily our operations in water stress areas, from the most strategic to the least. In case of local leaf sourcing, also the cost to source it from other growing regions. To further mitigate against water risks in the area, BAT Mexico has invested in several optimization projects in order to optimize water consumption and reduce water withdrawal. Investment in 2023 alone was around 350k in Mexico. In addition to responsible water consumption, in 2022 our Mexico factory received AWS certification, demonstrating our commitment to water preservation in our internal processes, as well as external communities and has maintained this certification in 2023.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk10

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Declining water quality

(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

☑ Nigeria

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Ohsun Basin. Water risks & opportunity assessments are conducted globally use tools including the World Resources Institute's (WRI) Aqueduct, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) projections, Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) scenario analysis, Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) and our risk and insurance provider on natural catastrophes. Assessments aim to identify material water-related risks and opportunities allowing locations to consider risk management & mitigation plans and discuss and engage with local stakeholders. Assessments consider flood, drought, baseline water stress, water depletion and water quantity limitations. The BAT factory in Nigeria is located in high water risk area. The water risk is primarily driven by water quality risk, mainly associated with low levels of wastewater treatment and collection. Water courses in the area is affected by industrial, agricultural, and civil water run-offs. The facility sources most of the water from the ground and discharges water to surface water following treatment. The site has no access to municipal water supply and treatment infrastructure. Worsening water quality might result in a need for additional technical arrangements and practices for treating withdrawn and discharged water. As the worst-case scenario impairment or interruptions in local production due to poor water quality can result in alternative sourcing for this market or operational delays.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Upfront costs to adopt/deploy new practices and processes

(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:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Minor

(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)

358000

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

1080000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 358,000 to 1.08 Mn for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Nigeria facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). The range can be broken down as: potential financial impact (minimum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost" and potential financial impact (maximum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The method used to calculate the cost of response involves allocating capital expenditure (Capex) specifically for a water recycling project. This allocation is based on the average project cost for similar purposes at our facilities that already have some wastewater treatment capabilities. The goal of this project is to eliminate the necessity for alterations in the supply chain and operational delays. Additionally, the cost of redesigning leaf sourcing is included as part of the regular operations and expenses. (1 x 1000000)

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The local BAT management's response has been focused on reducing water dependency on water withdrawals through the implementation of water saving initiatives over many years. Our factory team have identified suitable options to prepare for further water quality issues and these tie into local business continuity management plans which are tested at regular intervals. BAT have established a system of monitoring the quality of the water withdrawn and discharged to ensure it meets regulatory requirements. The system also ensures water meets the quality requirements required when recycled into our processes, which supports reducing the water we need to withdraw. We continue with capex investments and opex spend for efficiencies. In 2023 alone 43k was spent to upgrade the waste water treatment plant to replace all defective equipment to enable automatic mode operation, install a reverse osmosis plant, install a water storage tank and carry out piping rerouting. From a non-technical side, the site implemented a water stewardship management system that was audited and certified by AWS in 2022 and maintained in 2023.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk11

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Declining water quality

(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

☑ Pakistan

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Indus

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water risks and opportunity assessments are conducted globally using WRI Aqueduct Tool, IPCC projections, TCFD scenario risk mapping analysis and inputs from AWS standard and our Global Risk and Insurance provider on Natural Catastrophes. Assessments aim to identify material water-related risks and opportunities allowing locations to consider risk management and mitigation plans and discuss and engage with local stakeholders. The assessments include flood, drought, baseline water stress, water depletion and water quantity limitations. Our BAT factory in Pakistan with green leaf threshing plant on site is located in high water risk area. However, mitigation plans in place have seen the site gain AWS certification. The water risk is primarily driven by water quality risk, mainly due to low levels of wastewater treatment and collection as well as due to issues with drinking water quality and sanitation. The BAT factory is located at river Indus which is being affected by agricultural and industrial water run-offs. The facility sources most of the water from the ground. Worsening water quality might result in a need to change or diversify water supply and change water treatment technical arrangements and practices. As the worst-case scenario impairment or interruptions in local production due to poor water quality can result in alternative sourcing for this market or operational delays.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Upfront costs to adopt/deploy new practices and processes

(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:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Minor

(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)

308000

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

922000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 308,000 to 922,000 for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Pakistan facility. Since we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). Broken down as: potential financial impact (minimum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost" and potential financial impact (maximum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost includes capex allocations for water efficiency and recycling projects. This is based on the average project cost for this purpose incurred by our facilities which already include wastewater treatment, thus mitigating water stress impacts. Cost of redesigning leaf sourcing are also included in the cost. (1 x 500000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

BAT continues to invest in capex investments and incur opex spend for efficiencies, conduct scenario analysis and materiality loss mapping and undertake risk analysis on water recycling processes. We prioritise operations in water stressed areas from the most strategic to the least. We also consider the cost to source leaf from other growing regions. To further mitigate against water risks in the area, BAT's Pakistan factories withdraw water from tube wells, extracting ground water, with progressive water recycling rates of over 40%. Our Akora site (which includes both a manufacturing facility and green leaf threshing plant) is AWS Certified and our Jhelum Factory achieved it's certification in 2023. Measures have been taken by both sites (on and off-site) to drive water stewardship. In the catchment, awareness and education campaigns have been delivered regarding the installation of drip irrigation systems for farmers and filtration plants, to increase provision of clean drinking water. To reduce the industrial runoff of print which can lead to a decline in water quality, both sites are equipped with effluent treatment plants to maximize water conservation efforts by re-using and recycling the wastewater within the system. Further collaborations with the government and NGOs are in progress to progressively drive efforts towards water stewardship within the community.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk12

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Romania

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Danube

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water risks & opportunity assessments conducted globally use tools incl. the WRI Aqueduct, IPCC projections, TCFD scenario analysis, Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) and our risk & insurance provider on natural catastrophes. Assessments aim to identify material water-related risks & opportunities allowing locations to consider risk management & mitigation plans and discuss & engage with local stakeholders. The assessments incl. flood, drought, baseline water stress, water depletion & water quality limitations. The BAT factory in Romania is located in high water risk area, the risk is mainly driven by water stress, identified as extremely high, via the WRI aqueduct tool, which we expect to further increase, remaining extremely high in 2030 & 2040 under the pessimistic, BAU optimistic scenarios. In any of the projections, water stress is expected to increase 1.4 times. Water demand is high due to the water needs of densely located industrial facilities & local communities. The Danube flows over multiple countries, exacerbating the effect of upstream water withdrawals. Water supply is generally low. Our facility sources most of the water from the ground & may be affected by the lowering of groundwater table as well as municipal quotas for water withdrawal aimed to share water resources between users. As the worst-case scenario, an impairment, or interruptions in local production due to water shortage can result in alternative sourcing for this market or operational delays.

(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:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 1.06 Million to 3.17 Million

(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)

1060000

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

3170000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 1.06 Million to 3.17 Million for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Romania facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). The range can be broken down as: potential financial impact (minimum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost" and potential financial impact (maximum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The method used to calculate the cost of response involves allocating capital expenditure (Capex) specifically for a water recycling project. This allocation is based on the average project cost for similar purposes at our facilities that already have some wastewater treatment capabilities. The goal of this project is to eliminate the necessity for alterations in the supply chain and operational delays. Additionally, the cost of redesigning leaf sourcing is included as part of the regular operations and expenses. (1 x 500000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

BAT continues to invest in capex investments and incur opex spend for efficiencies, conduct scenario analysis and materiality loss mapping and undertake risk analysis on water recycling processes. We prioritise operations in water stressed areas from the most strategic to the least. We also consider the cost to source leaf from other growing regions. In addition, we have included the application of AWS Water Stewardship Standards at the site and the site gained AWS certification in 2022 and maintained in 2023. To further mitigate against water risks in the area, a reverse osmosis water recovery has been installed for the existing wastewater treatment plant, as well as water filtration for the existing retention rainwater basin. This investment consisted of two systems being installed, one system treating our sewerage water from the existing wastewater treatment plant into the Disc Tube Reverse Osmosis (DTRO) plant. The recycled water is used in existing water-cooled towers, scrubber and steam boilers. The second system treats our rainwater in a filtration system. The treated water is used in water-cooler towers, irrigation system

and fire-fighting tank. The installation of these 2 systems has significantly contributed to reducing the factory's water consumption (by approx. 30,000 cubic metres) and increased water recycled at the site to over 30%.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk13

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Declining water quality

(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

☑ Viet Nam

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Song Delta. Our BAT factory in Vietnam is located in water risk area. The water risk is primarily driven by water quality risk, mainly associated with low levels of wastewater treatment and plastic pollution in watercourses. The river basin is affected by water runoffs from agriculture and local communities. The facility sources

most of the water from municipality and discharges water to surface water following treatment. Worsening water quality might result in a need for additional technical arrangements for improving water withdrawn quality and treating water discharged as well as diversifying water sources. As the worst-case scenario impairment or interruptions in local production due to poor water quality can result in alternative sourcing for this market or operational delays. Dong Nai river is within Viet Nam only, and not linked to any other country. The river is strictly protected by the government to ensure water quality, especially the upstream and middle stream of the river which supply fresh water to citizens. Only the downstream river is permitted for use by industrial parks and other manufacturing facilities. The risk of declining water quality is low due to governmental procedures and inspections. All discharged water from industrial zones are well controlled and are required to follow the Viet Nam standard. However, the discharge from the community is not controllable yet and this represents the greatest risk of Dong Nai River in regard to water quality.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Upfront costs to adopt/deploy new practices and processes

(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:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 430,000 to 1.29 Million

(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)

430000

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

1290000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 430,000 to 1.29 Million for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Vietnam facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). BAT impact range can be broken down as: Potential financial impact (minimum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost" and potential financial impact (maximum) "Number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

300000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The method used to calculate the cost of response involves allocating capital expenditure (Capex) specifically for a water recycling project. This allocation is based on the average project cost for similar purposes at our facilities that already have some wastewater treatment capabilities. The goal of this project is to eliminate the necessity for alterations in the supply chain and operational delays. Additionally, the cost of redesigning leaf sourcing is included as part of the regular operations and expenses. (1 x 300000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

BAT have established a system of monitoring the quality of the water withdrawn and discharged to ensure it meets regulatory requirements as well as quality requirements for our processes. BAT continues to invest in capex investments and incur opex spend for efficiencies, conduct scenario analysis and materiality loss mapping and undertake risk analysis on water recycling processes. We prioritise operations in water stressed areas from the most strategic to the least. We also consider the cost to source leaf from other growing regions. In addition, we have included the application of AWS Water Stewardship Standards at the site. To further mitigate against water risks in the area, all wastewater from our Vietnam site is treated by our Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) to achieve the necessary water quality standard, before it is discharged to the river. 70% of discharged water is also reused by BAT for the landscape surrounding the site and air scrubber machine. We will upgrade our WWTP in 2024 to achieve higher water quality to recycle for use in our cooling tower, with the aim to reuse 100% discharged water from 2025. In the catchment practice, there is an afforestation programme in upstream area to protect the river's water source.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk14

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Uzbekistan

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Zerafshan River. Water risks and opportunity assessments aim to identify material risks and opportunities, which includes flood, drought, baseline water stress, water depletion and water quantity limitations, which then although BAT globally, regionally and at each specific location to consider relevant risk management and mitigation plans and discuss and engagement with local stakeholders. Our BAT factory (Samarkand) and green leaf threshing plant (Urgut) in Uzbekistan are located in high water risk area, the risk is mainly driven by water stress. However, water demand is high due to developed agriculture (incl. water-intensive cotton growing) and industries within the area. Water supply is low due to the arid climate with extremely hot summer temperatures. Our facility sources most of the water from the ground, thus might be affected by the lowering of groundwater table as well as municipal quotas for water withdrawal aimed to share water resources between users. An impairment or interruptions in local production due to water shortage can result in alternative sourcing for this market or operational delays. Both Samarkand and Urgut factories are located in the Zerafshan river catchment. The Zerafshan river originates from neighboring Tajikistan. Hence, the upstream location in Tajikistan imposes additional risks in regard to future water supply for the whole Samarkand region.

(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:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 208,000 to 623,000 for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Uzbekistan facility

(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)

208000

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

623000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 208,000 to 623,000 for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Uzbekistan facility. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). BAT impact range can be broken down as: potential financial impact (minimum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost" and potential financial impact (maximum) "number of disrupted days x daily interruption cost".

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The approach utilized to calculate the cost of response involves several key methods. Firstly, we allocate both capital expenditure (CAPEX) investments and operational expenditure (OPEX) spending towards improving efficiencies. This includes conducting scenario and materiality loss mapping as well as risk analysis on water recycling processes. Emphasis is placed on prioritizing operations in water stressed areas, starting from the most strategically significant to the least. Furthermore, in the case of local leaf sourcing, we also consider the cost associated with sourcing from alternative growing regions. Additionally, we have implemented the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) Standards at our Uzbekistan sites. Both the factory and the green leaf threshing plant underwent an AWS gap assessment in 2021 and achieved the Certification in 2022, maintaining in 2023. These measures demonstrate our commitment to responsible water management and sustainability practices. (1 x 500000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

BAT continues to invest in capex investments and incur opex spend for efficiencies, conduct scenario analysis and materiality loss mapping and undertake risk analysis on water recycling processes. We prioritise operations in water stressed areas from the most strategic to the least. We also consider the cost to source leaf from other growing regions. In order to mitigate the aforementioned water risk to our Uzbekistan operations sites, water saving initiatives are in place on-site, as borehole water from Zerafshan River basin aquifers is used. Water use is being reduced via LVL3 metering, enabling leakage monitoring and closure, aerating nozzles have been introduced for water taps, and automatic motion-sensor water taps have been installed. Both Samarkand and Urgut sites are equipped with their own Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTP). Each plant is located on-site with capacities of 100m3 water treatment per day. Part of the treated water is used for irrigation. In 2023, built a pump station at the Urgut site, incorporating drip irrigation for its trees. Tobacco farming best practices included the introduction of drip irrigation in the 2022 crop year for Virginia and Basma tobacco types. This resulted in a successful crop with almost 40% water use reduction at drip-irrigated fields. With regard to catchment protection, we are working with Zerafshan Natural Reserve to improve irrigation of the reserve and are planting over 6500 trees between 2022-2023. Additionally, we are supporting an information campaign against increased illegal grazing at Zerafshan Natrual Reserve.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk15

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Declining water quality

(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

☑ Bangladesh

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Water risks and opportunity assessments are conducted globally using WRI Aqueduct Tool, IPCC projections, TCFD scenario risk mapping analysis and inputs from AWS standard and our Global Risk and Insurance provider on Natural Catastrophes. These assessments aim to identify material risks and opportunities, which includes flood, drought, baseline water stress, water depletion and water quantity limitations, which then although BAT globally, regionally and at each specific location to consider relevant risk management and mitigation plans and discuss and engagement with local stakeholders. Our BAT factory and green leaf threshing plant in Bangladesh are located in high water risk area. The water risk is primarily driven by water quality risk, mainly due to low levels of wastewater treatment and collection. The Bangladesh sites are located at river Ganges – Brahmaputra which is affected by industrial, agricultural, and civil water run-offs. Furthermore, the factory site is close to the capital city. The facility sources most of the water from the ground and discharges water to municipal sewer. Worsening water quality might result in a need to change or diversify water supply and change water treatment technical arrangements and practices. As the worst-case scenario impairment or interruptions in local production due to poor water quality can result in alternative sourcing for this market or operational delays.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Upfront costs to adopt/deploy new practices and processes

(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:

☑ 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

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 570,000 to 1.68 Million for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Bangladesh facility

(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)

570000

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

1680000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 570,000 to 1.68 Million for our operations based on potential water related disruption to the BAT Bangladesh facility. Due to the fact that we have not experienced such an event, our estimates are based on inputs from our insurance risk reports for natural catastrophes and potential financial losses related to minor and major business interruptions. The assessment is facility specific and is based on production related costs (excluding raw materials). BAT impact range can be broken down as: potential financial impact (minimum) "number of disrupted days * daily interruption cost" and potential financial impact (maximum) "number of disrupted days * daily interruption cost".*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The method used to calculate the cost of response involves allocating capital expenditure (Capex) specifically for a water recycling project. This allocation is based on the average project cost for similar purposes at our facilities that already have some wastewater treatment capabilities. The goal of this project is to eliminate the necessity for alterations in the supply chain and operational delays. Additionally, the cost of redesigning leaf sourcing is included as part of the regular operations and expenses. (1 x 1000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The local BAT management's response has been focused on reducing water dependency on water withdrawals through the implementation of water saving initiatives. Our factory team have identified suitable options to prepare for further water quality issues and these tie into local business continuity management plans which are tested at regular intervals. We have established a system of monitoring the quality of the water withdrawn and discharged to ensure it meets regulatory requirements as well as quality requirements required when recycled into our processes, which supports reducing the water we need to withdraw. We continue with capex investments and opex spend for efficiencies. This included investments in 2022 to install reverse osmosis technology alongside our onsite wastewater treatment plant. From a non-technical side, the site implemented a water stewardship management system that was audited and certified by AWS in 2022 and maintained in 2023.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk16

(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:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Bangladesh

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Bangladesh is one of our largest in-house leaf operations in BAT. One of the main leaf sourcing areas is located in a zone prone to riverine flooding, which can lead to disruption of leaf growing and sourcing activities. Should any disruption incur within the tobacco supply chain then the wider supply chain would be at risk, with a significant cost increase taking place to import tobacco into the country. As an example, they are developing a resistant hybrid that is being piloted in flooding areas.

(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 unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 19.8 to 39.6 million based on potential crop shortage in Bangladesh ranging between 5 and 10% due to climate events (flood or drought) and the potential impact that this can have in the local tobacco availability

(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)

19800000

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

39600000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 19.8 to 39.6 million based on potential crop shortage in Bangladesh ranging between 5 and 10% due to climate events (flood or drought) and the potential impact that this can have in the local tobacco availability. We have not experienced such an event to date; therefore, we have capped this to 10% chance. This figure assumes we will have to purchase this tobacco from other sources outside of the country; which will come at higher landed cost due to higher base cost, freight and import duties, which is 6.44 more per kg of tobacco (5% vol shortage is 3.1million kg x 6.44 19.8million and 10% vol shortage is 6.1 million kg of tobacco x 6.4439.6 million). Therefore, the risk figure reflects the cost of activating the sourcing plan from another country due to crop shortage.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase investment in R&D

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response represents part of the operational expenses required to sustain our Global Leaf Agronomy Development center. This includes the costs associated with running programs, trials, and projects that collaborate with Leaf operations and strategic third-party suppliers, all focused on enhancing farmer resilience and sustainability. It reflects the investments made in specific areas as our breeding program, variety improvement, seed technology, soil science, as well as operational costs and employee salaries. (1 x 4000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

With both our operations and supply chains having global footprints in 2023 we reviewed our plans to ensure we have mitigated the effects of severe climatic disruption in a small number of locations, and our business continuity management plans are designed to mitigate the consequence of supply chain interruption and disruption. We are also responding to that risk by maintaining an agronomy research programme in Bangladesh, constantly assessing new best practices, techniques and new cultivars that will along the time bring better yield (kg/hectare) and quality to the crop, mitigating the risk of the weather and water conditions in the specific leaf growing areas. The research programme is orchestrated by the team of experts of our Global Leaf Agronomy Development centre in Brazil that works extensively in farmer's resilience, this will continue into at least 2024. We believe our response is robust and agile to incorporate changes in risk levels and capitalise on opportunities coming out of our research schemes (such as water stress resilient varieties).

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk17

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Other chronic physical risk, please specify **:**Water Scarcity

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Pakistan

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Indus

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

BAT operates in a risk-based and contingency approach. This means sourcing locations which coincide with water scarcity zones which includes Pakistan, which is another strategic leaf region, are constantly monitored. Before they are ever to be impacted so severely in ways that could impose disruptions of supply BAT would trigger and mitigate sourcing alternatives as part of our risk management strategy and continuity approach. This may mean longer freights, foreign exchange influence raising cost which could actually translate into substantive financial impact for the Group, increasing cost and impacting sales.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 3.7 to 7.5 million based on potential crop shortage in Pakistan ranging between 5 and 10% due to climate events of drought and the potential impact that this can have in the local tobacco availability.

(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)

3700000

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

7500000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 3.7 to 7.5 million based on potential crop shortage in Pakistan ranging between 5 and 10% due to climate events of drought and the potential impact that this can have in the local tobacco availability. We have not experienced such an event to date; therefore, we have capped this to 10% chance. This figure assumes we will have to purchase this tobacco from other sources outside of the country, which will come at higher landed cost due to higher base cost, freight and import duties which is 2.62 more per kg of tobacco (5% vol shortage is 1.4 million kg x 2.62 3.7 million and 10% vol shortage is 2.9 million kg of tobacco x 2.627.5 million). Therefore, the risk figure reflects the cost of activating the sourcing plan from another country due to crop shortage.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Increase supplier diversification

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response represents part of the operational expenses required to sustain our Global Leaf Agronomy Development center. This includes the costs associated with running programs, trials, and projects that collaborate with Leaf operations and strategic third-party suppliers, all focused on enhancing farmer resilience and sustainability. It reflects the investments made in specific areas as such as our breeding program, variety improvement, seed technology, soil science, as well as operational costs and employee salaries. (1 x 4000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

BAT's suppliers are globally spread, mitigating the effects of severe climatic disruption. Business continuity management plans are designed to mitigate the consequence of supply chain interruption and disruption. Our business continuity management plans were reviewed in 2023 to ensure they still mitigate the consequence of supply chain interruption and disruption. Local management teams also work extensively with a team of experts in Brazil based in our Global Leaf Agronomy Development centre. This is focused on improving farmer resilience and researching breeding for resilient tobacco varieties. This will continue into at least 2024. As an additional control, we would also source tobacco from other farmers within or outside of the country.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk18

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ India

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Cauvery River

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Although BAT does not have a manufacturing or leaf operational facility in India, India suppliers still represent about 7% of our total tobacco purchases and access to specific styles and blends of tobacco, which is uniquely grown here. Before they would be impacted so severely in ways that could impose disruptions of supply BAT would trigger and mitigate sourcing alternatives as part of our risk management strategy and continuity approach.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 0.2 to 0.4 million based on potential crop shortage in India ranging between 5 and 10% due to climate events of drought and the potential impact that this can have in the local tobacco availability.

(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)

200000

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

400000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Our estimate in terms of relative magnitude ranges from 0.2 to 0.4 million based on potential crop shortage in India ranging between 5 and 10% due to climate events of drought and the potential impact that this can have in the local tobacco availability. We have not experienced such an event to date; therefore, we have capped this to 10% chance. This figure assumes we will have to purchase this tobacco from other sources outside of the country, which will come at higher landed cost due to higher base cost, freight and import duties which is 0.3 more per kg of tobacco (5% vol shortage is 0.8 million kg x 0.3 0.2 million and 10% vol shortage is 1.6 million kg of tobacco x 0.30.4 million). Therefore, the risk figure reflects the cost of activating the sourcing plan from another country due to crop shortage.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Increase supplier diversification

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response represents the operational expenses required to sustain part of our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre. This includes the costs associated with running programs, trials, and projects that collaborate with Leaf operations and strategic third-party suppliers, all focused on enhancing farmer resilience and sustainability. It reflects the investments made in specific areas as such as our breeding program, variety improvement, seed technology and soil science, as well as operational costs and employee salaries. (1 x 4000000).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

BAT's business continuity management plans are designed to mitigate the consequence of supply chain interruption and disruption, these plans were reviewed and validated in 2023. In addition, we are continuing is responding to that risk by working extensively via a team of experts in Brazil based in our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre which focuses on farmer's resilience and breeding for resilient tobacco varieties. This will continue into 2024 and beyond. Should that fail, the risk will subsequently be mitigated by BAT would sourcing tobacco from other farmers within or outside of the country.
[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:
☑ OPEX

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

4545000000

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

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

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

4545000000

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

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Total OPEX that is vulnerable to both transition and physical climate risks is that in respect of raw materials and consumables used in the production of goods. This will include leaf, wrapping materials, electronic devices, e-liquids, manufacturing production and logistics costs but (excludes employee salaries and depreciation). Capex 34m reflects the total investment on addressing climate related risk through reducing both our scope 1-2 emissions (24m) and other projects reducing scope 3.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

2550000000

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

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

2550000000

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The financial metrics at risk relate to the direct purchasing costs for leaf, paper and pulp as all these could be impacted by transition risks (such as carbon taxes or fines on non DCF compliance products) or physical risks due to climate driven impact on soil, water and heat. BAT spent 2.55 BN on tobacco, pulp and paper in 2023 which was 17% of the group's total OPEX (excluding impairment and goodwill and amortisation charges.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

37749600

(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)

37749600

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

Select from:

☑ 21-30%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Total tobacco purchased by the group that is vulnerable to physical climate risks relating to areas with high or very high water risk. Our total OPEX spend on tobacco is 1,498 Mn. Across our supply chain 25.2% of tobacco is grown in areas with high or extremely high water risk. (1498000000 x 0.252 37749600). Over the last few years, we have invested around 2m annually in addressing water related risk in our own operations. Further initiatives to address water risks in tobacco are also undertaken through the financing of water saving solutions with our farmers.

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)

27283000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

27283000000

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Total Revenue that is vulnerable to both transition and physical climate risks is that of the Group. If climate risks are such that impact the supply of raw materials and semi-finished goods then all revenue will be at risk. As well as cigarettes, we have taken the view that all New Category Products would be impacted. For example, disruption to the supply of nicotine (from tobacco leaves) would impact both Modern Oral and Vapour products whilst electronics devices would be impacted by other raw materials. Capex 34m reflects the total investment on addressing climate related risk through reducing both our scope 1-2 emissions (24m) and other projects reducing scope 3.
[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

Bangladesh

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facilities in Sarvar and Dhaka Bangladesh are in 'extremely high’ overall water risk zones as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. The two facilities represents 3.1% out of our 64 facilities. As per production, it contributes to around 7.8%. The water basin specified is 'minor water basin' as per WRI Aqueduct map. Respective 'major water basin' is Ganges - Bramaputra, respective 'minor water basin' are Bhramaputra 4.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Respective 'major water basin' is Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast, respective 'minor water basin' is Upper Yadkin.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facility (factory) in the US is in 'high’ overall water risk zone as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. One facility represents 1.6% out of our 64 facilities. As per production, it contributes to around 5.35%. The water basin specified is 'major water basin' as per WRI Aqueduct map. Respective 'major water basin' is Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast, respective 'minor water basin' is Upper Yadkin.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify **:**Respective 'major water basin' is Black Sea, South Coast, respective 'minor water basin' is Corum / Amasya / Samsun.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facility (factory) in Turkey is in 'high’ overall water risk zone as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. One facility represents 1.6% out of our 64 facilities. As per production, it contributes to around 4.9%. The water basin specified is 'major water basin' as per WRI Aqueduct map. Respective 'major water basin' is Black Sea, South Coast, respective 'minor water basin' is Corum / Amasya / Samsun.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

☑ Rhine

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facility (factory) in Germany is in 'high’ overall water risk zone as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. One facility represents 1.6% out of our 64 facilities. As per production, it contributes to around 2.4%. The water basin specified is 'major water basin' as per WRI Aqueduct map. Respective 'major water basin' is Rhine.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facility (factory) in Mexico is in ‘ High’ overall water risk zone as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. One facility represents 1.6% out of our 64 facilities. As per production, this contributes to around 2.1%.The 'major water basin' is RÃo Grande - Bravo, respective 'minor water basin' is Bravo / San Juan.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facility (factory) in Pakistan Jhelum is in 'High' overall water risk zone as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. One facility represents 1.6% out of our 64 facilities. As per production, these contribute to around 2%. The water basin specified is 'minor water basin' as per WRI Aqueduct map. Respective 'major water basin' is Indus.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Uzbekistan

☑ Amu Darya

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facility (factory) in Uzbekistan is in 'extremely high' overall water risk zone as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. One facility represents 1.6% out of our 64 facilities. As per production, this contributes to around 1.3%. The water basin specified is 'minor water basin' as per WRI Aqueduct map. Respective 'major water basin' is Amu Darya

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Other, please specify **:**Respective 'major water basin' is North Chile, Pacific Coast, respective 'minor water basins' is Maipo.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our facility (factory) in Chile - Casablanca is in 'high' overall water risk zone as per Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. 1 facility represents 1.6% out of our 64 facilities. As per revenue, this contributes to around 1.17%. The water basin specified is 'minor water basin' as per WRI Aqueduct map. Respective 'major water basin' is North Chile, Pacific Coast, respective 'minor water basins' is Maipo.

[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

We had no Water related regulatory violations, fines, enforcement orders and/or other penalties in 2023 in our direct operations. The closest incident we had in Turkey was findings from an audit that the chemical oxygen demand was higher than the limit, however this was due to the wastewater treatment plant being turned off. The finding was logged by the government, but we have not received any fine or enforcement order from any governmental body. The wastewater treatment plant is being reactivated in 2024 and will resolve the issue.
[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
☑ Switzerland ETS
☑ France carbon tax
☑ Norway carbon tax
☑ Poland carbon tax
☑ Sweden carbon tax
☑ Denmark carbon tax
☑ Ukraine carbon tax
☑ Switzerland carbon tax
☑ South Africa carbon tax

☑ Canada federal fuel charge

☑ Other carbon tax, please specify **:Croatia carbon tax**

(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

3

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

1640

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

6137

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

7700

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

"Our facility (cigarette factory) in Poland Augustow is under the EU ETS. The scheme is applied to emissions from fuel combustion on site to generate energy, including natural gas (boiler house and air dryer) and oil; it doesn't cover emissions from fuel use by company vehicles. The scheme is not applicable to Scope 2 emissions. Reported verified Scope 1 emissions for our facility in Augustow cover both emissions from fuel use on site (mostly natural gas) and in fleet vehicles. Reported verified Scope 2 emissions are as per Market-based method and are equal to 0, while the site sources 100% renewable electricity. For our factory in Augustow the last free EUA allocation for 2023 was equal to 1640 tCO2e. EUA allowances were purchased on the market in twice in 2023 in total amount of 6137 tCO2e. The remaining part of 2023 emissions was covered by allowances purchased/allocated in previous years."

Switzerland ETS

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

0.46

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

1751

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

1344

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Our facility (cigarette factory) in Switzerland is under EU ETS. The scheme is applied to emissions from fuel combustion on site for energy generation, which constitutes major part of Scope 1 emissions; it doesn't cover emissions from fuel use by company vehicles. The scheme is not applicable to Scope 2 emissions. According to the Swiss confederation legislation, a company subject to ETS can ask the authorities to develop emissions reduction glidepath for it. Whenever company's emissions are lower than the glidepath, it is exempt from paying carbon taxes for relevant equivalent amount. The BAT factory in Switzerland entered such a scheme and committed to reduce its CO2e emissions by signing an agreement with the Swiss confederation. A glidepath was defined for the period 2013-2020. Throughout the period, our facility had been performing better than the target, which allowed BAT to convert the difference into tradable CO2e certificates (CHF 100 / ton) and refund carbon taxes. Later the agreement was extended to cover 2021 - 24. A new glidepath was defined and agreed. In 2023 CO2e emissions of our factory in Switzerland were below the target given by authorities (1750 tCO2e), hence no additional purchase of emissions allowance was needed. For over a decade our factory in Switzerland has implemented a range of decarbonization initiatives, such as energy saving, replacement of natural gas boiler at the warehouse for biomass fuel boiler, and sourcing 100% renewable electricity, which allowed it to meet commitments made to the authorities. Further, subject to purchase of carbon offset and verification as per PAS2060 standard it become carbon neutral in regard to each of the years from 2020 - 2022 (the status hasn't been maintained after 2022 due to the Factory closure announcement).
[Fixed row]

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

Canada federal fuel charge

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.85

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

79090

(3.5.3.5) Comment

BAT Canada pays a federal fuel charge applicable to fuel used by company vehicles used for trade marketing, and a federal fuel charge for natural gas used for heating in the Canadian warehouses and head office. The payment is based on the rate of average 50 CAN /tonne of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent in 2022.

Denmark carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.08

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

52085

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Denmark Carbon Tax is applied to fuel used (diesel and petrol) by our vehicles fleet at the end market. Carbon tax is applied based on fixed rate per litre of diesel and per litre of petrol and is included in the price of fuel. In the market we have an office that uses electrical energy only and fleet vehicles for trade marketing activities.

France carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.19

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

36223

(3.5.3.5) Comment

France Carbon Tax is applied to fuel used (diesel and petrol) by our vehicles fleet at the end market. Carbon tax is applied based on fixed rate per litre of diesel and per litre of petrol and is included in the price of fuel.

Norway carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.02

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

5480

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Norway Carbon Tax is applied to fuel used (diesel and petrol) by our vehicles fleet at the end market. Carbon tax is applied based on fixed rate per litre of diesel and per litre of petrol and is included in the price of fuel. In the market we have an office that uses electrical energy only and fleet vehicles for trade marketing activities.

Poland carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.85

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

430950

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Carbon Tax in Poland is applied to fuel used (diesel and petrol) by vehicles fleet in the country. Carbon tax is applied based on fixed rate per litre of diesel and per litre of petrol. Note: Our factory in Poland Augustow is regulated by ETS (European Emissions Trading System, in 2023 the amounwe paid was 430 950 GBP), while our factory in Ostrzeszów consumes very minor amounts of fuel subject to carbon tax, thus is exempt from it.

South Africa carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/01/2023

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

2.97

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

12749.85

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Our factory in South Africa is subject to carbon tax as the total installed thermal capacity of the combined stationary fuel combustion equipment on site exceeds the threshold (10 MW(th)) as per Carbon Tax Act. Emissions from fuel use by vehicles fleet are not in scope of the taxation scheme.

Sweden carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.11

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

25278

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Sweden Carbon Tax is applied to fuel used (diesel and petrol) by vehicles fleet in the country and a diesel generator as back-up for the IT servers and for the sprinkler pump.. Carbon tax is applied based on fixed rate per litre of diesel and per litre of petrol (included in the price). All Scope 1 emissions are associated with diesel fuel use by vehicles and generators since the only fuel used on site by our factory is bio gas covered by biogas certificates.

Switzerland carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.57

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

0

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Switzerland Carbon tax is applicable to natural gas and fuel oil used at the facility in Boncourt. The sum of the tax for the reporting period is approx 140 thousand GBP. However, due to the fact that BAT Switzerland is registered in EU ETS and relevant emissions reduction program, carbon taxes are refunded because of Scope 1 emissions from fuels used on site are significantly below the allowance. Thus, refunding taxes serves as a kind of allowances trading. The tax is not applicable to fuels used by fleet vehicles in trade marketing and other activities.

Ukraine carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

0.61

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

789

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Our factory in Ukraine pays a tax on CO2e emissions from the use fuel use on site, which is applicable to natural gas and diesel oil. Payment is done annually on the basis of volumes of natural gas used in the reporting period. The tax is not applicable to other fuels use on site as well as fuels used by fleet vehicles in trade marketing and other activities.

Other carbon tax, please specify

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

1.91

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

683

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Croatia Carbon tax: BAT facilities in Croatia (factory and green leaf threshing plant) pay a governmental fee on CO2e emissions from the use of natural gas, fuel oil and diesel on site. This is required for facilities that are not covered by ETS and emit more than 450 tCO2e per year. Payment is done annually based on the report of calculated emissions (the methodology implies use of number of worked hours and fuel used by each type of equipment, e.g. boiler, dryer etc) in the central informational governmental system. The fee is not applicable to fuel used by fleet vehicles.; Croatia Leaf (Croatia Virovitic GLT) will pay for 2023 year a governmental fee on CO2 emissions from the use of natural gas on site. This is required for facilities that are not covered by ETS and emit more than 450 tCO2 (not CO2e) per year. Payment is done annually based on the report of calculated emissions (the methodology implies use of number of worked hours and fuel used by each type of equipment, e.g. boiler, dryer etc) in the central informational governmental system. The fee is not applicable to fuel used by fleet vehicles. For 2023 we have reported 542,9698 tonnes CO2 and we will pay 807 Euro or 683 GBP.
[Fixed row]

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

The central ERM team oversees BAT's bi-annual risk review and reporting exercise and applies a standardised risk assessment methodology (outlined in our Risk Management Manual) embedded at Group, functional, direct-reporting business unit and individual market levels. Risk data (from each business level) is collected in the Group's risk management system (SAP GRC RM) which applies intelligent aggregation of risk impact scores. The direct reporting business unit risk scores aggregate up to produce a regional risk score for each risk. The system also provides standardised risk management output documents which support the bi-annual risk assessment process and are used, in part, to drive risk debates at various Risk Management Committee meetings. Risk reviews are completed by multidisciplinary teams (e.g. manufacturing, leaf, supply chain, procurement, commercial). External assessments take place as required and may focus on specific areas (e.g. leaf growing) or end markets depending on risk mapping indications. Climate change risks and impacts are identified through internal and external risk assessments considering short, medium, and long-term (aligned with TCFD scenario analysis and materiality risk mapping). Local BAT site risk assessments are carried out bi-annually (min) and are linked with business continuity plans focusing on, but not restricted to, short- and medium-term risks (depending on risk type). BAT's risk management process has four stages: "Identify" identifies potential events that could adversely impact achievement of business objectives, including failure to capitalise on opportunities. This involves identifying relevant strategy and objectives, identifying stakeholders and their objectives, and analysing the overall

*environment. Risks are identified by the relevant Leadership Team, Risk Management Committee or any senior manager involved in managing risks. “Assess and Evaluate” considers risks/opportunities to determine their impact and likelihood for prioritisation. This is done using two scales, both from 1 to 3, that combined provide a total risk rating from 1 to 9 which helps to understand the Group’s risk exposure. Details are provided on impact, likelihood and total risk rating. The potential impact of a risk/opportunity is evaluated through our Risk Impact Matrices. These measure potential impacts on a Group, functional, direct-reporting business unit and individual market level relative to 5 Impact Categories covering financial, reputational, safety, legal and environmental impact metrics. This evaluation is converted into a number (1 to 3, low to high) based on the relevant Risk Impact Matrix. The risk/opportunity is then evaluated based on the current net impact. This evaluation considers the reasonably foreseeable gross impact and the expected impact of current mitigation activities. The likelihood of the risk having the evaluated impact is rated from 1 to 3 (low to high) based on assessment by the Risk Manager and Risk Owner. Examples of identification of risks/opportunities at facility level include making our factories more resilient to climate change impacts through investment in building fabric and energy systems, reducing energy consumption and potential exposures to climate change regulation. The assessment covers both physical and transitional risks and opportunities. “Manage” and “Monitor” involves assigning mitigation measures, ensuring their effectiveness, and monitoring and reporting risk related information at various Risk Management Committees. *

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

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Opportunities exist, but none anticipated to have a substantive effect on organization

(3.6.3) Please explain

Improving water efficiency in operations is considered strategically important, helping BAT reduce our reliance on the local environment and communities in which we operate. However, these opportunities are not considered to have a substantive opportunity on the financial position, financial performance or cash flow of BAT. BAT considers the threshold for 'substantive' as 60mn, BAT spent 3.1mn on water in 2023, therefore current cost of water is financially not substantive to BAT, resulting efficiency savings would not be considered substantive especially when split to Basin level. Estimates from external sources, BAT have assessed financial savings linked to water efficiency to be around 1.73 – 2.60 million split across the 50 operational sites over the next 4 - 6 years. Basin level savings will be substantially smaller, the most expensive site for water is based in the U.S who spent in 2023 0.96 million. The site has currently under construction, the award-winning WaterHub initiative, an advanced water recycling facility, one of a few water recycling projects of its scale in the US. Once construction is complete, the WaterHub is expected to reclaim more than 60 million gallons of water per year, equivalent to the average water supply of approximately 550 average U.S. households. Reynolds has been honored with the 2024 SEAL Business Sustainability Awards in the Environmental Initiative Award category for the project however this project is not considered to have a substantive opportunity on the financial position, financial performance or cash flow of BAT. We fully understand that in the future many countries in which we operate will limit the number of licenses granted and/or limit the amount of m3 per license. BAT's geographical spread means if a water risk materialises and interrupts operations substantially, the BCP plans for our factories aim to cover 80% of the production volume (if not covered via inventory) in a different location therefore resilience opportunities at a basin level are very minor and costly to realise and relevant to only a small proportion of our factories. Finally, adopting sustainable irrigation systems such as drip irrigation can minimise water use and increase yields. BAT have assessed financial savings linked to land reduction and water needs at around 102,600 – 1.30 million in the next 4 - 6 years across all our leaf operations across multiple water basins.
[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

☑ Move to more energy/resource efficient buildings

(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

☑ Fiji
☑ Mali
☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Samoa
☑ Spain
☑ Sudan
☑ Angola
☑ Brazil
☑ Latvia
☑ Malawi
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Ghana
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Kenya
☑ Malta
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Guyana
☑ Jordan
☑ Serbia
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Uganda

☑ Poland
☑ Albania
☑ Algeria
☑ Austria
☑ Belarus
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Jamaica
☑ Nigeria
☑ Réunion
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Paraguay
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Costa Rica
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ Mozambique
☑ Uzbekistan
☑ Côte d'Ivoire
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ North Macedonia
☑ Solomon Islands
☑ Papua New Guinea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
☑ Zambia
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ukraine
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Cameroon
☑ Colombia
☑ Honduras
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ South Africa
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Russian Federation
☑ Republic of Moldova
☑ Trinidad and Tobago
☑ Bosnia & Herzegovina
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Improving energy efficiency is an important part of BAT's low carbon transition plan by enabling our operating sites to achieve our Scope 1 and 2 emission targets. Almost 80% of these emissions are being generated by these operating facilities. Glidepaths have been developed at factory, regional, and Group level, to track our progress and prioritise our investments towards initiatives that deliver the most effective emission reductions and energy cost reduction. A focus on top losses caused by inefficient use of energy, are analysed and remediating actions are put in place under the Group's Integrated Work Systems (IWS) programme. Proposals for investments in energy efficiency initiatives such as building energy management systems, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems are reviewed centrally and incorporate the use of our internal carbon price to reflect the future cost of carbon to the business. Our 10 Golden Rules Programme standardises how we run energy efficient practices across our sites. Our factory in Chile was our first operational site to fully adopt the programme which resulted in a 7% energy consumption reduction versus 2020 baseline.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The opportunity to increase energy efficiency will be beneficial to BAT and will reduce direct operating costs at our sites. The amount will be relatively immaterial to the overall cost of products sold.

(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)

8000000

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

18000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

In 2023, there were 49 initiatives implemented to reduce carbon emissions through operational excellence and smart energy projects across 28 of our operating facilities. These initiatives delivered total reduction in our scope 1 and 2 emissions of 6402 MT CO2e ([1.2%] of the Group 2020 baseline). The annualised energy cost saving of these initiatives implemented amounted to 1.3 m with a one-off capex cost of 4 m. Continued investment is planned for up until 2030 and will play a crucial role in helping the Group make progress towards its targets. The financial estimate of the potential benefit of these initiatives include both the cost of direct energy that is anticipated to be saved as a consequence of the installation of more energy efficient plant and machinery, as well as the financial benefit of emission reduction, using our Internal Carbon Pricing to the value of this benefit. The lower financial estimate assumes 1m of energy cost reduction initiatives being implemented for a period of 6 years reducing scope 1 and 2 emissions by 5,000 MT CO2e p.a. together with an average internal carbon price of 80 per MT (total financial impact 8m). The upper range assumes 2m of energy cost reduction initiatives being implemented for a period of 6 years reducing scope 1 and 2 emissions by 10,000 MT CO2e p.a. together with an average internal carbon price of 100 per MT (total financial impact 18m). Whilst we fully intend to optimise the efficiency of our infrastructure as far as possible, we recognise emission reduction may get more challenging over time, depending on technological developments, as high impact initiatives are prioritised in the early years of our transition. Consequently, the range of benefits reflects different scenarios on the average savings and timing of delivery up to 2030. Additionally, we also recognise uncertainties relating to internal carbon pricing in the future as it depends on level of supply and demand, hence estimating these at an average of 80-100 per MT based on current available market data.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

18000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

In 2023 49 projects spanned across our 28 Group factories and Green Leaf Threshing Plants (GLTs) and included the following initiatives: building energy management systems (e.g. Pakistan, Venezuela), compressors, vacuums, and heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems (e.g. South Korea, Turkey, Mexico), lighting upgrades and LED roll out (e.g. USA, Nigeria), process optimization (e.g. Hungary), smart control systems (e.g. Bangladesh, Indonesia, South Korea). The costs to realise the opportunity has been based on the average investment cost expected over the next few years (3-4mn) as the Group continues to drive projects to deliver our targets, with an average multiple of 6 years (up to 2030) used in the benefits above, (6 x 3mn 18mn cost to achieve).

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Glidepaths have been developed at local factory, regional, and global level to map the delivery of these targets, The Operations ESG team operates as a Centre of Excellence and work in collaboration with the Regional Engineering team, the Group Head of Manufacturing technology, and Local/ Regional Operations directors to provide insights, technologies, and best practice. These are tailored to the local environment to ensure suitability to drive energy efficiency programmes and emissions reduction. Where possible, local engagement and collaboration is also performed with universities with a view of accessing new to world technologies that can be rolled out across Group infrastructure. Opportunity areas are identified and prioritised, with internal carbon pricing and marginal abatement costing tools used to appraise projects and allocate ESG funding, with glidepath delivery tracked to ensure that pace and reach of transformation are in line with our overall targets and ambition.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Increased resilience to impacts of climate change

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Kenya
☑ Brazil
☑ Mexico
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Mozambique
☑ Croatia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Zimbabwe
☑ Argentina
☑ South Africa
☑ United States of America
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

BAT is dependent on the availability of sustainable wood to ensure curing of Flue Cured Virginia, one of the main tobacco types bought, representing more than 70% of total purchases. Farmers we work with either grow exotic plantations on their farm or buy sustainable wood off-farm. For our contracted farmer base, we track the source of the wood, and if on-farm the specific species used. The primary opportunity when doing so is that it allows us to continuously engage with our supplier base to manage & protect forest resources, the more we do this, the more sustainable and resilient our overall supply chain becomes. Furthermore, as we progress our strategy to increase the proportion of fuel coming from renewable sources, the demand for wood is likely to increase in certain locations which can lead to increased prices. That leads us to the opportunity of supporting proactively the management of cost by farmers to allow them to choose the best supply model on how to source that wood. We continue to work with our directly contracted farmers and third-party suppliers to promote the sustainable use of forest resources. This includes training in forest management, distributing tree saplings for a sustainable source of fuel & helping farmers to switch to locally available alternative fuels. By supporting these and other activities, we aim to realise the opportunity to continue improving the sustainability and resilience of our supply chain, which in turn will help to protect forests.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(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

The opportunity to increase curing efficiency and use alternatives will be beneficial to BAT and will reduce direct operating costs of our farmers.

(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)

4730000

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

7800000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Based on the work that Global Leaf Agronomy Development (GLAD) centre is conducting, and programmes like Curing 2.0, we calculated the cost savings of farmers requiring less wood to cure leaves. We did this by estimating a range of between 20% (121.6mn kg) and 30% (182.5 mn kg) consumption reduction, based on the 2023 figure. Based on the initial pilot results in countries like Pakistan and Brazil, this is expected to be an achievable opportunity. Furthermore, we plotted two price ranges on the wood cost per kilo to cater for potentially reduced availability due to increased demand and/ or reduced supply due to climatic conditions. This price range was based on the 2023 average cost per kg paid by our suppliers, which was 0.039 GBP/Kg for flat wood price and 0.043 GBP/Kg for a wood price increase of 10%. The minimum anticipated financial effect of GBP 4.7 mn was calculated considering the 20% volume opportunity (121.6mn kg) and the flat wood price (0.039 GBP/Kg) (121.6 X 0.039 4.7). The maximum anticipated financial effect of GBP 7.8 mn was calculated considering the 30% volume opportunity (182.5mn kg) and the wood price increased by 10% (0.043 GBP/Kg) (182.5 X 0.043 7.8). The additional benefit of decreasing our overall emissions is not yet captured and it is expected to further increase the value of that opportunity.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

3120000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost is based on curing efficiency projects planned for development by our Global Leaf Agronomy Development (GLAD) centre for a period of 6 years. GLAD are responsible for providing science-based carbon-smart solutions globally, on behalf of BAT. Solutions are rolled out to our contracted farmers by our field technicians ("FTs"). Our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre has a cost of approx. 7.4mn annually, made up of investments and operating costs. Around 7% of their project portfolio is dedicated to curing efficiency projects (7.4 x 0.07 x 6 3.12mn). GLAD conduct world-class research, from development and testing in labs to real-world field trials with farmers.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

To realize the opportunity, we drive global collaboration with internal and external leaf suppliers to support our Scope 3 targets, which include research programmes for trials on new curing barns and collaborate with farmers to develop and deploy curing efficiency initiatives. To deploy the Curing 2.0 programme we focus on the development of a global platform and standard model for the technology, then seek local suppliers that can support in the commercialisation. We start deployment through demonstrating the new initiatives and designs in leader farmers, plan for a semi-commercial adoption and finally we streamline implementation in wider farmer base. In parallel we have a training plan for 100% of the Field Technicians (FTs) and to farmers according to their profile (early adopter or follower). Collective trainings like field days, and individual or mini groups sessions are undertaken. In Brazil, we created a technology diffusion technical team, which consists of FTs dedicated to train and cascade new technology to farmers, including tobacco curing technology. To date, trials were implemented in our Leaf Operations in Brazil, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. In Brazil the use of efficient curing barns is already deployed to cure about 95% of the crop volume in our directly contracted farmers. Next step is to advance in the adoption of improved versions of the curing barns to provide higher efficiency in the amount of wood per kilo of tobacco cured. In Pakistan and Bangladesh trials were implemented using local suppliers to manage the cost of the curing equipment and a 5-year development and deployment plan is created.

We also streamline farmer training, regarding curing techniques and efficiency, both for the new technologies and for the existing models. To date, 104,000 people have been trained, across BAT Leaf Operations and strategic 3rd party suppliers.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Increased upstream value chain resilience

(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

☑ Fiji
☑ Chile
☑ Brazil
☑ Mexico
☑ Croatia
☑ Pakistan
☑ Sri Lanka
☑ Bangladesh
☑ Uzbekistan
☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

BAT has an opportunity to increase tobacco yields and improve farmers' resilience to a changing climate. In 2023, the Group sourced 73% of its annual tobacco requirement via 14 vertically integrated leaf operations like Brazil, Mexico, Bangladesh & Pakistan, which hold direct purchasing contracts with more than 91,000 farmers. This direct sourcing strategy provides BAT with the best opportunity to access high quality, sustainably-sourced tobacco. To support the resilience of our

farmer base, we develop tailored best practice techniques through our Global Leaf Agronomy Development centre (in Brazil) as well as through local/regional partnerships. Successful initiatives are rolled out to our contracted farmer base via our network of field technicians. As well as environmental best practice, we focus on continuous improvement of yield (kg/ha) with the following benefits: a) improving financial returns and sustainability for directly contracted farmers; b) facilitating the repurposing of land for crop diversification and improved income from non-tobacco crops; c) reducing our Scope 3 emissions (by reducing amounts of curing fertilisers needed per kg) Whilst yield is impacted by weather and other uncontrollable events, field performance data shows a continuous improvement in yield over time. In Bangladesh, for example, we had an increase of 13.4% in yield comparing 2023 to 2019. The continuous development of hybrids in all leaf operations is progressing the yield.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

The opportunity to increase farmer resilience will be beneficial to BAT and will reduce direct operating costs associated with our leaf purchases. The amount will be relatively immaterial to the overall cost of products sold.

(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)

7400000

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

8200000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

As part of our Sustainability and farmer living income goals, we collect data to estimate income levels generated by our contracted farmers and those farmers contracted by our strategic third party suppliers through the production of tobacco and non-tobacco crops, as well as other forms of income they generate through the year. The data collected includes total volume produced, farmer yield, % of crop diversification, production costs, and dependents living on the farms, allowing us to understand income levels vs in-country indices such as rural and urban living wages. Using this data across our 14 leaf operations, and based on production volumes, number of farmers, and average yield (which ranges depending on tobacco type, growing conditions, and size of farm amongst other factors), we were able to estimate the benefit of a 1% yield improvement across our contracted farmer base in our leading 5 leaf operations which generated a potential increase in farm revenue of 7.4mn (Average yield from the 5 leading markets is 2604 kg/ha, with 1% improvement it goes to 26kg more per ha x average price per kg of tobacco which is 2,47 x total ha from the 5 leading operations which is 114,786 7.4mn). When pro-rated to our globally contracted volumes, a potential increase in farm revenues of up to 8.2mn per annum at a global level (Average yield from the 5 leading markets is 2604 kg/ha, with 1% improvement it goes to 26kg more per ha x average price per kg of tobacco which is 2,47 x total ha from the 5 leading operations which is 128,069 8.2mn). In light of our historic performance and ability to deploy best practice to our farms, this yield improvement was considered conservative but demonstrates the potential benefit that could arise from our continued global leaf research and agronomy efforts. The increase in production efficiency also raises the possibility of farmers repurposing their land for the purposes of non-tobacco growing activities. Our directly contracted farmers utilise c. 114,786 ha across our largest 5 operations for tobacco growing, with a 1% yield improvement giving up to 1,147 ha which could be repurposed for other activities.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

7400000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre has a cost of about 7.4mn annually between investments and operating costs and its core purpose is to improve farmer resilience and the sustainability of their farms. We have therefore allocated this 7.4 mn as the cost to achieve the goal of favorably impacting farmer profitability and increasing their resilience to climate change. The total cost of 7.4 million is allocated as follows: 3.4 million is designated for employee salaries related

to managing the projects and trials. 4.0 million is allocated to the project execution, including its structure and the involvement of third parties such as startups, universities, and other partners. (3.4 mn 4.0 mn 7.4 mn)

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Global leaf research and agronomy deployment is a key aspect of our strategy for driving our environmental and social goals across the leaf operations we grow tobacco, ensuring the application of best practice, and long-term sustainability of the communities working with or supported by tobacco production. Our leaf research activities are split into 4 strategic pillars: farmer profitability, carbon management, biodiversity and water & climate change, with ongoing workstreams designed to support the delivery of our targets and goals. Situated in Brazil (our largest leaf operation globally) and leveraging decades of experience in tobacco growing, the leaf research centre seeks tailored solutions for application and deployment across all 12 of our leaf operations (as well as strategic third parties), with the following focus areas: Soil Science & Plant Nutrition, Water management, Emissions, and pest management Leaf Breeding, Seed Technology, Seed production & Industrialization, Mechanization & Curing Crop Protection, Agrochemicals, Agriculture best practice Substrates, Botanicals, Bioprocess, Leaf Chemistry Using our network of leaf technicians and senior leaf leadership teams in each of the operations, improvement needs are identified and form the basis of focus areas and active workstreams within our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre, with technology solutions identified and technology deployment plans developed over a time horizon of up to 5 years. In 2023 deployment of technology specifically targeting farmer profitability improvement included elite hybris in Bangladesh, Mexico, Pakistan, Fiji, Sri Lanka, Croatia, Brazil, Vietnam and Chile. Mechanization to reduce labour, other technologies like stitching machine aiming labour reduction in the curing phase was developed in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Mexico.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(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:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ South Africa

☑ Zimbabwe

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Tobacco growing is a key contributor the Group's value chain emissions, contributing 1,966 thousand tonnes CO2e in 2021 (32% of the Group's scope 3 emissions). The largest contributor relates to practices used to cure flue-cured Virginia and Dark Fire Cured tobacco which represent more than 70% of our tobacco purchases. The Group has recognised the impact on environment and biodiversity and has had programmes in place for years to ensure wood used for curing is sustainability sourced, with 99% of wood used for curing since 2016 being sourced from sustainable means, and more than 80% of our tobacco purchased in 2023 being cured using renewable fuels. The Group has sought to remove coal as a fuel source for curing and we have seen a steady reduction in the total tobacco sourced that was cured using coal. Programmes are in place to remove it entirely from the remaining locations where coal is still used (predominantly Zimbabwe and South Africa). In 2023, less than 4% of the volume was cured with coal, and it remains a key priority of the Group in meeting its emission reduction objectives of net zero across our value chain (scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions) by 2050. By maximising the efficiency of curing processes and fuel used by our farmers. we estimate that the emissions generated by curing can be reduced by up to 90% (depending on tobacco barn type and alternative fuel used) compared to coal used in these countries.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(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:

☑ 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

The benefits amount will be immaterial to the overall cost of products sold.

(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)

5200000

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

9400000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*The financial estimate provided relates to the reduction in curing emissions expected to be delivered on the purchases we make from our strategic supplier based in Zimbabwe (which amounted to 24% of our reportable curing emissions), with a rollout plan in place to transition the strategic supplier's farmer base from coal to renewable fuels by 2025. Pilots were performed in 2021 to test alternative options for curing fuel including wood, wood chips, briquettes, and wood logs. The results of the trial demonstrated that the level of emissions generated by coal amounted to 2.64kg CO2e vs 1 kg of coal used, with alternative wood fuels being approximately 0.12kg Co2e vs 1 kg of wood (95% lower emissions). Given the properties of the alternative fuel sources, the thermal efficiency was 2.1 times lower than the coal being replaced, and as such, the overall reduction in emissions amounted to 90% ((0.12*2.1)/2.64). We therefore anticipate curing emissions for our purchased tobacco from our strategic supplier in Zimbabwe will reduce cumulatively by 78,770 MT CO2e (excluding biogenics) in the next three years. We have estimated the financial benefit associated with this emission reduction through the anticipated cost of carbon. Our internal cost of carbon has been considered as a proxy for the benefits that the coal removal project will deliver, with indicative prices of 67 per MT for 2023 (lower range 78,770 x 67 5.2m) rising to 120 per MT for 2030 (upper range 78,770 x 120 9.4m).*

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

697115

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

As part of the rollout plan, our strategic third-party supplier has analysed logistics routes to deliver the alternative fuel from wood farms to the supplier base, with backloading (wood for following season taken back by the farmer as the current crop is delivered to the buying floors) used wherever possible to reduce transport costs/ emissions. Based on the analysis performed, including the cost of timber and the volume of renewable fuel required (noting reduced thermal efficiency vs coal) the cost of replacing coal has been estimated at 0.05 per kg of tobacco purchased. Based on current volumes being purchased which was 13,942,309 kg this equates to 697,115 per annum. (13,942,309 x 0.05 697,115).

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre plays a key role in our climate change strategy, with Carbon management being one of its four strategic pillars. We concluded a project called Curing 2.0, which consider optimised curing barn construction (optimised for the farmer base, affordability, and materials available in the countries they operate), as well as the fuel(s) being used to cure the tobacco to optimise thermal efficiency/ emissions being generated. These resultes provided a portfolio of many different alternatives to be implement for a variety of curing barns and fields. Our Asian Agritech Hub in Bangladesh is developing a low cost loose leaf curing barn adapted to small scale farmers with low investment capacity. The plan is to deliver a technological package for Loose Leaf barn and present the technology to the farmers in the next crop. Modern loose leaf barns were introduced in trial stage in Venezuela and Mexico. Vietnam and Sri Lanka are already deploying the curing units in commercial scale. Specifically in Zimbabwe, our strategic third-party supplier has performed pilots of wood, wood chip, and briquettes usage in the curing process with contracted farmer, both small scale and commercial farmers. Leveraging the expertise of our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre based in Brazil, assessments were performed to analyse the best combination of barn type and fuel use. Trials were successful and our strategic third-party supplier has rollout plans in place to remove coal from use as a curing fuel by 2025.

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

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

☑ Bangladesh

☑ Brazil

☑ Kenya

☑ Pakistan

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

BAT is dependent on the availability of sustainable wood to cure Flue Cured Virginia, tobacco that represents more than 70% of total purchases. Farmers we work with either grow exotic trees on their farm or buy sustainable off-farm wood. For our contracted farmers, we track the source and species of the wood used. The primary opportunity by doing so is that it allows us to continuously engage with our supplier base to protect forest resources to increase the sustainability and resilience of our overall supply chain. As we progress our strategy to increase the proportion of fuel coming from renewable sources, the demand for wood is likely to increase in certain locations, leading to increased prices. That gives us to the opportunity of proactively work with our suppliers to promote the sustainable use of forest resources, with trainings on forest management, distributing tree saplings for a sustainable source of fuel and helping farmers to switch to available alternative fuels. With this, we aim to realise the opportunity of improving the sustainability and resilience of our supply chain, which will result in cost savings and business protection. Through the engagement with our suppliers, with trainings and afforestation support for example, we work to reduce the risk of supply chain disruption from reduced availability of sustainable wood. We are evaluating with suppliers what is the best option to achieve 100% wood self-sufficiency, via on or off-farm production.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(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-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

The opportunity to increase reduce wood from off-farm sources will be beneficial to BAT and will reduce direct operating costs of our farmers.

(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)

2100000

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

4500000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

These financials reflect the opportunity of reducing cost of production for the farmers which can use on-farm instead of purchased wood. In Brazil, where we have the biggest tobacco operation and 100% of the Flue Cured tobacco is cured with wood, the farmers produce 73% of the wood used on their own farms. The remaining

27% is bought from off-farm local wood suppliers. The financial opportunity reflects a possibility to improve the production coming from on-farm to be 75% or 80%, rather than from off-farm. As the demand for wood increases, we have considered that the price of wood could increase up to 20% over a 6-year period. We continuously review the opportunity considering the overall crop volume, wood requirements and market dynamics.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

304000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity relates to the supplying of trees saplings to directly contracted farmers in Brazil, assuming the farmer has available land, as well as the associated training. The cost is associated with funding the cost of the saplings and incentivizing the farmers to increase their planted Eucalyptus area. Assuming that the increase in wood used directly from the farm reaches 80%, this represents an additional 24.15 mn kg of wood to be produced. If each tree produces around 52 Kg of wood, at least 694,604 saplings are needed (assuming a survival rate of 67%). Each sapling costs 0.073 and over a period of 6 years this represent 304,000 (24,2 x 1,000,000 / 52 / 67% x 0.073 x 6). This doesn't include the opportunity cost in case there isn't any land available.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The strategy is based on the increase of wood produced on farms, which also will improve traceability. Our local operation works with around 16K contracted tobacco farmers and since the late 1970's has developed an afforestation programme to promote wood production in the farms. To date more than 125 million saplings were distributed and more than 20K hectares of Eucalyptus is currently planted. This generates more than 100% of wood self-sufficiency to the farmers that have planted the trees and 73% of the total wood used by them comes from on-farm plantations. As smallholders, in various cases farmers do not have enough area to grow production forests. They buy wood from local Eucalyptus providers. We estimate that there is still an opportunity to increase the percentage of wood sourced from on-farm plantation, potentially increasing to 75% or 80% of the wood used by the farmers. The cost is associated with funding the saplings cost, incentivizing the farmers to increase their planted Eucalyptus area. This will also leverage traceability, once we increase the percentage of wood volume produced on farm, in line with our operational standard. Farmer training is provided on topics such as: use of sustainable wood for curing and construction, curing efficiency and / or curing barn management and maintenance. In 2023 100% of the 13K farmers using wood in Brazil were trained on the above-mentioned topics, and we also had 289k participations in trainings on these topics across the Thrive monitored supply chain.
[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:

☑ CAPEX

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

24000000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Capex associated with addressing climate change such as more efficient systems and moving to solar or biomass sources amount to 24m. Total Capital expenditure of the group amounted to 676m. Overall share of total is 4%,

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

(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

CAPEX associated with more efficient barns for leaf curing is paid by the farmers as part of the loan agreement they have with BAT. It is not a direct investment by BAT.

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

7400000

(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

BAT invested 7.4m in Global Leaf Agronomy Development activities, and Agronomy Initiatives done in every operation, all aimed to improve farmer resilience & the sustainability of their farms. The key components of this costs are the BAT employees, partnership with third party companies/start-ups/universities and others research institutes in order to run trials, pilots and proof of concept for technologies development, varieties improvement (drought tolerance, higher yield) and others. This is less than 1% of total group operating expenditure.
[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

Our Board Diversity and Inclusion Policy sets out our approach to diversity applicable to the Board, its Committees and the Management Board. This policy is intended to support the Board, through the activities of its Nominations Committee, in maintaining the effectiveness and balance of the Board, its Committees and the Management Board. Our Board Diversity and Inclusion Policy sets out the Board's commitment to the following objectives: • Considering all aspects of diversity when reviewing the composition of, and succession planning for, the Board, its Committees and the Management Board. • Considering a wide and gender-balanced pool of candidates for appointment to the Board. • Maintain at least 40% representation of women on the Board • At least one of the following senior positions on the Board to be held by a woman: Chair; Senior Independent Director; Chief Executive; Chief Financial Officer. • At least one Director of a minority ethnic background on

the Board. • Giving preference, where appropriate, to engagement of executive search firms accredited under the Standard and Enhanced Code of Conduct for Executive Search Firms. • Oversight of the development of a pipeline of diverse, high-performing potential Executive Directors, Management Board members and other senior managers.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

Board Diversity Policy Extract.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

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in 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 the development of a business strategy
☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements
☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

BAT's Board has oversight of our climate strategy and climate-related risks and opportunities. Our Board has strategic oversight of our sustainability agenda and takes climate-related considerations into account where applicable when making strategic decisions, including in relation to budgeting, risk management and overseeing capital expenditure. The Board reviews environmental performance for the prior year and progress towards the Group's environmental targets (including climate targets and renewable energy targets) and priorities for the Group's sustainability agenda. In 2023, the Board received two updates from the Director, Operations, which included progress towards our renewable energy and near-term emission reduction targets. In 2023, the Board approved a revised version of the Group Environment Policy, to include an assessment of our value chain impacts, Circular Economy principles, new biodiversity commitments and information on metrics and targets. The Board also reviews our approach to stakeholder engagement and how the Group responds to stakeholder considerations. In 2023, this included oversight of the Group's progress in reducing Scope 3 emissions, which represent around 90% of the Group's total carbon footprint. The Board reviews the Group risk register annually, which incorporates climate-related risks. The Board reviews the Group's budget annually which takes into account capital allocation to deliver our sustainability agenda and associated targets. The Remuneration Committee determines any annual changes to the remuneration of Management Board members. This may include salary adjustments, which are determined taking into account performance against individual objectives (see Q4.5 for further details). Annually, the Board reviews and approves the Combined Annual and ESG Report and Form 20-F, which report on the Group's progress on climate-related matters. The Audit Committee (AC) is responsible for reviewing the effectiveness of the Group's risk management and internal controls systems, including those relating to climate change. The AC reviews the Group's risk register twice per year and regularly reviews the Group's progress against its sustainability metrics, including emission targets that address climate-related issues (including progress against 2030 Scopes 1 and 2, and 2050 net zero value chain GHG emissions). Example of climate-related oversight: In 2023, the Audit Committee considered climate change risks and their impact on the Group, including: - oversight of processes in place to manage physical and transitional climate change risks; - annual reporting on the identification, assessment and management of those risks, in alignment with the TCFD framework. The AC also reviewed external assurance activities conducted on defined sustainability metrics (incl. Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions and energy data) and related information conducted by the assurance provider and reviewed the outcomes of assurance with the provider.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in 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 the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

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

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Our Board has strategic oversight of our sustainability agenda and takes forest-related considerations into account where applicable when making strategic decisions, including in relation to budgeting, risk management and overseeing capital expenditure. In 2023, the Board approved a revised version of the Group Environment Policy to include an assessment of our value chain impacts, commitments and targets including: no gross deforestation, primary native forest and net zero deforestation of managed forests in our tobacco supply chain by 2025 and developing 100% timber traceability systems. The Board reviews environmental performance for the prior year and progress towards achieving the Group's environmental targets, including forest-related objectives and targets, and priorities for the Group's sustainability agenda. In 2023, the Board received two updates from the Director, Operations, which included an overview of our biodiversity value chain assessment and launch of a biodiversity operating standard. The Board also reviews our approach to stakeholder engagement and how the Group responds to stakeholder considerations. In 2023, this included how we use data to support managing the risk of deforestation in our value chain e.g. directly contracted tobacco farmers. The Board reviews the Group risk register annually, which incorporates forest-related risks. The Board reviews the Group budget annually which takes into account capital allocation to deliver the Group's sustainability agenda and associated targets. The Remuneration Committee determines any annual changes to the remuneration of Management Board members. This may include salary adjustments, which are determined taking into account performance against individual objectives. For more information on these please refer to Q4.5. The Board reviews and approves the Combined Annual and ESG Report and Form 20-F on an annual basis, which report on the Group's progress on forest-related matters. The Audit Committee (AC) is responsible for reviewing the effectiveness of the Group's risk management and internal controls systems, including those relating to deforestation. The AC reviews the Group risk register twice per year and regularly reviews the Group's progress against its sustainability metrics, including deforestation-related targets. Example of forest-related oversight: In 2023, the AC reviewed external

assurance activities conducted in respect of defined sustainability metrics (such as % of sources of wood used by our contracted farmers for curing fuels that are from sustainable sources) and related information conducted by the external assurance provider and reviewed the outcomes of assurance with the external provider.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in 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 the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board takes water-related considerations into account where applicable when making strategic decisions, incl. risk management, overseeing capital expenditure, oversight of water-strategy and water-related risks and opportunities. In 2023, the Board approved a revised version of the Group Environment Policy to include an assessment of our value chain impacts, circular economy principles, new biodiversity commitments and information on metrics and targets. The Board reviews water-related action plans, and monitors implementation and performance of water-related objectives and targets. For example, in 2023, the Board received bi-annual updates from the Director, Operations, which included progress against Alliance for Water Stewardship certification, water withdrawn and water recycling targets. The Board also reviews our approach to stakeholder engagement and how the Group responds to stakeholder considerations. In 2023, this included our approach to assessing the water impacts of procured goods across our supply chain. The Board reviews the Group risk register annually, which incorporates water-related risks. The Board reviews the Group budget annually which includes the operations sustainability budget. The Remuneration Committee determines any annual changes to the remuneration of Management Board members. This may include salary adjustments, which are determined considering performance against individual objectives. For more information on these please refer to 4.5. The Board reviews and approves the combined Annual and ESG Report, and Form 20-F on an annual basis, both of which report on the Group's progress on water stewardship matters. The Audit Committee (AC) is responsible for reviewing the effectiveness of the Group's risk management and internal controls systems, including those relating to water. The AC reviews the Group risk register twice per year and regularly reviews the Group's progress against its ESG metrics, including our 2025 roadmap target of reducing the total amount of water withdrawn by 35% (vs 2017 baseline). Example of water-related oversight: In 2023, the AC reviewed external assurance activities conducted in respect of defined sustainability metrics and related information conducted by the external assurance provider and assessing the outcomes of assurance with the external provider e.g. % total water withdrawn, recycled and discharged.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in 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 the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board takes biodiversity related considerations into account where applicable when making strategic decisions, incl. risk management, overseeing capital expenditure, oversight of nature strategy and biodiversity related risks and opportunities. In 2023, the Board approved a revised version of the Group Environment Policy, including updated biodiversity commitments. The Board reviews biodiversity related action plans, and monitors implementation and performance of biodiversity related objectives and targets. In 2023, the Board also oversaw the launch of an industry first Biodiversity Operational Standard for Tobacco Farming which sets operational requirements for the Group's own Leaf Operations and provides guidance to our third-party leaf suppliers. The Board reviews the Group risk register annually, which incorporates biodiversity related risks. The Board reviews the Group budget annually which includes Operations sustainability budget. The Board reviews and approves the Combined Annual and ESG Report and Form 20-F on an annual basis, both of which report on the Group's progress on biodiversity related matters. The Audit Committee (AC) is responsible for reviewing the effectiveness of the Group's risk management and internal controls systems, including those relating to biodiversity. The AC reviews the Group risk register twice per year and regularly reviews the Group's progress against its ESG metrics, % of tobacco hectares reported to have appropriate best practice soil and water management plans implemented.
[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

☑ 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

☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition

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

☑ 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

☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition

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

☑ 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

☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition

[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

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Director Operations

(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 supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Operating Officer (COO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director, Operations (DO), is a member of the Management Board reporting directly to the COO for the full year 2023 and has overall responsibility for delivery of the Group's climate strategy, mitigation activities and environmental targets, including climate-related risks and opportunities and associated global budgets. The Board is updated on climate-related matters as follows: - twice per year by the DO on progress on the Group's sustainability agenda and performance against environmental targets; - an annual review of the risk register including climate-related risks;- review and approval of the Combined Annual and Sustainability Report and Form 20-F which includes reporting on the BAT's climate-related performance for the year; and additional focused updates as required. The DO is accountable for overseeing delivery of climate related targets and development of our low carbon transition plan and in 2023 was the responsible senior manager for revising the Group Environment Policy, approved by the Board of Directors, which included our updated science-based emission reduction targets and specific description of impacts and dependencies. The DO cascades climate targets into operational employee objectives, which impact yearly remuneration. The DO receives updates on progress on climate-related strategy and targets through the Operations Sustainability Forum (OSF) which is attended by senior members of our Leaf, Technology, Procurement, Regional Operations and Finance functions. The OSF meets up to 4 times a year and is supported by the Group Head of Operations Development, Sustainability, and functional teams. In 2023, these updates related to 1) outputs from latest climate scenario analysis, 2) progress against our climate targets 3) automation of Scope 3 reporting 4) implementation of supplier emission reduction initiatives to support our science-based targets and 5) capital expenditure supporting lower emission energy sources in operations.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director Operations

(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 supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Operating Officer (COO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director, Operations (DO) is a member of the Management Board (MB) reporting directly into the COO for full year 2023 and has overall responsibility for delivery of the Group's Forest strategy; delivery against targets such as deforestation and conversion free paper and pulp and tobacco supply chains by 2025; assessing and managing risks and opportunities and associated policies / budgets. The Board is updated on forest-related performance. This includes an update twice per year from

the Director, Operations on progress on the Group's sustainability agenda and performance against environmental targets (including forest targets); an annual review of the risk register (which includes forest-related risks); review and approval of the Combined Annual and Sustainability Report and Form 20-F which includes reporting on forest-related performance for the year; and additional focused updates on our ESG progress as required. The DO cascades forest targets into operational colleague's employee objectives, which impact yearly remuneration The DO receives updates on progress on forest-related strategy and targets through the Operations Sustainability Forum (OSF) which is attended by senior members of our Leaf, Technology, Procurement, Regional Operations and Finance functions. The OSF meets up to 4 times a year and is supported by the Group Head of Operations Development, Sustainability, and functional teams. In 2023, these updates related to 1) impact-related initiatives such as implementing 100% traceability for wood and satellite monitoring of deforestation and 2) the Group's approach to meeting requirements of external frameworks such as TNFD, SBTN, Global Biodiversity Framework. The Leaf Sustainability Forum meets 4 times per year, is chaired by the Group Head of Leaf who reports into the DO. This forum is responsible for reviewing strategic direction and targets, risks and opportunities including deforestation.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director, Operations

(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 supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis environmental issues

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Operating Officer (COO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director Operations (DO), is a member of the Management Board (MB) reporting directly into the COO for full year 2023 and has overall responsibility for delivery of the Group's Water strategy (own operations & tobacco supply chain); performance against water targets, identifying & addressing risks & opportunities e.g. drought & flooding can impact tobacco growing in our agricultural supply chain. The Board receives water-related updates including: progress report twice per year by the DO on sustainability progress including water targets, annual review of the risk register which includes water-related risks, annual review & approval of the ARA which describes our management approach & performance in water-related issues for the year (see pg. 86 & 87 of 2023 ARA) & other updates e.g. review of approach to stakeholder engagement, which includes monitoring of water usage in our supply chain. The DO receives progress updates on water-related strategy & targets through management level forums & is supported by the functional heads & teams. The DO cascades water targets into operational colleagues employee objectives, which impact yearly remuneration The DO receives updates on progress on water-related strategy and targets through the Operations Sustainability Forum (OSF) which is attended by senior members of our Leaf, Technology, Procurement, Regional Operations and Finance functions. The OSF meets up to 4 times a year and is supported by the Group Head of Operations Development, Sustainability, and functional teams. In 2023, these updates related to 1) reducing impacts by setting site-specific targets for water quantity and quality, prioritised by water risk assessment, 2) performance against water targets (35% less water use by 2025, 100%

operations sites Alliance of Water Stewardship (AWS) certified by 2025), 3) water-related capital expenditure on projects to support water withdrawn, recycling and AWS certification targets.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director, Operations

(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 supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ 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 Chief Operating Officer (COO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Director, Operations (DO) is a member of the Management Board (MB) reporting directly into the COO for full year 2023 and has overall responsibility for delivery of the Group's biodiversity strategy; implement Biodiversity Management Plans; assessing and managing risks and opportunities and associated policies / budgets. The Board is updated on biodiversity related performance. This includes an update twice per year from the Director, Operations on progress on the Group's sustainability agenda, our biodiversity value chain assessment, launch of an industry first biodiversity operating standards, and performance against environmental targets; an annual stakeholder update including the increasing important of biodiversity to stakeholders and how we respond as a business e.g. our value chain risk assessments, engaging with specialist consultancies to support our understanding and launching our biodiversity operating standard; an annual review of the risk register (which includes biodiversity related risks); review and approval of the Combined Annual and Sustainability Report and Form 20-F which includes reporting on biodiversity related performance for the year; and additional focused updates on our ESG progress as required. The Board was also updated on our Group Environmental Policy which includes commitments related to enhancing and avoiding activities that harm biodiversity in our tobacco supply chain. DO receives updates on progress on biodiversity related strategy and targets through the Operations Sustainability Forum (OSF) which is attended by senior members of our Leaf, Technology, Procurement, Regional Operations and Finance functions. The OSF meets up to 4 times a year and is supported by the Group Head of Operations Development, Sustainability, and functional teams. In 2023, these updates related to 1) priority sites where actions to protect and restore biodiversity are most important and 2) the Group's approach to external frameworks such as TNFD.
[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

7

(4.5.3) Please explain

BAT uses different mechanisms to incentivise the management of climate-related issues. We incentivize some but not all of our employees by creating a positive link between achieving environmental performance objectives & eligibility for an annual bonus. Eligibility to receive an annual bonus under the Group International Executive Incentive Scheme (IEIS) is impacted by annual performance assessments, which considers in the round progress against performance objectives, which may include environmental metrics, non-environmental metrics and other factors. The value of the bonus is tied to non-environmental metrics as set out in the Remuneration Policy described on page 173 of the 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report.

Forests

(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

7

(4.5.3) Please explain

BAT uses different mechanisms to incentivise the management of forest-related issues. We incentivise some but not all of our employees by creating a positive link between the management of a forest- related performance objective & eligibility for an annual bonus. Eligibility to receive an annual bonus under the Group IEIS scheme is impacted by annual performance assessments, which considers in the round, progress against performance objectives, which may include forest-related metrics, non-environmental metrics and other factors. The value of the bonus is tied to non-environmental metrics as set out in the Remuneration Policy described on page 173 of the 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report. We also use non-monetary incentives, for example, through recognition in our internal scheme 'Celebrating our Success' which highlights best practice on operational initiatives including those linked to forest-related activities.

Water

(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

7

(4.5.3) Please explain

BAT uses different mechanisms to incentivise the management of water-related issues. We incentivise some but not all our employees by creating a positive link between the management of a water-related performance objective and eligibility for an annual bonus. Eligibility to receive an annual bonus under the Group IEIS scheme is impacted by annual performance assessments, which considers in the round, progress against performance objectives, which may include water-related metrics, non-environmental metrics and other factors. The value of the bonus is tied to non-environmental metrics set out in the Remuneration Policy described on page 173 of the 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report. We also use non-monetary incentives, for example, through recognition in our internal scheme 'Celebrating our Success'
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director, Operations

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Achievement of climate transition plan

Emission reduction

☑ Increased share of renewable energy in total energy consumption

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ The incentives are not linked to an incentive plan, or equivalent (e.g. discretionary bonus in the reporting year)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Our Director, Operations, a member of the Management Board, is responsible for the delivery of our climate-related targets as part of the overall sustainability agenda. The most important targets are externally communicated and linked to the evaluation of the Director, Operations' performance and remuneration. The Director, Operations' performance objectives contain environmental targets, which are directly linked to their assessment of performance alongside other non-environmental performance objectives. The Director, Operations' eligibility for an annual bonus under the Group's International Executive Incentive Scheme (IEIS) plan is based on their performance assessment, which considers performance against environmental metrics, non-environmental metrics and other factors. The Group's GHG emissions and energy reduction targets are examples of environmental metrics contained within the Director, Operations' performance objectives. The threshold for success is achieving or exceeding the targeted amount of emission/energy reduction for the year, as described by target glidepaths. For example, by the end of 2023 a reduction of 24.1% in BAT's Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions (vs 2020 baseline) was required and a reduction of 33.1% (vs 2020 baseline) was achieved, exceeding the target threshold for this year; meaning the Director, Operations met this performance objective which contributed to their eligibility for an annual bonus payment.

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

BAT has aligned its business model to a world in which the rise in global average temperature is no more than 1.5 ºC above pre-industrial levels. External targets have been set for BAT's operations to reduce Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 50% compared to a 2020 baseline year, and Net Zero GHG emissions across our value chain by 2050 at the latest. BAT has glidepaths in place to track and monitor progress towards this, with clear annual targets on the emissions reduction and increase in renewable energy sourced required to achieve our 2030 and 2050 goals. Our Director, Operations is the most senior person accountable for BAT's delivery our emission reduction targets. Achievement of the annual milestones required to progress towards these targets form part of the Director, Operations performance objectives. As the achievement of these annual objectives is linked to the eligibility for a bonus payment (% of salary), a financial incentive is provided by BAT, to the Director to deliver them.

Forests

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Director, Operations

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Increased investment in environmental R&D and innovation

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Eliminating deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems in direct operations and/or other parts of the value chain

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ The incentives are not linked to an incentive plan, or equivalent (e.g. discretionary bonus in the reporting year)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Our Director, Operations, a member of the Management Board and responsible for delivery of our forest-related targets as part of the overall sustainability agenda. The most important targets are externally communicated and linked, amongst other areas, to the evaluation of our Director, Operations' performance and remuneration. The Director, Operations' performance objectives contain environmental targets, which are directly linked to their assessment of performance alongside other non-environmental performance objectives. The Director, Operations' eligibility for an annual bonus under the Group's International Executive Incentive Scheme (IEIS) plan is based on their performance assessment, which considers performance against environmental metrics, non-environmental metrics and other factors. The Director's performance objectives and remuneration are linked, amongst other things to the achievement of our deforestation-related targets. Performance is measured by determining whether operations are on track to achieve targets via specific actions/ steps taken within the year aligned with their glidepath; as an example, in 2023, whilst piloting the use of technologies such as satellite to support the assessment process, the number of deforestation cases remained flat in comparison to 2022, meeting the target threshold for this year, meaning the Director met this performance objective which contributed to the eligibility for an annual bonus payment.

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

BAT works closely with the farmers in our tobacco supply chain to protect biodiversity and forest resources. Targets have been set at Group level to achieve a Deforestation and Conversion Free tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs. 2021 baseline) and Deforestation Free pulp and paper supply chain by 2025. BAT has glidepaths in place to track and monitor progress, with clear annual targets required to achieve our goals. Our Director, Operations is the most senior person accountable for BAT's sustainability agenda, including delivery of our deforestation-related targets. Achievement of the annual milestones required to progress towards these targets form part of the Director, Operations performance objectives. As the achievement of these annual objectives is linked to the eligibility for a bonus payment (% of salary), a financial incentive is provided by BAT, to the Director, Operations to deliver them.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Director, Operations

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals – direct operations

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ The incentives are not linked to an incentive plan, or equivalent (e.g. discretionary bonus in the reporting year)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Timeframe: The performance indicators are monitored on an annual basis to evaluate advancements towards our water targets. These targets are established for each year, and the performance is assessed relative to a designated baseline, which is 2017 in this instance. Regional, sectoral, and/or operational context: The performance indicators take into account the specific context of our operations. They are designed to address the water management challenges and opportunities within our sector, considering factors such as the availability of water resources, local regulations, and industry best practices. The threshold used to indicate successful performance is defined based on the targeted reduction or improvement specified in the glidepaths. For example, in 2023, the target was a reduction of 35% in water withdrawal. Exceeding this target by achieving a reduction of 39.2% indicated successful yearly performance. How performance impacts the incentive/reward: The performance of the Director, Operations directly impacts their eligibility for a bonus payment. The achievement of annual milestones and performance objectives, related to water targets, is a factor in determining the incentive. By meeting or exceeding the specified performance thresholds, the Director demonstrates effective water management and contributes to the organization's overall sustainability goals, thereby contributing to eligibility for the financial reward tied to their performance.

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

The performance indicator reported, reduction of water withdrawals in direct operations, is directly linked to BAT's progress in achieving its water commitment. The rationale for incentives and indicator selection is based on the recognition of the significant of water management for efficient operations. We have established glidepaths with annual milestones to track progress of our external water targets. Our Director, Operations is the most senior person accountable for BAT's sustainability agenda, including delivery of our water-related targets. Achievement of the annual milestones required to progress towards these targets form part of the Director, Operations performance objectives. As the achievement of these annual objectives is linked to the eligibility for a bonus payment (% of salary), a financial incentive is provided by BAT, to the Director to deliver them.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

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

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

The Group Environment Policy Statement applies to our entire value chain, as stated in the Policy "The BAT Group is committed to assessing the environmental impacts across our value chain, which includes future operational changes, new ventures or acquisitions, and proactively putting in place plans to eliminate, reduce or mitigate these impacts". The Policy also contains biodiversity, climate, forest, waste, water targets and commitments which relate to direct operations e.g. Scope 1 and 2 emission reduction, upstream value chain e.g. Deforestation and Conversion Free tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline) and downstream value chain e.g. Promoting responsible management of post-consumer waste. A commitment to respect the human right to water is cited. As stated in the environment section of our Standards of Business Conduct, the Group Environment Policy Statement is based on local and international labour laws, recommended practices and standards (accessible here: https://www.bat.com/sobc/DOC8LDBG.html) In addition, expectations relating to supplier environmental management, climate change, eliminating waste and circular economy, protecting biodiversity and forests and water stewardship are explained in our Supplier Code of Conduct (accessible here: https://batsobc.com/en-gb/english-supplier-code-of-conduct/english-our-supplier-code-of-conduct/english-supplier-code-interior-environmental-sustainability/).

(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 Net Positive Gain

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

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

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify **:**Carbon Neutral operations by 2030, Sourcing 50% of our energy requirements from renewable sources, by 2030.

Forests-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat

☑ Commitment to conduct or support restoration and/or compensation to remedy for past deforestation or conversion

☑ Commitment to no-conversion of natural ecosystems by target date, please specify **:**2025

☑ Commitment to no-deforestation by target date, please specify **:**Net Zero deforestation of managed forests in our supply chain by 2025

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Other water-related commitment, please specify **:100% of Group companies' operations sites being certified to the Alliance for Water Stewardship's management standard by 2025.**

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

☑ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of commodities covered by the policy

☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement

☑ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems

☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation

☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

☑ Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

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

☑ 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

BAT_Group_Environment_Policy.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

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

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

BAT has signed up to the TNFD (Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures) to be an inaugural Early Adopter. The TNFD Early Adopter list includes organisations that have declared their intention to start making disclosures aligned with the TNFD Recommendations in their corporate reporting by the financial year 2024 or 2025. BAT will start making disclosures aligned with the TNFD recommendations as part of our corporate reporting suite for financial year 2024.

[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

BAT_Group_Environment_Policy for CDP.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Mandatory government register

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

EU transparency register, REG number 2427500988-58.

(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

External engagement on all policy matters, including environmental policy, is coordinated through Corporate and Regulatory Affairs (CORA). CORA will also, where appropriate, consult with subject-matter experts on such matters. This approach is replicated across the group, at a regional and end market level. Such an approach ensures all our direct and indirect activities are aligned with our overall approach to climate change, and our overall business strategy. In addition, we engage with our external stakeholders on our climate commitments and transition plan through our Combined Annual and Sustainability Report. Our internal processes and communications are utilised to engage with our employees on our climate change strategy, encouraging them to act in line with this strategy when acting on behalf of the organization. BAT has a Global Environmental, Health & Safety Policy Manual which is distributed to all BAT Group operating companies for their local implementation in their operating environments. According to the Global Environmental, Health and Safety Policy Manual, the local companies are required to engage as appropriate with government on the development and implementation of relevant legislation, this includes climate- related legislation.
[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

W - Youth Vaping: call for evidence. This consultation considered the impact of vapes on the environment, particularly disposable products.

(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

Social issues

☑ Public health

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

Select from:

☑ National

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

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(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

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

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

W - Incorrect disposal of single-use vapes may lead to environmental damage, through contamination of water ways and soil. BAT supports measures to ensure that all vape products are disposed of properly, highlighting Vuse Take-Back schemes, designed to collect Vuse Go (single-use vapes) using recyclable collection bags that are provided to customers.

(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

Row 2

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

CC – Provided comments in response to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Request for Public Comment Regarding Draft National Strategy to Prevent Plastic Pollution

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

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

Select from:

☑ National

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

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Neutral

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

Select all that apply

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

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

CC - Plastic recycling generates air emissions which may harm the environment. BAT highlighted an opportunity for the EPA to consider an allowance for advanced chemical recycling in its plastic pollution strategy. With respect to air emissions, BAT highlighted that there could be additional safeguards in place e.g. more stringent emission limitations and fence line monitoring.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 4

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

F - BAT is part of the UK Business and Biodiversity Forum which is coordinating UK participation in COP16, seeking to ensure robust implemention of COP15 outcomes. The working group includes Government, NGO, and Private companies.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Other

☑ International agreement relating to water- and/or forests-related issues

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

Select from:

☑ Global

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

Select from:

☑ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

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

0

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

The UK Business and Biodiversity Forum is supporting the UK’s objective in ensuring that the outcomes agreed in COP15 have been robustly implemented. This includes national progress on implementing plans in line with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. BAT’s environmental commitments are aligned to the goal of ensuring ecosystem resilience are maintained, enhanced or restored. For example, BAT has a commitment to be Forest Positive in our tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline), to following the mitigation hierarchy and implement biodiversity management plans in our tobacco supply chain. We also have a target to reduce the amount of water withdrawn in our operations by 35% by 2025 (vs 2017 baseline), a target that we met in 2023. Our engagement is supportive of the outcomes of this framework and our measure of success is to reinforce these outcomes during working group meetings.

(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

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

[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

☑ TNFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Commodity volumes
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Water pollution indicators
☑ Content of environmental policies
☑ Deforestation and conversion footprint
☑ Deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status metrics
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Public policy engagement

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Disclosures are made through the Strategic Report and Governance Report of BAT's 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report. Additional disclosures are made in the 2023 ESG Performance Data Book.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

BAT_Combined_Annual_and_Sustainability_Report_2023_Reduced.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

No additional comments
[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:
☑ Not defined

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently
[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:
☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Parameters are the 10 largest tobacco source/ growing countries, the regional temperature behaviour over time, precipitation, and soil water levels (surplus and deficit). This was assessed and risk calculated relative to the growing conditions. Analytical choices made aligned to climate scenarios from the UN IPCC methodology and GHG trajectories for RCP 8.5. We named this 'Climate Inaction, 3 degree'. This provides us with the worst case of climate risk and scenario for BAT. We further analysed 3 timeframes: 2030, 2040 and 2050. Assumptions include the impact of crop yields/ access and cost to tobacco and financial impact of the scenario on the basis that the farmer would require more land to grow a lower yielding crop. These were modelled to determine the highest risk countries and develop mitigation plans.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Continued change in climate would lead to ongoing changes in precipitation patterns and temperatures leading to increased levels of water stress in our tobacco supply chain resulting in lower yields.

Forests

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Forests scenarios

☑ Bespoke forests scenario

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Country/area

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The study was commissioned between BAT and RD Consulting, a sustainability consulting firm in Brazil, to understand the long-term weather forecast and potential limitations for Eucalyptus cultivation in Brazil, Mexico, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. A similar approach has been taken for acacia species in Pakistan and Bangladesh. The objective of BAT is understand climate impacts on the production of firewood for curing tobacco in the producing regions of the countries mentioned. The three drivers considered on the scenario were temperature change, precipitation change, and water availability. For temperature change, the temperature range in which the photosynthesis occurs combined with lower, upper and lethal temperatures were considered to evaluate the long-term effect in the species productivity. For precipitation, the rainfall distribution throughout the year, with minimum and maximum rain volumes stablished for each specie, as well as the maximum daily rainfall event. For water scarcity, the categories of medium, high, and very high-water deficit were considered in the analysis of the frequency of occurrence of hydric stress conditions and production risk, in the base period and in future climate scenarios. The criteria of rainfall were used, considering the impacts of global warming up to the 2041-2050-decade, to set up analysis for the Eucalyptus crop considering high, low, and medium risk. Finally, the climatic limits defined for each species, the climatic conditions for the decades of 2020-2030, 2030-2040 and 2040-2050, and the average annual temperature, the precipitation, and the water deficit, for each country and in each producing region, were crossed giving the results of overall risk condition for each specie in each one of the decades.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The main tobacco type used in BAT Products, representing more than 79% of our purchases, is Flue Cured Virginia that requires a source of fuel to cure the leaves. In Brazil specifically, one of the countries where we buy more than 28% of our global leaf requirements, farmers use wood exclusively sourced from sustainable wood sources to cure their Virginia crop and 73% maintain supply via on-farm production. Remaining volumes come from off-farm local wood suppliers. Wood is from various species of Eucalyptus. We know this production is at risk to be disrupted based on rising temperatures, rainfall patterns and overall water availability, therefore, in 2022 we conducted a study with an independent consultancy to understand the risk of climate change on timber species, and production in 6 countries (and all the 17 growing regions in those origins) that are dependent on use of wood in tobacco cropping, modelling weather scenario until 2050. Brazil was part of the

scope of the study which found that E.saligna and E.benthami were currently used as curing agents for around 2% of the crop we buy from Brazil (from 5% in 2022 and 8% in 2021), and that these overall have a high-risk profile due to rising temperatures, overall climatic conditions and rainfall patterns.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Country/area

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Market

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6ºC - 1.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Number of ecosystems impacted

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Assumptions include the impact of crop yields/ access and cost to tobacco and financial impact of the scenario, as well as the frequency and severity of weather events such as El Nino and La Nina events which impact tobacco growing conditions in the southern hemisphere. These were modelled to determine the projected impact on cost of tobacco and develop mitigation plans. Data sources include: country growing regions, crop stages, planting dates, water requirement, root system characteristics, historical data from NOAA stations. Analytical choices made aligned to two climate scenarios from the UN IPCC methodology and GHG trajectories for RCP 2.6 and 8.5. This provides us with a range of climate risk: best case and worst-case scenario for BAT. We further analysed 3 timeframes: short (2020-2025), medium (2026 -2035) and long term (2036-2050).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Climate change poses a risk to agriculture production over the medium to long term as a consequence of potential changes to precipitation and temperature and the resulting impact on the effectiveness of tobacco production and the Group's ability to grow/ procure sufficient tobacco leaf to meet our demand. To assess this risk, we commissioned an independent study on the risks of climate change on tobacco leaf growing to model material risks to the Group up to 2050. Climate related risks to tobacco-growing conditions were assessed examining the impact of possible changes in temperature, rain and water balance in the soil. We then assessed the findings of the first phase to model the potential impact of the climate-related risks on crop yields, estimating the potential impact on crop productivity (kg/ha) and the impact of that yield on farmer production costs. Parameters used: 10 largest tobacco source/ growing countries (accounting for 80% of our annual tobacco production), the regional temperature behaviour over time, rainfall variation, and soil water levels (surplus and deficit). 88 sub-national jurisdictions, accessing historical weather data of more than 3.1K weather stations and generating more than 5.4K weather forecast maps, were used to assess predicted growing conditions and impact on tobacco production yield.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Parameters are the 10 largest tobacco source/ growing countries, the regional temperature behaviour over time, precipitation, and soil water levels (surplus and deficit). This was assessed and risk calculated relative to the growing conditions. Analytical choices made aligned to climate scenarios from the UN IPCC methodology and GHG trajectories for RCP 2.6. We named this Sustainable Transition

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Continued change in climate would lead to ongoing changes in precipitation patterns and temperatures leading to increased levels of water stress in our tobacco supply chain resulting in lower yields.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Bespoke climate transition scenario

(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

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Analytical choices made aligned to climate scenarios that result in warming of 3-4 degrees. We named this 'Climate Inaction, 3 degree' We further analysed 3 timeframes: 2030, 2040 and 2050. We included data sets such as REMIND-MAgPIE 3.0-4.4 with 'Divergent Net Zero' scenario. The modelling was based BAT's forecasted future and category mix evolution until 2050. Assumptions include changing carbon taxes, emerging product legislation (e.g. plastic taxes and Extended Producer Responsibility Schemes) and renewable energy and changes in energy consumption based on product growth and energy efficiency forecasts. Assumptions were detailed down to either market level or a group of markets at a point in time. Due to the long timeframe and uncertainties in both internal and estimate forecasts, there is a large degree of uncertainty in these forecasts.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The scenarios were the result of the TCFD working group with input from BAT's subject matter experts and using the methodology defined in the group Risk Management Framework determined the risks and opportunities to be modelled.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Bespoke climate transition scenario

(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

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2040
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

2030, 2040 and 2050. We included data sets such as REMIND-MAgPIE 3.0-4.4 with 'Divergent Net Zero' scenario. The modelling was based BAT's forecasted future and category mix evolution until 2050. Assumptions include changing carbon taxes, emerging product legislation (e.g. plastic taxes and Extended Producer Responsibility Schemes) and renewable energy and changes in energy consumption based on product growth and energy efficiency forecasts. Assumptions were detailed down to either market level or a group of markets at a point in time. Due to the long timeframe and uncertainties in both internal and estimate forecasts, there is a large degree of uncertainty in these forecasts.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The scenarios were the result of the TCFD working group with input from BAT's subject matter experts and using the methodology defined in the group Risk Management Framework determined the risks and opportunities to be modelled.
[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

We identified three climate-related opportunity areas and seven climate-related threats, which span transitional opportunities: O1 products and services; O2 energy sourcing and O3 resource efficiency), transitional risks: T1 emerging regulation on carbon pricing; T2 emerging regulation on products; T3 increased cost of capital; T4 increased insurance premiums; T5 increased energy prices and physical risks: T6 acute and T7 chronic. These are described in the TCFD disclosure section of the 2022 Combined Annual Report. The results of the Sustainable Transition scenario highlighted increased transitional risk of compliance costs due to emerging regulation, cost of green energy and carbon taxation arising from Government policies. The impact would be greatest in the medium term as these regulatory costs outweighed the reduction in emissions and energy consumption as part of BAT's Low Carbon Transition Plan. In addition, higher costs and reduced access to both insurance and capital markets were identified across the three time-horizons. This analysis has informed the decision to undertake a more comprehensive review of BAT's energy strategy including seeking opportunities in Purchase Power Agreements in certain countries over the next few years and continue supporting energy reduction initiatives. Physical risk analysis under the Sustainable Transition showed that whilst there were some favourable and unfavourable impacts on yield across the three time horizons and two scenarios, the risk of potential financial impact on annual cost of tobacco is less than 5%. We believe the impacts on yield can be mitigated through agronomy action plans, which avoid yield driven cost of production increases. The results of the Climate Inaction scenario showed the cost of transition risks will be lower, and impact delayed, as little or no change to current regulation is projected. In contrast to transition risks, physical risks were shown to be most severe under Climate Inaction (the scenario sees a world where warming exceeds a 3C threshold) due to increased frequency and severity of climate-related events and consequential potential financial impact on our business. In response, more extensive mitigation may be required including investments in working capital to increase our supply chain resilience and this will continue to be monitored. While there are challenges ahead, the Group is well placed to address them. We believe we have the resilience and agility to create new transitional growth opportunities, supported by our global reach, supply chain flexibility, diverse product portfolio and capital strength. The insights gained from the modelling performed further strengthen the importance and relevance of our climate strategy and net zero carbon emissions target to mitigate these risks. We will continue to review each material climate related risk and opportunity and build upon our existing mitigation strategies to enhance the resilience of our business to climate change.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Capacity building

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Country/area/region

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

The study was commissioned between BAT and RD Consulting in Brazil to understand the long-term weather forecast and potential limitations for Eucalyptus cultivation in Brazil, Mexico, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. A similar approach has been taken for acacia species in Pakistan and Bangladesh. The objective of BAT is the production of firewood for curing tobacco in the producing regions of the countries mentioned. In Brazil, farmers use exclusively sustainable wood to cure their Virginia crop and 73% maintain supply via on-farm production. Remaining volumes come from off-farm local wood suppliers. The study found that E.saligna and E.benthami are currently used to cure around 2% of the crop we buy from Brazil (from 5% in 2022 and 8% in 2021) and overall have a high-risk profile due to rising temperatures, overall climatic conditions and rainfall patterns. In Pakistan, the species E.camadulensis and Acacia modesta, commonly known as Phulai and locally called Palosa, are recommended. Over time, E.camadulensis migrates from a low-risk condition to a medium-risk condition, mainly due to water deficit. In Bangladesh, no restrictions were seen for the production of Acacia in the period 2021-2030 to 2041-2050. In the decade 2031-2040, a reduction in precipitation is seen, which shows the condition of medium risk for the production of Acacia. In Mexico, there is no restriction for the cultivation of E.camadulensis, which is a species more adapted to greater water deficits and higher temperatures. In Zimbabwe, due to lower rainfall and high temperatures, the cultivation conditions for E.grandis will be of medium risk until the 2040s, and from this year onwards the conditions will be of high risk. In Mozambique, climatic conditions will be high risk for both E.saligna and E.grandis.

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

The assessment performed enables us to consider estimated water balance within the soil of specific growing areas in which our group contracts farmers on an annual basis over the period 2021 - 2050. Based on water levels and temperature, growing yield projections (farmers productivity - kg/ha) were made which enabled us to compute the estimated impact on production cost and tobacco prices into the future which were then compared to baseline costs of tobacco. Possible outcomes included: - higher frequency of droughts and high temperatures - water surplus in areas and additional water deficit in some of our growing regions. - instances of crop productivity stabilised or increased slightly over the longer term in some areas. - In some growing areas the overall growing conditions remain similar to the current conditions. Financial estimates of the impact of these conditions on tobacco prices were estimated, with an overall impact of between 7m and 40m across all growing areas modelled (depending on year, and climatic conditions generating the range). The potential financial impact on annual cost of tobacco is less than 5% and current climate change trajectories indicate it is unlikely that the Group would face reduced production capacity as a consequence of consistent supply constraints. The sustainability of our tobacco growing activities has always been a focal point of our business strategy. However. the scenario analysis performed has enabled us to plan for potential changes in growing conditions over time and develop plans to mitigate these potential impacts. Our Global Leaf Research and agronomy Deployment Centre plays a key role in ensuring the application of best practice in tobacco growing, including water usage/ efficiency. The Centre conducts world-class research, from development & testing in the lab to real-world field trials with farmers. The purpose of the Centre is to identify tailored solutions for deployment across all our leaf operations; focus areas include Soil science, plant nutrition, water management, and agronomic best practises. Utilising the scenario analysis performed, bespoke mitigation plans for each country were established including cost effective drip irrigation solutions, drought tolerance mapping, seed development & precision irrigation pilots. Drip irrigation & soil management improvement rollouts are planned in 7 and 3 of our leaf operations respectively by 2025. [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:

☑ Yes

(5.2.5) Description of activities included in commitment and implementation of commitment

Upstream value chain decarbonization initiatives are product and packaging related. Direct operations decarbonization initiatives include incremental use of renewables such as green power and biofuels, transportation, use and end of life related emission decarbonization levers.

(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 engage with and receive feedback from shareholders on sustainability-related matters generally, and climate change matters specifically, including our climate transition plan and our commitments to halve absolute GHG emissions by 2030 (vs 2020 baseline) and achieve net zero by 2050 across our value chain (scope 1, 2 and 3). We engage with shareholders and collect feedback on our TCFD report, which includes key elements of our climate transition plan and detailed financial modelling on the timing and materiality of key climate-related risks and opportunities, including on a 1.5C-aligned transition. Our comprehensive Investor Relations (IR) programme includes: IR general and sustainability-specific roadshows across our shareholder base, specific IR sustainability communications materials, and, 1:1 sustainability-specific meetings with shareholders. BAT attendees include, amongst others, our Chief Growth Officer (the Management Board member responsible for sustainability), Director of Scientific Research (Management Board member responsible for science and R&D), Chief Sustainability Officer, Head of IR and Senior Investor Sustainability Manager. Our Chairman and Chief Executive also receive feedback on sustainability matters, including on our climate transition, during their regular interactions with investors. Additionally, shareholders also have opportunities to ask questions on any matter, including our climate transition, at our Annual General Meeting.

(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

Key assumptions and dependencies: our approach consists of (1) direct operations decarbonization: maximization of renewable electricity use, on site renewables energy generation – predominantly solar, migration from fossil fuels to biomass – from waste or reforestation wood and, finally, electrification. (2) value chain decarbonization via – designing out unnecessary product materials and packaging or accessory items, engagement with suppliers towards decarbonization and science-based targets setting so that current materials also lower footprint, adoption of circular economy principles in portfolio transformation, logistics optimization, migration from air to sea freight and/ or road to rail freight as much as possible, piloting with sustainable aviation fuels, etc. We assume over time some road-blockers, such as, for example, the shortage of supply of bioplastics or materials with recycled contents will ease but will require governmental and private engagement at global and local levels. We have been proactively engaging with governmental and local industry representations towards the expansion of renewable energy markets. We expect that as several countries have committed to net zero by 2050 or 60, policy makers will increase actions in order to boost circularity and infrastructure required for steep decarbonization as required.

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

We have decarbonized our direct operations by 58.1% since the beginning of our journey in 2017 and – 33% vs our revised baseline year 2020. Key contributors to that have been the increment in the use of renewable electricity and renewable energy in general terms as mentioned in other sections of this questionnaire. With regards to scope 3, we have decarbonized our agriculture-related emissions mainly via yield increase, lower use of fertilizer and other regenerative agriculture practices like low tillage, etc reaching a reduction of 16% vs 2020 by the end of 2023. With regards to non-agricultural elements, we are focusing on improving the circularity of our products via eliminating materials (more than halved packaging of several items, removed accessory parts) and migration to lower footprint components where possible. We have expanded our supplier engagement program now covering over 600 of our materials suppliers and have taken actions to support them with education towards decarbonization, access to instruments such as energy attribution certificates and expect to cooperate further in joint developments and to expand to even more suppliers and geographies.

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

BAT_Low_Carbon_Transition_Plan_2022.pdf,BAT_Low_Carbon_Transition_Plan_2022.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

☑ Plastics

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

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

The most significant issues or road blockers relate to (1) insecurity of energy supply in countries with significant weight in our footprint; (2) unavailability of renewable electricity in various countries beyond those with insecurity of supply); (3) shortage of supply and high cost of low carbon footprint materials and how this supply will interconnect with our nature agenda (forest, land and water impacts, reduction of plastics use, etc.); (4) extremely high cost of low emissions' freight.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

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

We recognise the importance of linking our sustainability ambitions to our products with a view to meet the changing needs of consumers and to generate growth. Our Group-wide circular economy strategy and life cycle analysis (LCAs) across our product categories support this. Our product strategy is multi-faceted, considering both the materials used in its production to reduce their environmental impact at source (recyclable, compostable products with removal of 100% of unnecessary single-use plastics) as well ensuring takeback schemes are in place to manage end of life processes for our New Category products through developing strategic recycling partnerships and solutions in line with local logistical, legal and regulatory requirements. At end of 2023, 100% of New Category markets have take–back schemes in place, and 94% of packaging was reusable, recyclable or compostable. Our stakeholder engagement programme demonstrates that consumers care about products with a reduced environmental impact and targets have been set to achieve 30% of recycled plastic content in plastic packaging and operating waste going to landfill to be less than 1% by 2025. Where permitted to do so, we are articulating our commitment to reduce the environmental impact of our products (including digital platforms to enhance consumer engagement via our Corporate and brand websites) to raise awareness of our ESG ambition and performance to date with a view of enhancing consumer buy-in, brand loyalty, and generating growth through increasing market share of our products to realise the opportunities presented by climate change.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Risks and opportunities posed to BAT's supply chain include ability to grow/access tobacco, risks of impending regulation, and increasing costs of energy. The likelihood of these risks occurring is exacerbated by climate change, and our strategy continues to minimise them as far as possible. Examples of how our strategy has been impacted include: Access to leaf tobacco – BAT have a long track record of agronomic excellence and rollout of farmer best practice. In 2023, a new agronomy centre was established in Asia to supplement our global centre in Brazil to assist in the rollout of technologies for Asian growing markets to ensure efficient use of water and minimise the impact of climate change on yields in the future. Examples are: tailored seed varieties, and deployment of farming best practices such as alternative furrow irrigation/drip irrigation techniques for efficiency. Inventory durations and our sourcing footprint continue to be reviewed to ensure supply risk is minimised through diversification of sourcing and holding sufficient levels of inventory to mitigate the risk of supply shortfalls caused by flooding, drought, fire and climate change risks. Carbon-smart farming programme - aimed at reducing emissions from tobacco using agriculture's ability to remove carbon from the atmosphere. We run this programme in Brazil, Bangladesh, Mexico and Pakistan, where our highest in-house Leaf operations are located. Learnings from these countries will help further develop and scale up the programme to all other operations, which is planned for 2025. Supplier Engagement – Our approach to supplier engagement is set in our Supplier Code of Conduct which defines the minimum standard we expect from our suppliers in supplying goods or services to BAT and it complements our Standards of Business Conduct (SoBC). Additionally, we continued to progress our SBTi supplier engagement goal which is for 20% of suppliers of purchased goods and services by spend to set Science Based Targets by 2025. We achieved 15% at the end of 2023. We also continue to invest in our supplier enablement program to improve supplier environmental performance and data quality by working with our Top 60 Suppliers (high emission impact) to share best practices and drive reduction in their carbon footprint. We have provided one to one training within our New Categories supply chain which has led to an increase in supplier's renewable certificate purchases. We have also held sustainability focused summits in Bangladesh and Pakistan to help build supplier capability and manage challenges in these key geographies. Additionally, in 2023 we invited more than 600 suppliers representing more than 90% of Purchased Goods and Services Emissions to respond to CDP Supply Chain Program. We recorded 92% response rate versus average industry response rate of 59%. This level of engagement is almost a threefold increase in comparison to 2022 (over 200 Suppliers).

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

☑ Forests

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

We are investing in R&D to develop alternative products that not only reduce risk to health, but their environmental impact. Our approach to circular economy is guided by our 3 strategic priorities: 1. Simplify product and packaging design to improve recyclability and reduce the use of virgin materials and finite resources, 2. Maximise the longevity of our products to improve the experience of our consumers, 3. Recover: Minimising waste through increased product recovery, reusability and recycling. We monitor progress through our circularity targets and carry out life cycle analysis (LCA) across our products to identify areas for further improvement. Our targets are: - 100% of plastic packaging to be reusable, recyclable, or compostable by 2025; and - 30% average recycled content across all plastic packaging by 2025. In 2023, for our Vapour product category, we reduced the pack profile of our Vapour refills, removed plastic trays from our device kits and silicone caps from our pods. These initiatives saved approximately 381 tonnes of plastic globally since 2022. For our Heated Products (HPs), in Glo devices and starter kits we removed the polypropylene device overwrap and replaced plastic trays with a pulp-based alternative. We also reduced the size of the boxes for devices savings approximately 250 tonnes of paper and other wood fibre material and a 58% reduction in CO2e footprint for starter kit packaging versus 2022. In Modern Oral all our Velo cans are now 100% recyclable where local facilities exist and assuming consumers properly recycle them. We have made progress in improving the recyclability of plastic packaging in cigarettes. 93.5 % of our plastic packaging for cigarettes can be recycled and all poly film, as well as tear-off strips used on packs, can be recycled (subject to local recycling infrastructure). We are also conducting trials on alternative plastic-free materials for cellulose acetate cigarette filters (filters classified as having plastic content). In 2023, we began to formally embed our 3 strategic priorities within our product lifecycle management (PLM). It requires an assessment of the environmental impact (CO2e) across all development phases of our products from early-stage R&D informing our materials and components selection. We also developed and piloted a Green Design Tool to equip our product development teams with a screening tool to compare CO2e impacts of different materials and components. The pilot was successfully completed, and we plan to deploy across New Categories R&D in 2024.

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

Our strategy across operational sites is to use decarbonisation assessments and value stream mapping to eliminate losses and identify opportunities to reduce CO2e emissions and energy use. This underpinned by our target to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emission by 50% vs. our 2020 baseline in 2030. Our internal Energy Standard provides guidance on decarbonisation and seeks consistency in the way climate-related initiatives are financially assessed with our internal carbon price glidepath. Each of our manufacturing facilities has a detailed decarbonisation roadmap to clearly demonstrate its contribution to and the actions needed to reach our targets.

The Operations Sustainability team operates as a Centre of Excellence for Scopes 1 and 2, collaborating with Regional Engineering teams, Group Heads of Manufacturing Technology, and Local and Regional Operations directors to provide insights, technologies and best practices to drive energy-efficiency programmes, emissions reductions and increase renewable energy use. In 2023, there were over 49 initiatives to reduce carbon emissions through operational excellence across 28 of our operating facilities. These initiatives delivered a total reduction in our scope 1 and 2 emissions of 6402 MT CO2e in 2023 1.2% of the Group 2020 baseline). The projects included: implementation of building energy management systems (e.g. Pakistan, Venezuela), compressors, vacuums, and heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems (e.g. South Korea, Türkiye, Mexico), lighting upgrades and LED roll out (e.g. USA, Nigeria), process optimization (e.g. Hungary) - smart control systems (e.g. Bangladesh, Indonesia, South Korea).
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply
☑ Revenues
☑ Direct costs
☑ Capital expenditures
☑ Capital allocation
☑ Access to capital

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

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

Examples of how short, medium and long-term financial planning was influenced by climate change risks/opportunities (RO) in 2023: Revenues–volume, market share growth & pricing are key to BAT's profitability. Climate change ROs affect the competitiveness of our products. E.g. allowing customers to return used devices through take-back schemes for responsible disposal is an important part of glo and Vuse's brand planning. Physical risks also affect revenue planning: ensuring we have sufficient inventory durations to mitigate short-term supply risks whilst business continuity plans are mobilised, with a view to mitigate impact on consumers. Direct costs: a key metric for BAT's financial planning is cost of sales. Climate change RO impact cost of sales through: increased cost of tobacco leaf as a consequence of El Nino weather events, flooding, drought, hail storms impacting yield; cost of raw materials & specification changes to reduce the environmental impact of our products (e.g. improving recyclability); cost of regulation (e.g. EPR in Europe); cost of energy impacting direct operations & wider value chain as we transition away from fossil fuels. Capital allocation: BAT uses established processes to determine base budget allocation for future periods and resource allocation requests are made for significant incremental funding requirements. E.g., in 2023, more capital was allocated to fund the expansion of the Global Sustainability Team which included Operations' ESG Centre of Excellence teams. Capital investment: we fund a capital investment budget to progress the delivery of our ESG commitments. In 2023, this amounted to over 30 million, with investments directed towards equipment to drive energy efficiency/renewable energy generation, water recycling/efficiency projects, waste reduction, and product specification improvements to drive recyclability. Financial planning is used to prioritise budgets, using marginal abatement cost curves, internal carbon pricing and balanced scorecards (assessing impact of specific investments on environmental and social targets). Access to capital - climate ROs impact BAT's financing as follows: (1) potential higher costs and/or impacting consumers' ability to buy our products affecting profitability and credit ratings; (2) investors' perception towards our ESG progress could reduce willingness to invest in BAT or restrict our access to capital. Both of these, if materialised, would result in higher cost of funding.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Spend aligned with internal ESG targets

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

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

34000000

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

5

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

5

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

5

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

Capital investment initiatives whose primary focus is to contribute to a reduction in GHG emissions across the supply chain, as set out in the Group's Low Carbon Transition Plan, are budgeted, monitored and reported to various governance forums on a regular basis. To ensure the delivery of emission targets set across scope

1-3, glidepaths have been established, with capital investment and operating budgets to support the delivery of these planned reductions. In 2023 In 2023, 24m was invested in energy sourcing and efficiency capital projects across the group which included (i) Solar heating, cooling, and PV equipment (e.g. Italy, Nigeria, Türkiye), (ii) - Boiler replacement (biomass, heat pumps and others) (e.g. South Korea, Germany) and (iii) Efficient building energy management system (e.g. Chile, UK). There were also projects to target improved efficiency of infrastructure through Integrated Work Systems (IWS) methodologies and footprint related projects, reducing idleness of infrastructure and optimising our use of energy. There were also capital investments initiatives focused on water (e.g. replacing water-colling systems with more efficient dry coolers in our Turkish factory), waste (e.g. and product (such as replacing aluminum innerbundling with paper).
[Add row]

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

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

-5.12

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

24.32

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

95

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

24

(5.9.5) Please explain

In 2023, we continued to invest in reducing fresh water use and recycling technology, focusing on key improvements to achieve our 5-year CAPEX plan and minimize groundwater usage. Water related CAPEX reduced slightly by 5.1% however it increased in water stressed areas by 12.5%. In 2024 we have already budgeted a 24.3% increase across 36 initiatives. A total of 37 Capex driven water projects in 2023 covered 34% of our factories across all regions. BAT broke ground in September 2023 at our largest factory on a multi-year project; 'The water hub', once completed will have a water recycling capacity of 200,000m3 reducing group operations water usage by 6%. Other initiatives in 2023 include condensate recovery optimisation in Pakistan (10400m3), reverse osmosis cooling towers in Brazil

(36000m3) and replacing water-cooling systems in Türkiye with more efficient dry coolers (20000m3) We continue to spend on attaining & maintaining our AWS Certifications for 100% of operations sites by 2025.
[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 ☑ Water

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

☑ 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

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

A number of sources are used to estimate internal carbon prices, including initiatives under UNCFFF (International Emissions Trading, Joint Implementation and Clean Development Mechanism, New Approaches under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement), and outside of the UNFCCC including (The voluntary Carbon market, Result-based Climate Finance). BAT used as reference a) the EU's Emissions Trading Scheme b) World Bank trends, c) Joseph Stiglitz social cost of carbon assumptions. In addition, the price is compared against peers are published in their ESG literatures. Prices are reviewed annually and issued by the Group's Climate Centre of Excellence for use by the business.

(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

Carbon price is expected to increase around 10% p.a.

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

67.5

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

120

(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 :Used for all Operations and Marketing related capital investments (being the most significant proportion of Group capex)

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

10

(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 application of the internal carbon price (ICP) ensures the net present value (NPV) and business cases of proposed investment considers costs of carbon offset for emissions being generated and assists in the prioritisation of projects that support the Group's objectives in reducing carbon emissions. This process not only helps ensure that the NPV of projects delivered a financial return (after accounting for the cost of carbon) but also facilitated the application of marginal abatement

considerations and project prioritisation of the Group's ESG related capital expenditure (which amounted to 34mn in 2023), ensuring those projects that delivered the most beneficial carbon reductions were prioritised and progressed. Concurrently, as part of the Group's emission target delivery plans, glidepaths of planned emission reduction have been developed and are periodically reviewed by senior management throughout the course of the year. The application of ICP and emission impact tracking enables visibility of the impact of new projects (adverse and favourable) and allows the glidepaths to be updated accordingly. In addition, to further supplement the ICP process, a balanced scorecard was designed to appraise investment cases to consider their impact across our broad environmental and social objectives (i.e. not just considerations of emissions impact, but also considering impact on water, waste, and our social agenda). The revised process was trialled in 2022 for all operations capital expenditure which enabled the approach to be calibrated and was rolled out to marketing investment cases in 2023.
[Add row]

(5.10.2) Provide details of your organization's internal price on water.

Row 1

(5.10.2.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:
☑ Shadow price

(5.10.2.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply
☑ Stress test investments
☑ Drive water-related investment
☑ Influence strategy and/or financial planning
☑ Identify and seize low-water impact opportunities
☑ Setting and/or achieving of water-related policies and targets
☑ Incentivize consideration of water-related issues in decision making

(5.10.2.3) Factors beyond current market price are considered in the price

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.10.2.4) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Existing water tariffs

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

The internal water price was determine through benchmarking methodologies with peer companies. Some set a flat rate per m3 whilst others linked their shadow price to be a multiple of the actual cost of water. BAT chose to use the multiple of actual cost of water but further differentiated this by having a higher multiple for water stressed areas.

(5.10.2.6) Stages of the value chain covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(5.10.2.7) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Differentiated

(5.10.2.8) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

The internal water price (IWP) is based on the actual costs of water in the area under consideration. For investment business cases, this is multiplied by 2 for location not in water stressed areas and by 3 for those in water stressed areas.

(5.10.2.9) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Evolutionary

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

Would be linked to actual cost of water. Would expect the differentiation between water stressed and not in water stressed to widen.

(5.10.2.11) Minimum actual price used (currency per cubic meter)

0.03

(5.10.2.12) Maximum actual price used (currency per cubic meter)

37.39

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

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Operations

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify **:**Capex related

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

In order to support the delivery of the Group's water targets and factor in the wider environmental costs of water, BAT has implemented internal water pricing ("IWP") for investment decisions along with its capex balanced scorecard for all projects over 0.5m. The application on the IWP helps ensure the net book value of business cases considers the true cost of water and assists in prioritisation of projects that support the Group's objectives in reducing water usage and increasing the water we recycle. The IWP shadow price set is higher for a "Water Stressed" area as defined as per the WRI Aqueduct map which reference to sites in the "Extremely High risk" or "High risk" zones. In addition, the Capex Balanced Scorecard requires the assessment of capital projects on the Group's water KPIs, the outcome of which is integrated into the capital allocation approval process.
[Add row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Forests ☑ Water
Smallholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply*
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water ☑ Plastics
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Forests ☑ Plastics
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change

[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:

☑ 76-99%

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

Spend GBP 1mn per annum equivalent to a coverage of 90% emissions.

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

1200

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

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Purchased volumes of pulp & paper products per annum of more than 300 tonnes, because this category has the highest deforestation risk. This covers more than 90% of total pulp & paper volumes purchased

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

80

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

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Purchased volumes of pulp & paper products per annum of more than 300 tonnes, because this category has the highest water stress risk. This covers more than 90% of total pulp & paper volumes purchased.

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

12
[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

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Product lifecycle

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

No additional comments

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Regulatory compliance

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

No additional comments

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ No, we do not prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.3) Primary reason for no supplier prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Priority focus for water-related supplier engagement is our agricultural supply chain and own operations.
[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

Procurement/ non-tobacco suppliers: BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct (ScoC) is also issued once a supplier is selected which is applicable to all suppliers. SCoC defines the minimum standard expected of our suppliers. We make it clear through our contractual arrangements that our suppliers are required to comply with the SCoC. We expect suppliers to meet the requirements of this code which includes supplier environmental performance management, targets and progress against targets This is incorporated into our contractual arrangements as indicated in the Supplier Code of Conduct.

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

Procurement/ non-tobacco suppliers: BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct (ScoC) is also issued once a supplier is selected which is applicable to all suppliers. SCoC defines the minimum standard expected of our suppliers. We make it clear through our contractual arrangements that our suppliers are required to comply with the SCoC. We expect suppliers to meet the requirements of this code which includes deforestation and conversion free (DCF status) of wood and pulp-based materials. This is incorporated into our contractual arrangements as indicated in the Supplier Code of Conduct.

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

Procurement/ non-tobacco suppliers: BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct (ScoC) is also issued once a supplier is selected which is applicable to all suppliers. SCoC defines the minimum standard expected of our suppliers. We make it clear through our contractual arrangements that our suppliers are required to comply with the SCoC. We expect suppliers to be aware of the water risk level in the area they are operating in, as defined, for example, by the World Resource Institute (wri.org). This is incorporated into our contractual arrangements as indicated in the Supplier Code of Conduct.
[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:

☑ Purchasing of low-carbon or renewable energy

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

☑ Other, please specify :off site third part audit

(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:
☑ 26-50%

(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:
☑ 26-50%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply
☑ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Our climate target of 50% emissions reduction in scope 3 by 2030 can only be achieved if our suppliers adhere to the requirements we lay out in BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct (applicable to all suppliers). We track progress of our supplier ability to adhere to these future requirements through capability monitoring via CDP disclosure and direct supplier engagements. The current delta of 55% to full compliance helps us identify areas of focus and tailor our interventions to systemic gaps in the supply chain. Over the next years we will be working to close those gaps.

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

☑ Certification

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.5) % 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:

☑ 51-75%

(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

☑ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics

☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Our target of deforestation free pulp and paper supply chain by 2025 is relayed to our suppliers through BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct (applicable to all suppliers). In it, we state the requirements we need suppliers to adhere to by 2025. We track progress of our supplier adherence to these future requirements via direct supplier

engagements. The current delta of 31% to full compliance helps us identify areas of focus and tailor our interventions to systemic gaps in the supply chain. Over the next year we will be working to close those gaps.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Regular environmental risk assessments (at least once annually)

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct, which all of BAT's suppliers are expected to comply with, states that suppliers must be aware of the water risk level in the area they are operating in, as defined, for example, by the World Resource Institute (wri.org).

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Our climate target of 50% emissions reduction in scope 3 by 2030 is relayed to our suppliers through our supplier enablement programme. In it, we state the expectation for suppliers to work towards science-based targets. We track progress of our supplier ability to adhere to these requirements through capability monitoring via CDP disclosure and direct supplier engagements. The current delta of 80% to full compliance helps us identify areas of focus and tailor our interventions to systemic gaps in the supply chain. Over the next years we will be working to close those gaps.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to set science-based targets

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

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

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

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to make credible renewable energy usage claims

Financial incentives

☑ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect WASH information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovative business models and corporate renewable energy sourcing mechanisms

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(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

12

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

In 2023, we engaged 600 of our non-tobacco suppliers via the CDP supply chain program with 90% emission coverage and additionally the Top 60 from an emission perspective are engaged under the BAT internal climate enablement program. These suppliers are measured against 7 climate metrics which includes scope 1,2 and 3 reporting and verification, emission roadmap, target emission Initiatives, renewables electricity, supply chain engagement, primary data and CDP Disclosure. Supplier baselines of these 7 metrics were established based on 2023 CDP disclosure and assigned a climate score. Via this engagement we drive improvement of climate score for the suppliers in the program with a target of 0.5 improvement over 2024. We also provide capability build to suppliers in collaboration with CDP. In 2023 we also conducted 2 ESG summits in Bangladesh and Pakistan to educate our key suppliers within these geographies and pledge our commitment to climate action. We also set out the foundations of climate action and BAT climate commitments and encourage lower carbon innovations.

(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 **:**For non-tobacco Suppliers, the climate enablement program (engagement program) has encouraged suppliers in scope to report their scope 1,2 & 3 driven improvement in supplier's corporate or SBTI targets & has increased renewable electricity purchases.

(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:

☑ No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Develop or distribute resources on how to map upstream value chain

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

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

Financial incentives

☑ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

☑ Include long-term contracts linked to environmental commitments

☑ Provide financial incentives for certified products

Information collection

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

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Other innovation and collaboration activity, please specify

(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:

☑ 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:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

8

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

In 2023, we engaged 50 of our non-tobacco suppliers via the CDP supply chain program with 80% pulp and paper volume coverage, In addition, we engaged the top 20 from a volume perspective under the BAT internal deforestation free program. These suppliers are measured against volume certified by FSC/PEFC CoC, volume traceable to low-risk geographies, volume traceable to certified forests in high-risk geographies and volume from recycled or recovered sources. Suppliers' performance against these 4 criteria were assessed. Via this engagement we drive improvement of deforestation free a target of 100% by 2025. We also provide capability build to suppliers in collaboration with CDP. In 2023 we also conducted two ESG Summits in Bangladesh and Pakistan to educate our key suppliers within these geographies and pledge our commitment to deforestation free action. We also set out the foundations of deforestation free action, BAT deforestation free commitments, and encourage deforestation free innovations.

(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 **:**For Non-Tobacco Suppliers, the deforestation programme encourages suppliers in scope to report on their deforestation risk assessment and control mechanisms and promotes transparency and enhanced traceability across the pulp & paper supply chain

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Substitution of hazardous substances with less harmful substances

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

(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:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

All BAT leaf suppliers are expected to comply with the BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct (SCoC), including providing us with 'received and read' confirmations, as part of the Leaf Supplier Manual (LSM), which is reviewed and submitted to 100% of leaf suppliers on an annual basis. Requirements in SCoC include the need for suppliers to comply with all applicable laws, codes and regulations wherever they operate. Suppliers are also expected to submit Sustainable Tobacco Programme and Thrive self-assessments, including requests to the suppliers to state how they ensure legal compliance with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards in the jurisdictions where they operate. In the LSM there is a specific section specific for agrochemicals compliance that should be followed and also training provided for farmers on the topic. The use of active ingredients listed in "Agrochemicals non-endorsed (not to be used in tobacco production)" is also shared in the manual. In 2023 100% of tobacco suppliers found no detection of such agrochemical in testing.

(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 **:**Agrochemicals compliance that should be followed.

(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

Capacity building

☑ Disseminate technical materials

☑ Offer on-site technical assistance and extension services

☑ Support smallholders to adhere to standards in upstream value chain

☑ Support smallholders to adhere to regenerative agriculture principles

☑ Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity

☑ Support smallholders to measure and address their exposure to environmental risk

☑ Support smallholders to measure and report on environmental and social indicators

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

Financial incentives

☑ Purchase guarantee linked to best agricultural practices

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

91196

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our engagement with our tobacco suppliers is key, given that tobacco is an agricultural commodity and a cornerstone of our operations. While BAT does not own tobacco farms or directly employ farmers, we buy more than 300,000 tonnes of tobacco each year. Securing our supply of tobacco leaf for the future, coupled with our agronomy support to contracted farmers, helps us ensure we have an agile, efficient, and reliable supply, with traceability down to the farm level. This means we can continue to meet consumer demand, while also enhancing the sustainability of rural communities and agriculture. We support our farmers through field visit by our field technicians who provide guidance and information to encourage the adoption of good agricultural and regenerative practices that support the conservation and protection of soil, water, and biodiversity. This includes soil analysis for precise fertilization, recommendation of appropriate agrochemicals, and distribution of personal protective equipment (PPE) to ensure farmer safety during application. Through the Global Leaf Agronomy Development (GLAD) centre we have the introduction and test of new technologies to enhance the production processes of contracted farmers. This includes more efficient irrigation techniques, precision irrigation sensors, and other advancements. These standards are monitored annually through field technician field visits. We have more than 80% of tobacco hectares reported to have appropriate best practice on soil and water management plans implemented.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

To support the responsible disposal of our New Category products, we launched a take-back scheme and defined our measure of success as availability of such a scheme in all markets where we sell devices, depending on the local infrastructure and regulatory environment. The take-back scheme provides a complimentary means for customers to return our new category devices (any BAT product that contains a battery or printed circuit board) for responsible disposal – regardless of condition.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our first measure of success is to maintain our commitment to having 100% of New Category markets (markets where New Category devices are sold) with take-back schemes in place. In 2023 this increased from 50 markets to 64 markets. Our second measure of success is to increase the usage of these initiatives. For example, in 2023 we are working with a supplier and rural community to recycle Vapour pods returned via our customer take-back scheme.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

We engage with investors for two reasons. As owners / potential owners of BAT these stakeholders have an interest in how the business operates, from a financial and non-financial value creation perspective. We also seek to communicate with current or potential investors to protect or increase shareholdings. We engage with and receive feedback from shareholders on sustainability matters, including biodiversity / deforestation. In 2023, our Investor Sustainability team carried out deep dives on our sustainability reporting, which includes our deforestation targets, programmes and performance, responded to stewardship requests on nature related topics – which includes our approach to deforestation. Further our Combined Annual and Sustainability Report is sent to 100% of shareholders.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We seek feedback from investors following engagement and there continues to be good support for the measures that we have taken in sustainability and deforestation in 2023. A second benefit of engagement is the fact we continue to build a database of different investors topic focus, allowing us to improve and tailor future communications.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(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

Cigarette butts are a source of marine (Araújo and Costa, 2019) and freshwater (Winton et al., 2020) pollution. As a large manufacturer of cigarettes, we support education campaigns and work with consumers to encourage responsible disposal. For example, in collaboration with local Ministries of Environment, our 'Small Actions, Big Crimes' programme has been rolled out in a number of markets in Southeast Europe.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

In Italy, we expanded the programme to four more cities in 2023, which included distributing more than 30,000 recyclable plastic pocket ashtrays and reuseable ashtrays. To measure the success of our engagement, we used satellite monitoring to assess the quantity of cigarette butt litter before, during, and after the implementation of our activities. An average reduction of 59% in littering from cigarette butts was seen during the campaign period. In Greece, we extended the programme to Naxos, after its launch in Rafina in 2021. Through a combination of awareness raising initiatives and specifically designed bins and signage for cigarette butt disposal, over 255,000 cigarette butts have been collected across the two locations since November 2021. The use of technology not only enabled measurement of impact but also the provision of useful data to local authorities for managing butt litter.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**Tobacco Leaf Farmers

(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:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Purchased tobacco accounted for about 23% of our Scope 3 GHG emissions, contributing 1,402,000 tCO2e in 2022. The majority of these emissions came from fuels used in the processes to cure tobacco leaves.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We are helping farmers to reduce emissions from farming activities by introducing new curing technologies, alternate fuel sources, new fertilisers with lower emissions and 'carbon-smart' practices. Our carbon-smart farming programme aims to reduce emissions from farming activities and remove carbon from the atmosphere through reforestation and reduction in soil disturbance. We are implementing this programme in our Leaf Operations in Brazil, Bangladesh, Mexico, Pakistan and the U.S., which represent the highest directly contracted tobacco volumes. In 2023, 85% of total tobacco sourced was cured with renewable fuels and methods (sustainable wood biomass sun cured air cured).
[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

BAT has initiated multiple global workstreams to reduce our overall logistics emissions. These initiatives include: route/ network optimization, improvement of load filling, optimisation of freight mode (i.e. air to sea, road to rail).

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

These improvements support our target to reduce our Scope 1, 2 & 3 Emissions by 50% by 2030 across our value chain. We would welcome opportunities to share experience and best practices related to these initiatives with J Sainsbury Plc, as well as learn more about emissions reduction initiatives being taken by our customers.

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

BAT has initiated multiple global workstreams to reduce our overall logistics emissions. These initiatives include: route/ network optimization, improvement of load filling, optimisation of freight mode (i.e. air to sea, road to rail).

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

These improvements support our target to reduce our Scope 1, 2 & 3 Emissions by 50% by 2030 across our value chain. We would welcome opportunities to share experience and best practices related to these initiatives with Ahold Delhaize, as well as learn more about emissions reduction initiatives being taken by our customers.

Row 3

(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

BAT has initiated multiple global workstreams to reduce our overall logistics emissions. These initiatives include: route/ network optimization, improvement of load filling, optimisation of freight mode (i.e. air to sea, road to rail).

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

These improvements support our target to reduce our Scope 1, 2 & 3 Emissions by 50% by 2030 across our value chain. We would welcome opportunities to share experience and best practices related to these initiatives with S Group, as well as learn more about emissions reduction initiatives being taken by our customers.

Row 4

(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

BAT has initiated multiple global workstreams to reduce our overall logistics emissions. These initiatives include: route/ network optimization, improvement of load filling, optimisation of freight mode (i.e. air to sea, road to rail).

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

These improvements support our target to reduce our Scope 1, 2 & 3 Emissions by 50% by 2030 across our value chain. We would welcome opportunities to share experience and best practices related to these initiatives with Salling Group A/S, as well as learn more about emissions reduction initiatives being taken by our customers.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

BAT has implemented environmental initiatives; however the pre-filled response limits the selection. BAT invited more than 600 suppliers representing 92% of purchased goods and services emissions to respond to the CDP supply chain programme. The data we collect from our suppliers through the programme enables us to better understand our wider environmental impact and set targets. We recorded a 92% response rate which is above the average industry response rate of 59%. This level of engagement is almost a threefold increase in comparison to 2022 (over 200 suppliers) and builds upon our recognition as a supply chain engagement leader by CDP in 2022. Throughout the disclosure cycle, we invited our suppliers to multiple capability building webinars.
[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Pursuant to the greenhouse gas reporting protocol, Operational Control is the most appropriate approach for our organisation.*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Pursuant to the greenhouse gas reporting protocol, Operational Control is the most appropriate approach for our organisation.*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Pursuant to the greenhouse gas reporting protocol, Operational Control is the most appropriate approach for our organisation.*
Plastics	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Pursuant to the greenhouse gas reporting protocol, Operational Control is the most appropriate approach for our organisation.*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Pursuant to the greenhouse gas reporting protocol, Operational Control is the most appropriate approach for our organisation.*

[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)

In 2022, we enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to the reporting periods 2020 and 2021 being restated accordingly. In 2023, we have included fugitive and other process GHG emissions (HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3, CO2, CH4, N2O) into our Scope 1 emissions inventory.
[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3

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

To improve the accuracy of our Scope 3 emissions data, we continuously refine the calculation methodology applied by utilising higher percentage of primary suppliers' data, shifting from industry-average to company-specific information, and refining the assumptions and estimates. Changes applied in 2022 will be further outlined by Scope 3 category within question 7.8. BAT's Scope 3 emissions reporting process aligns with the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and follows a guidance of 5% significance threshold for recalculation.

(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

☑ IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2006

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

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

☑ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol Agricultural Guidance: Interpreting the Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard for the Agricultural Sector

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

Scope 2 CO2e emissions includes indirect emissions associated with the purchase of electricity, heat, cooling and steam which is consumed at our locations. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Scope 2 Location-based CO2e emissions are calculated using International Energy Agency 2022 country specific emission factors. The set of emissions factors used for calculations is updated on annual basis. Scope 2 market-based CO2e emissions are calculated from supplier-specific emissions factors. To ensure reported market-based CO2e emissions meet the 'good quality criteria' as per GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, we specify market-based factors only when these are supported by contractual instruments. For renewables, electricity procurement is either unbundled energy attribute certificates (I-RECs, GoOs, RECs, etc.) or green electricity products from an energy supplier (supported by energy attribute certificates or Power Purchase Agreement). Whenever market-based factors are not available, market-based Scope 2 CO2e emissions are calculated using International Energy Agency 2022 country specific emission factors, same as in the location-based method.
[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

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

342034

(7.5.3) Methodological details

2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

417572

(7.5.3) Methodological details

2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

198830

(7.5.3) Methodological details

2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5119936.9

(7.5.3) Methodological details

*In 2022, we enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision, leading to our Scope 3 data for reporting periods 2020 and 2021 being restated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. * BAT is committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products by 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

172147.6

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

163690.4

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

348283

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8831.4

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17678.5

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

67041

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from leased assets are included in Scopes 1 & 2.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16970.7

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we have further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained SBTi sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased*

*goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

BAT's products are not processed by third parties.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

756206.6

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we have further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained SBTi sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

231111.7

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we have further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained SBTi sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

BAT does not lease assets to third parties.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4895.3

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In 2022, we have further enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to our Scope 3 2020 base year emissions been recalculated accordingly. 2020 was selected as the baseline as BAT have obtained SBTi sign-off for our near-term targets in line with 1.5C trajectory. BAT committed to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also committed to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The assessment and calculation of emissions related to this category is work in progress and will be published within the next BAT Integrated report.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 3 emissions assessment performed by BAT with support of external sustainability consultant identified no other upstream activities, emission from which would be relevant.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 3 emissions assessment performed by BAT with support of external sustainability consultant identified no other downstream activities, emission from which would be relevant.
[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)

299209

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 includes direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by BAT. These are emissions associated with use of fuel at facilities under our operational control and by our vehicle fleet as well as CO2 used for the production of Dry Ice Expanded Tobacco (DIET). Fuels include both renewable, such as wood fuel, biodiesel etc., and non-renewable ones, such as natural gas, LPG, diesel, coal etc. Data is collected from invoices, telematics, fuel cards, meter readings and other documentation including information logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. DEFRA Greenhouse Gas Reporting: Conversion Factors 2022 are used to convert fuel

usage to CO2e. Scope 1 CO2e emissions decreased by 2.8% compared to the 2022. This was driven by energy saving projects which are based on internal energy efficiency assessments recommendations, as well as from identification of energy losses and prompt actions taken upon as part of the Energy Conservation Daily management system in manufacturing and leaf sites. There have also been many route optimisations, some outsourcing of distributions' activities and replacements of vehicles to less carbon-intensive models in the commercial side of the business. In 2023 we have included fugitive and other process GHG emissions (HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3, CO2, CH4, N2O) into our Scope 1 emissions inventory. Fugitive emissions accounted for 8.2% of Scope 1 in 2023.

Past year 1

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

307708

(7.6.2) End date

11/30/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 includes direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by BAT. These are emissions associated with use of fuel at facilities under our operational control and by our vehicle fleet as well as CO2 used for the production of Dry Ice Expanded Tobacco (DIET). Fuels include both renewable, such as wood fuel, biodiesel etc., and non-renewable ones, such as natural gas, LPG, diesel, coal etc. Data is collected from invoices, telematics, fuel cards, meter readings and other documentation including information logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Our Scope 1 CO2e emissions decreased by 5.6% compared to 2021.

Past year 2

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

324985

(7.6.2) End date

11/30/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 includes direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by BAT. These are emissions associated with use of fuel at facilities under our operational control and by our vehicle fleet as well as CO2 used for the production of Dry Ice Expanded Tobacco (DIET). Fuels include both renewable, such as wood fuel,

biodiesel etc., and non-renewable ones, such as natural gas, LPG, diesel, coal etc. Data is collected from invoices, telematics, fuel cards, meter readings and other documentation including information logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Our Scope 1 CO2e emissions decreased by 5.2% compared to 2020.

Past year 3

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

342034

(7.6.2) End date

11/30/2020

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 includes direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by BAT. These are emissions associated with use of fuel at facilities under our operational control and by our vehicle fleet as well as CO2 used for the production of Dry Ice Expanded Tobacco (DIET). Fuels include both renewable, such as wood fuel, biodiesel etc., and non-renewable ones, such as natural gas, LPG, diesel, coal etc. Data is collected from invoices, telematics, fuel cards, meter readings and other documentation including information logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. 2020 is a base year for our Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions reporting. Our Scope 1 CO2e emissions decreased by 15.9% compared to 2019.

Past year 4

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

396398

(7.6.2) End date

11/30/2019

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 includes direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by BAT. These are emissions associated with use of fuel at facilities under our operational control and by our vehicle fleet as well as CO2 used for the production of Dry Ice Expanded Tobacco (DIET). Fuels include both renewable, such as wood fuel, biodiesel etc., and non-renewable ones, such as natural gas, LPG, diesel, coal etc. Data is collected from invoices, telematics, fuel cards, meter readings and other documentation including information logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Our Scope 1 CO2e emissions decreased by 4.7% compared to 2018.

Past year 5

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

415195

(7.6.2) End date

11/30/2018

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 includes direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by BAT. These are emissions associated with use of fuel at facilities under our operational control and by our vehicle fleet as well as CO2 used for the production of Dry Ice Expanded Tobacco (DIET). Fuels include both renewable, such as wood fuel, biodiesel etc., and non-renewable ones, such as natural gas, LPG, diesel, coal etc. Data is collected from invoices, telematics, fuel cards, meter readings and other documentation including information logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Our Scope 1 emissions were at 415 195 metric tons of CO2e in 2018 reporting year. [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)

341836

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

95166

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool by our

facilities. In 2023 our Scope 2 CO2e emissions- Location based decreased by 4.6% compared to 2022.This is driven mostly by implementation of energy saving projects as per energy efficiency assessments recommendations, focused on electricity, as well as from the identification of energy losses and prompt implementation of solutions as part of the Energy Conservation Daily management system in manufacturing and leaf sites. Supporting driver is replacing purchased electricity with renewable electricity generated on site via solar technology (e.g. Chile, Italy, Fiji, Samoa, Nigeria). Further factors are production decrease and divestments in certain geographies. In 2023, our Scope 2 CO2e emissions – Market based decreased by 18.49% compared to 2022. This was driven by the same factors as the decrease in Scope 2 CO2e emissions- Location based as well as additional renewable electricity sourcing in a range of countries (e.g. Nigeria, Bangladesh, Pakistan, etc.).

Past year 1

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

356070

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

112764

(7.7.3) End date

11/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool by our facilities. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Location based) decreased by 10.3% compared to 2021. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Market based) decreased by 51.1% compared to 2021.

Past year 2

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

392840

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

170422

(7.7.3) End date

11/30/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool by our facilities. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Location based) decreased by 6.3% compared to 2020. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Market based) decreased by 16.7% compared to 2020.

Past year 3

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

417572

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

198830

(7.7.3) End date

11/30/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool by our facilities. 2020 is a base year for our Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions reporting. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Location based) decreased by 8.4% compared to 2019. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Market based) decreased by 94.1% compared to 2019.

Past year 4

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

489853

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

385996

(7.7.3) End date

11/30/2019

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool by our facilities. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Location based) decreased by 8.2% compared to 2018. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Market based) decreased by 10.4% compared to 2018.

Past year 5

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

452844

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

425975

(7.7.3) End date

11/30/2018

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool by our facilities. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Location based) were at 452844 metric tons CO2e in 2018. Our Scope 2 CO2e emissions (Market based) were at 425975 metric tons CO2e in 2018.
[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)

4301105.7

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Fuel-based method
☑ Spend-based method
☑ Average data method
☑ Site-specific method
☑ Distance-based method
☑ Supplier-specific method

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

36

(7.8.5) Please explain

Purchased materials were extracted from the BAT Procurement System, and materials were allocated into broad categories based on taxonomy. The standard weight was used to allocate emission factors as follows: LCAs: Specific product LCAs were utilised where available and/or proxy LCAs used where appropriate. In the absence of these datasets, the Ecoinvent v3.8 database was utilised. If the Ecoinvent v3.8 database did not have the relevant emission factors, we used a combination approach based upon the different materials used in the product. In 2022, BAT made the following changes to the calculation methodology. Update of all purchased material groups compositions and properties. This has led to the application of different emissions factors compared to 2021. In addition, BAT updated the purchased materials Unit of Measure (UoM) conversions factors to standard weight metric (i.e. KG) for more than 95% of purchased materials by volume. This has led to the application of different conversion factors, which take into consideration manufacturing location and product specification. The availability of LCAs for a wider range of our products enabled us to refine the use of emissions factors and their respective calculation methodology. Services: Spend data was used to estimate emissions. Two methods were used: Supplier specific emission factors: CDP data was used to source supplier specific Scope 1, 2 and 3 (upstream) reported emissions and annual revenue. Emissions per GBP revenue were then calculated per supplier and applied to the GBP spend by BAT for the corresponding supplier. This was applied where supplier specific emissions and revenue were published. An average emissions intensity of tCO2e per GBP spend was calculated based on the Supplier Specific emission factors per service category. This average emission factor was then applied to the remaining spend per service category that have not already been accounted for. For further details on our Scope 3 methodology please refer to our Scope 3 Simplified Methodology available on BAT.com. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

139722.2

(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

Capital Goods expenditure is extracted from Category 1 Purchased Goods and Services data and includes general production (machinery) and technology (hardware and IT infrastructure) equipment. Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator emission factors for Food Beverage and Tobacco and Electrical and Optical Equipment are utilised to convert spend volumes into emissions. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

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)

178941

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Site-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Fuel and energy related data is recorded within our EHS Reporting Tool and includes purchased fuels (coal; bioethanol; fuel oil; natural gas; petrol; wood logs; CNG; diesel; biodiesel; LPG), electricity, heat (hot water) and steam. The data covers a reporting period of November 2021 to December 2022. DEFRA 2022 and IEA 2022 emission factors were applied to the energy consumption to calculate emissions. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

369524.8

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Average data method

☑ Distance-based method

☑ Site-specific method

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

37

(7.8.5) Please explain

Freight movements of in-bound and out-bound finished goods or semi-finished products/materials owned by BAT, including all modes of transport (i.e. air, road, rail and sea) fall within this category. BAT calculate movement up until the change of product/material ownership. Data is either provided direct from suppliers (in CO2e) based on their emission calculation methodology, or within our EHS Reporting Tool and converted to emissions using DEFRA 2022 emission factors. Upstream transport which is undertaken within BAT owned or leased vehicles is reported within Scope 1 under vehicle fuel. 2022 methodology changes: We performed an end-to-end logistics data completeness review following the change of our key transportation supplier. This resulted in the incorporation of a more holistic data set from our new supplier. Our alignment with industry best practices and SBTi resulted in the following changes: – The inclusion of emissions associated with the storage of BAT products, which are calculated from the spend on warehousing services. – The application of higher emissions factors inclusive of Radiative Forcing (RF) for transportation by air. – The application of higher Well-to-Wheel (WTW) emissions factors inclusive of both Well-to-Tank (WTT) and Tank-to-Wheel (TTW) components. These allowed us to capture both emissions generated during fuel use for transportation as well as those generated at earlier stages of the fuel life cycle. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

5149.7

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

☑ Site-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Waste volumes (tonnes) and disposal route (excluding waste incineration onsite which is captured in Scope 1) are recorded within our EHS Reporting Tool. DEFRA 2022 emission factors were allocated dependent upon disposal route (i.e. landfill, combustion or recycled). 2022 methodology changes: We improved the data granularity for waste generated in direct operations, which enabled us to apply more specific emissions factors by type of material going to waste (e.g. cardboard, filter tow, general waste). Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

33018.1

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Average data method

☑ Distance-based method

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

80

(7.8.5) Please explain

Business Travel is recorded within our EHS Reporting Tool. Air data includes passenger kilometre and class of travel, rail data includes passenger km, and rental vehicles data includes fuel used (litres or kg). DEFRA 2022 emission factors were allocated. 2022 methodology changes: Our alignment with the industry best practices, resulted in the application of higher emissions factors; including radiative forcing (RF). Our key travel services supplier improved its data availability, which encompasses more than 80% of countries where we operate. This resulted in the incorporation of a more holistic data set with higher data granularity (e.g. breakdown of trips by class). The application of higher Well-to-Wheel (WTW) emissions factors inclusive of both Well-to-Tank (WTT) and Tank-to Wheel (TTW) components. These allowed us to capture both emissions generated during fuel use for transportation as well as those generated at earlier stages of the fuel life cycle. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

71325.5

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Employee headcount (including direct contractors) and location are recorded within our EHS Reporting Tool. The average commuting mode (e.g. car, rail, walking) and distance have been referenced from Numbeo, a source aligned to GHG guidance. DEFRA 2022 Well-to-Wheel (WTW) emissions factors inclusive of both Well-to-Tank (WTT) and Tank-to-Wheel (TTW) components were allocated against total distances across transport modes (i.e. return journey for the typical amount of working days per year) to calculate emissions. Assumptions: All employees are assumed to commute to their place of work, as opposed to work from home, and walking and cycling are assumed to have zero emissions. In total, it was assumed each employee commuted twice a day for 234 days in a year. No calculations for working from home are included. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from leased assets are included in Scopes 1 & 2.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

15315

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Average product method

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions associated with the transportation of products sent from BAT to retailer, paid for by a third-party, in addition to customers travelling from retailers having bought BAT products, are included in this category. Emissions are calculated based on total weight of products sold by BAT in the reporting period and an average travel distance for both scenarios to calculate total tonne km for each product type. DEFRA 2022 Well-to-Wheel (WTW) emissions factors inclusive of both Well-to-Tank (WTT) and Tank-to-Wheel (TTW) components were allocated. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

BAT's products are not processed by third parties.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

768615.5

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Average product method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

BAT produce a variety of products from cigarettes to New Category products. Specific product LCAs were utilised where available and/or proxy LCAs were allocated. The emissions associated with the use of products sold by BAT are defined as follows: Tobacco Heated Products/Vapour: Emissions associated with charging of devices throughout a device's lifetime, and emissions associated with the use of e-liquid and tobacco blend. Tobacco Combustion: Emissions associated with the combustion of cigarettes including cigarette paper and tobacco blend. Lighter Fuel: Emissions associated with the use of lighter fuel to light all products sold in 2022. Assumption: It was assumed that 90% of cigarette paper and tobacco blend are combusted in cigarettes and similar products. The remaining 10% of the product is assessed in Category 12 End of Life Treatment. 2022 methodology changes: The availability and utilisation of an improved versions of LCAs as well as LCAs for a wider range of our products has enabled us to refine the emission factors for the use phase of our products and their respective calculation methodology. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

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)

161192.5

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Average product method

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

End of Life emissions accounts for the disposal of final products and associated packaging used for sale and transportation of BAT products. LCAs, where available, and/or proxy LCAs, were used to understand the split of different disposal routes for different material types of BAT products. The disposal route splits were then adjusted to reflect the end market in which products were sold. Using recycling research, BAT undertook into its 20 key markets. Assumptions: Using the market-specific recycling research allowed for a market specific emission factor to be attributed to those top 20 markets and where market-specific information was not available, global average emission factors were used. Recycling rates provided through a waste footprint research exercise were also halved to consider consumer behaviour. 2022 methodology changes: The availability of LCAs for a wider range of our products enabled us to refine the use of emissions factors and their respective calculation methodology. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

BAT does not lease assets to third parties.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

746.5

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Site-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

BAT have a franchise agreement for New Category product stores in the EU, for which emissions from electricity, gas oil and natural gas are estimated using Real Estate Environmental Benchmark data and IEA 2022 and DEFRA 2022 emission factors. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in

accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report one year behind. Therefore, please note that the Scope 3 emissions populated correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The assessment and calculation of emissions related to this category is work in progress and will be published within the next BAT Integrated report.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 emissions assessment performed by BAT with support of external sustainability consultant identified no other upstream activities, emission from which would be relevant.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 emissions assessment performed by BAT with support of external sustainability consultant identified no other downstream activities, emission from which would be relevant.
[Fixed row]

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

11/30/2021

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

4660244.3

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

142082.9

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

197064.5

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

364606

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

8273.5

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

18056.2

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

74514.1

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

0

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

17211.6

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

0

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

787939.3

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

225129.9

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

0

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

1009.3

(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

In 2022, we enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to the reporting periods 2020 and 2021 being restated accordingly. To improve the accuracy of our Scope 3 emissions data, we continuously refine the calculation methodology applied by utilising higher percentage of primary suppliers' data, shifting from industry-average to company-specific information, and refining the assumptions and estimates. Changes applied in 2022 are further outlined by Scope 3 category within question 7.8. BAT's Scope 3 emissions reporting process aligns with the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and follows a guidance of 5% significance threshold for recalculation.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

11/30/2020

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

5119936.9

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

172147.6

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

163690.4

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

348283

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

8831.4

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

17678.5

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

67041

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

0

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

16970.7

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

0

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

756206.6

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

231111.7

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

0

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

4895.3

(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

In 2022, we enhanced our Scope 3 calculation methodology and data precision leading to the reporting periods 2020 and 2021 being restated accordingly. To improve the accuracy of our Scope 3 emissions data, we continuously refine the calculation methodology applied by utilising higher percentage of primary suppliers' data, shifting from industry-average to company-specific information, and refining the assumptions and estimates. Changes applied in 2022 are further outlined by Scope 3 category within question 7.8. BAT's Scope 3 emissions reporting process aligns with the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and follows a guidance of 5% significance threshold for recalculation.
[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

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: 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

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Capital goods

(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

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 3

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

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

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 4

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 5

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

(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

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 6

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Business travel

(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

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 7

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 8

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 9

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 10

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 11

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Franchises

(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

2023 ARA - UK Version - assurance statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

KPMG Independent Limited Assurance Report on page 2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32987

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

8.36

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Change is driven by: decrease in emissions due to additional renewable electricity purchases (e.g. Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nigeria, and U.S etc.) and more on-site renewable electricity generation with solar panels incl. new and expanded installations in 10 countries (e.g. Mexico, Chile, Italy, Bangladesh, Fiji, PNG, Nigeria, etc). and 2 new biomass boilers in South Korea and Germany. This allowed to reduce emissions by 43,130 tCO2e. - (32987/394,375) *100% -8.36%*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12182

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3.09

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Change is driven by: decrease in emissions due to a wide range of energy efficiency projects in building and process improvements at our operation sites. This allowed to reduce emissions by 12182 tCO2e. -(12,182/394375) *100% -3.09%*

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1348

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.34

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Change is driven by divestment of facilities in Groningen, Belarus, and Russia. This resulted in emissions decrease by 998 tCO2e. -(1348/ 394,375) *100% - 0.34%*

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 acquisitions reported in this period

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 mergers in the reporting period

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6277

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.59

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*With the exclusion of closed sites, the volume of production of finished goods (e.g. cigarettes, snus, modern oral etc.) and semi-finished goods (e.g. threshed tobacco leaf, DIET) in BAT decreased and this resulted in decrease of emissions by 6,277 tCO2e. (-6,277/ 394,375) * 100% -1.59%*

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32371

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

8.21

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The amount of other fugitive and other process GHG emissions (HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3, CO2, CH4, N2O) normally oscillate around 4.7% of Scope 1 and 2 (Market-based) emissions including fugitive and process emissions. However, in 2023, due to an incidental release of refrigerant at one of our facilities, these equated to 8.2%. The root cause of the incident has been identified and corrective actions have been deployed.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material change in boundary in the reporting period

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No material change in physical operating conditions in the reporting period

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 unidentified drivers of change in the reporting period

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5674

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.44

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Changes in Sales and Distribution models as well as expansion of hybrids, electric, and efficient fuel vehicles in some geographies e.g. Poland, U.S., Brazil, Turkey and few other. This resulted in a decrease of emissions by 6,024 tCO2e. -(5,674/ 394,375) * 100% -1.44%*
[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

☑ Other, please specify :n/a

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Not applicable - belongs to Scope 3.

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
☑ Other, please specify :n/a

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Not applicable - belongs to Scope 3.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

41929

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

These are emissions from biofuels (e.g. wood fuel, biodiesel) used by our sites for on-site generation of steam, heat and electricity. Emissions are calculated based on amounts of fuels used reported by our units across the Group via our environmental reporting system and DEFRA 2023 factors for biofuels, outside of scopes.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

4378

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factors

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

These are emissions from biofuels (e.g. biodiesel, bioethanol) used by our fleet vehicles used in distribution, marketing and other activities. Emissions are calculated based on amounts of fuels used reported by our units across the Group via our environmental reporting system and DEFRA 2023 factors for biofuels, outside of scopes.
[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:

☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

☑ Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1455823.61

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

A Scope 3 assessment was performed in 2022; thus, we have calculated emissions from all Timber (Pulp and Paper) based materials within our Scope 3 (Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services). Scope 3 assessment for 2023 is under way. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8 and Scope 3 Simplified criteria, published on BAT.com for further details.

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)

1401644.66

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

BAT do not own any tobacco farms; thus we have no Scope 1 and 2 emissions associated with production of tobacco leaf as agricultural commodity. A Scope 3 assessment was performed in 2022, and we have calculated emissions from Tobacco as an agricultural commodity within our Scope 3 (Category 1 - Purchased Goods and Services). These are emissions associated with Purchased tobacco leaf for both combustibles and PRRP products, including biogenic emissions and removals. Scope 3 assessment for 2023 is under way. Our historical CDP responses state the reportable emissions related to agricultural commodity - tobacco excluding biogenic emissions and removals. However, the tobacco curing process is one of the biggest contributors to biogenic emissions throughout our leaf value chain. Therefore, the figure of 1,401,644.66tCO2e reported for 2022 is including biogenic emissions and removals within our upstream tobacco value chain. In relation to the total emissions of 2022 compared to those of 2020, we had a reduction that occurred due to the change in the volume of tobacco purchased in different countries, which have a lower emission factor, in addition to contributions from a more efficient curing processes. Please refer to Scope 3 methodology details in section 7.8 and Scope 3 Simplified criteria, published on BAT.com for further details.
[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)

264246

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CH4

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

1089

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ N2O

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

1504

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

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

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Fugitives

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

32371

(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.

Albania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

63

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

0

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

0

Algeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

987

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

1536

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

1536

Angola

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55

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

0

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

0

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1688

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

2891

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

288

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

456

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

440

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

30

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

48

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

3

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

0

Azerbaijan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

263

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

19

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

19

Bangladesh

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21395

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

35729

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

28757

Belarus

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1072

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

45

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

45

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

254

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

21

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

22

Bosnia & Herzegovina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

827

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

1845

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

2261

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8183

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

12037

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

0

Bulgaria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

451

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

33

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

26

Cameroon

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

172

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

30

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

30

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2546

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

513

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

0

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5254

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

4791

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

0

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

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

254

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

181

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

628

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

92

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

5

Costa Rica

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

425

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

0

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

0

Côte d'Ivoire

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

155

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

17

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

17

Croatia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6549

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

3115

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

162

Cuba

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2610

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

6887

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

6887

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

893

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

28

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

45

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1827

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

17555

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

12784

Democratic Republic of the Congo

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

29

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

0

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

0

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

226

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

44

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

225

Fiji

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1057

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

662

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

662

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

559

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

7

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

16

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8914

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

2609

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

212

Ghana

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

118

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

18

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

18

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

203

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

54

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

83

Guyana

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42

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

21

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

21

Honduras

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1109

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

876

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

0

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

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

48

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

48

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1101

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

3512

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

1092

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5794

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

19143

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

76

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

53

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

5

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

8

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1363

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

661

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

3

Jamaica

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

485

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

199

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

199

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1097

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

152

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

0

Jordan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

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

659

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

0

Kazakhstan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

632

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

87

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

1

Kenya

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3042

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

697

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

697

Latvia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

50

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

1

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

4

Malawi

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

71

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

2

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

2

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

752

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

1233

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

491

Mali

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

94

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

9

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

9

Malta

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

48

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

9

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

10

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11905

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

13297

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

0

Mozambique

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

241

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

18

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

18

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

25

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

124

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

114

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

242

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

13

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

13

Nigeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5207

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

9823

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

5435

North Macedonia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54

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

19

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

19

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

49

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

0

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

7

Pakistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8394

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

9249

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

5438

Papua New Guinea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1898

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

239

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

239

Paraguay

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23

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

0

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

0

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

56

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

21

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

21

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10813

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

30663

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

879

Republic of Moldova

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

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

1

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

1

Réunion

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

98

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

18

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

18

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9283

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

11209

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

852

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10449

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

12013

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

563

Samoa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

84

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

77

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

77

Saudi Arabia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2114

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

1300

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

1300

Serbia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1346

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

3043

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

76

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

440

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

3454

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

3454

Solomon Islands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

126

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

164

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

164

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10728

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

10771

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

2140

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

625

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

13

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

0

Sri Lanka

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1315

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

2399

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

0

Sudan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1488

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

867

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

867

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

296

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

52

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

7

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1575

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

122

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

0

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

164

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

129

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

129

Trinidad and Tobago

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

328

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

2877

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

2877

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17981

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

5820

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

0

Uganda

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

69

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

0

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

0

Ukraine

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2795

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

3848

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

3848

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

50

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

231

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

0

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2245

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

2675

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

0

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

71732

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

84205

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

0

Uzbekistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4586

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

7167

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

7167

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2440

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

1462

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

1462

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

628

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

5177

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

504

Zambia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

262

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

192

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

5

Zimbabwe

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1025

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

500

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

500
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By activity

(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 and Processing*	*213740*
Row 2	*Offices, Warehouses, Retail*	*9965*
Row 3	*Vehicle Fleet*	*75505*

[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)

213740

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

These are our Scope 1 emissions from tobacco processing at green leaf threshing plants and manufacturing cigarettes, other tobacco products and New Categories' Products etc. at our factories. In 2023 these decreased by 1% vs 2022 due to decrease in production and energy efficiency activities. The emissions are calculated from 1/ various types of fuels used on site (e.g. natural gas. diesel. heavy fuel etc.) with application of DEFRA 2022 emissions factors and 2/ Direct input of CO2 input DIET (dried ice expanded tobacco) process. The lower decrease of 2023 Processing/Manufacturing emissions vs previous years is explained by inclusion of fugitive and other process GHG emissions (HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3, CO2, CH4, N2O) into our 2023 Scope 1 emissions inventory.

Row 2

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Distribution

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

65689

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

These are our Scope 1 emissions from Trade Marketing and Distribution vehicles. Scope 1 includes direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by BAT. These are emissions associated with use of fuel at Trade Marketing and Distribution facilities under our operational control and by our vehicle fleet. Fuels include both renewable, such as biodiesel etc., and non-renewable ones, such as petrol, diesel, etc. Data is collected from invoices, telematics, fuel cards, meter readings and other documentation including and information logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. In 2023 these decreased by 10% vs 2022. The decrease is driven by change of route to market model implying reduction of distribution fleet in certain geographies, fuel saving programs as well as gradual shift to hybrid and electric vehicles across the Group.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By activity

(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 and Processing*	*296126*	*80824*
Row 2	*Offices, Warehouses, Retail*	*45644*	*14279*
Row 3	*Vehicle Fleet*	*66*	*63*

[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)

299209

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

341836

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

95166

(7.22.4) Please explain

These are our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions from tobacco processing at green leaf threshing plants and manufacturing cigarettes, other tobacco products and New Categories' Products etc. at BAT owned factories under consolidated accounting group entities.

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

All scope Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are coming from the consolidated accounting group entities. All other entities and investments are included in Scope 3. [Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Sainsbury purchase volumes of cigarettes, fine cut and modern oral which are produced in BAT facilities in: Poland, Hungary, Croatia. Most of purchased Potentially Reduced Risk Product volume (ePod, eTank, refills) and devices are produced by 3rd party, thus don't contribute to Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to end market and customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral)

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

187.9

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

24.68

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Fuels that compose Scope 1 emissions at our facilities in Poland, Hungary, Croatia (mostly natural gas, also minor amounts of light fuel oil, LPG and diesel).

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Scope 1 emissions are calculated based on amounts of fuel consumed at the facility level and emissions factors published by BEIS/ DEFRA UK 2023. The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.

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:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Sainsbury purchase volumes of cigarettes, fine cut and modern oral which are produced in BAT facilities in: Poland, Hungary, Croatia. Most of purchased Potentially Reduced Risk Product volume (ePod, eTank, refills) and devices are produced by 3rd party, thus don't contribute to Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to end market and customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral)

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

187.9

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8.44

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and in some instances via the Building Management System (BMS). Electricity purchased by our facilities in Poland, Hungary, Croatia as well as hot water purchased from an external provider by our facility in Hungary that compose Scope 2 emissions (Market-based). Electricity purchased by factories in Poland, Hungary, Croatia is by 100% covered by renewable energy attributes with associated 0 gCO2e/kWh emissions factor, thus reported emissions are zero. Emissions associated with hot water purchased by one of our facilities in Hungary are non-zero.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool by our facilities. Purchased electricity, hot water and steam consumption is reported by the facility as part of the global environmental reporting tool and are translated into Scope 2 emissions with the application emissions factors. For purchased hot water the market-based factor is equal to location-based factor and is based on DEFRA/BEIS 2023.The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Ahold Delhaize purchased volumes of cigarettes, oral nicotine pouches, fine cut, snuff, and other nicotine products are produced in BAT facilities in: US, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Germany, Croatia. Most of purchased Potentially Reduced Risk Product volume (ePod, eTank, refills) and devices are produced by 3rd party, thus don't contribute to Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral).

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

636.8

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

191.69

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Fuels which compose Scope 1 emissions at our facilities in US, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Germany, Croatia (mostly natural gas, minor amounts of LPG, light fuel oil and diesel oil). Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool, submitted by our facilities. Scope 1 emissions are calculated based on amounts of fuel consumed at the facility level and emissions factors published by BEIS/ DEFRA UK 2023. The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.

Row 4

(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:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Ahold Delhaize purchased volumes of cigarettes, oral nicotine pouches, fine cut, snuff, and other nicotine products are produced in BAT facilities in: US, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Germany, Croatia. Most of purchased Potentially Reduced Risk Product volume (ePod, eTank, refills) and devices are produced by 3rd party, thus don't contribute to Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral).

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

636.8

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

30.12

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Electricity purchased by our facilities in US, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Germany, Croatia as well as hot water purchased from external provider by our facility in Hungary that compose Scope 2 emissions (Market-based). Electricity purchased by factories in US, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Germany, Croatia is by 100% covered by renewable energy attributes with associated 0 gCO2e/kWh emissions factor, thus reported emissions are zero. Emissions associated with hot water purchased by one of our facilities in Hungary are non-zero.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool, submitted by our facilities. Purchased electricity, hot water and steam consumption is reported by the facility as part of the global environmental reporting tool are translated into Scope 2 emissions with the application emissions factors. For purchased hot water the market-based factor is equal to location-based factor and is based on DEFRA/BEIS 2023.The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

S Group purchased volumes of cigarettes, oral nicotine pouches, fine cut, cigars are produced in BAT facilities in: Poland, Hungary, Sweden, Italy. Most of purchased Potentially Reduced Risk Product volume (ePod, eTank, refills) and devices are produced by 3rd party, thus don't contribute to Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to end market and customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral).

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

453.8

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

45.28

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Fuels which compose Scope 1 emissions at our facilities in Poland, Hungary, Sweden, Italy (mostly natural gas).

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool, submitted by our facilities. Scope 1 emissions are calculated based on amounts of fuel consumed at the facility level and emissions factors published by BEIS/ DEFRA UK 2023. The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

S Group purchased volumes of cigarettes, oral nicotine pouches, fine cut, cigars are produced in BAT facilities in: Poland, Hungary, Sweden, Italy. Most of purchased Potentially Reduced Risk Product volume (ePod, eTank, refills) and devices are produced by 3rd party, thus don't contribute to Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to end market and customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral).

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

453.8

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

36.42

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Electricity purchased by our facilities in Poland, Hungary, Sweden, Italy as well as hot water purchased from external provider by our facility in Hungary that compose Scope 2 emissions (Market-based). Electricity purchased by factories in Poland, Hungary, Sweden, Italy is by 100% covered by renewable energy attributes with associated 0 gCO2e/kWh emissions factor, thus reported emissions are zero. Emissions associated with hot water purchased by one of our facilities in Hungary are non-zero.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data collected logged within the EHS Reporting Tool, submitted by our facilities. Purchased electricity, hot water and steam consumption is reported by the facility as part of the global environmental reporting tool are translated into Scope 2 emissions with the application emissions factors. For purchased hot water the market-based factor is equal to location-based factor and is based on DEFRA/BEIS 2023.The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.

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:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Salling Group purchased volumes of cigarettes, oral nicotine pouches are produced in BAT facilities in: Poland, Romania, Hungary, Italy. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to end market and customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral).

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

191.4

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

27.94

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Fuels that compose Scope 1 emissions at our facilities in Poland, Romania, Hungary, Italy (mostly natural gas, also minor amounts of light fuel oil, LPG and diesel). Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool, submitted by our facilities. Scope 1 emissions are calculated based on amounts of fuel consumed at the facility level and emissions factors published by BEIS/ DEFRA UK 2023. The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.

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:

☑ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Salling Group purchased volumes of cigarettes, oral nicotine pouches are produced in BAT facilities in: Poland, Romania, Hungary, Italy. Our Supply Chain team tracks the data of finished good allocation per facility to end market and customer with breakdown per product category.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Million cigarette equivalent (1 cig.equiv.equals 1 cigarette, cigar, cigarillo or 1 stick of heating product; or 1 portion of fine cut tobacco (0.5 to 0.8 grams by weight); or around 0.06 ml of liquid; or 1 pouch of modern oral).

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

191.4

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0.46

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 includes indirect emissions associated with purchasing electricity, hot water and steam consumed at our locations. While electricity is the main source, there are a few BAT facilities purchasing steam from third parties and rented offices using central heating at multi-tenant buildings. Data is collected from invoices, internal metering and logged within the EHS Reporting Tool. Electricity purchased by our facilities in Poland, Romania, Hungary, Italy as well as hot water purchased from external provider by our facility in Hungary that compose Scope 2 emissions (Market-based). Electricity purchased by factories in Poland, Romania, Hungary, Italy is

by 100% covered by renewable energy attributes with associated 0 gCO2e/kWh emissions factor, thus reported emissions are zero. Emissions associated with hot water purchased by one of our facilities in Hungary are non-zero.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Emissions are allocated based on data logged within the EHS Reporting Tool submitted by our facilities. Purchased electricity, hot water and steam consumption is reported by the facility as part of the global environmental reporting tool are translated into Scope 2 emissions with the application emissions factors. For purchased hot water the market-based factor is equal to location-based factor and is based on DEFRA/BEIS 2023.The emissions data are externally assured at Group level by KPMG.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

BAT used our own (primary) data for Scope 1 and 2 emissions in answering this question.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We sell our brands in more than 200 markets worldwide. In each of them we use different customers ranging from major retail networks operating internationally, to small tobacconist shops. Route to market models vary from country to country and include direct sales to customers as well as sales via distributors. In some markets production is local, in other markets product is imported. Thus, tracing product by item from the location where it is manufactured to the customer is challenging.

Row 2

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

*Our facilities produce numerous SKUs or finished goods (cigarettes, other tobacco products, potentially reduced risk products *† etc) as well as semi-finished goods (cut-rag tobacco, filter rods etc. for use at other facilities within the Group). It common to produce different SKUs at the same production line. Currently, energy metering level at most of our facilities doesn't allow us to track energy use by product line or production unit, thus allocating energy use and associated emissions to a particular batch of finished goods would help.*
[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

The emissions data is externally assured at Group level by KPMG. BAT is considering to digitalise the process of customers' emissions allocation. Key constraints for the full automation: variance in requesting member customers' name in CDP's portal and BAT's enterprise resource planning system; subsidiaries of the requesting members; indirect sales to the requesting members via a distributor.
[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:* ☑ 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

137296

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1141982

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1279279

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

675810

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

203283

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

879093

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

3004

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2073

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

5076

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

2926

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

3141

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

6066

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

12973

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

12973

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

832009

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1350478

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

2182487
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ 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

135093

(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

66335

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

68759

(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

Sustainable fuels that we use comprise biodiesel, biogasoline, wood fuel (e.g. wood chips, wood pellets) and other biomass fuels such as paddy husk. Biogasoline and biodiesel are used mostly in our fleet vehicles, to a large extent in South America (e.g. Brazil). Minor amount of biodiesel is consumed by manufacturing facilities. Wood fuel is mostly consumed by our factory and green leaf threshing plants (GLTs); and in Brazil and Korea for steam generation. A minor amount of sustainable wood pellets is consumed in our warehousing facilities in Switzerland for heat generation. Minor amount of other sustainable biomass fuels is used in Sri Lanka and Fiji for leaf curing that is done on site.

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

We endeavour not to use biomass fuels that are not sustainable. Biomass fuels that we source are in most cases certified (e.g. woodfuel used in Switzerland). Whenever fuel certification schemes are absent, we aim to ensure that biofuel is waste or by-product of agricultural process (e.g. rice husk used on Sri Lanka).

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

2203

(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

881

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

1322

(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

This is certified biogas used by one of our facilities in Sweden.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1027

(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

1027

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Coal is used for on-site energy generation (steam) at our facility (Zimbabwe).

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

435219

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

48694

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

361179

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

19530

(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

Oil-type fuels comprise petrol, diesel oil, heavy fuel oil and light fuel oil. Diesel is widely used across BAT geography of operations by both fleet vehicles and on-site generators. Petrol is used by Fleet vehicles in a wide range of geographies. Heavy fuel is used for generation of energy in different forms on site at a few factories and green leaf threshing plants (GLTs), while a small volume of light fuel oil is used for heating at our facilities.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

705736

(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

208622

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

380484

(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

116629

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Gas-type fuels comprise Natural gas as forms thereof, such as CNG and LPG. Natural gas is widely used across BAT geography for on-site generation of energy in the form of steam and heat. On top, it is used for tri-generation (e.g. our facility in Turkey). CNG is used by industrial vehicles on site (e.g. forklift trucks) and fleet vehicles as well as in boilers. LPG is used by Fleet vehicles, industrial vehicles on site (e.g. forklift trucks) and in on-site canteens.

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

Non other non-renewable fuels that cannot be classified as oil, gas or coal are curently used by our sites. Non-renewable hydrogen is not used.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1279279

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

48694

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

637019

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

471121

(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

116629

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Over 99.8% of fuel that is used for energy generation at our sites is consumed within our organization. The only facility selling energy is our factory in Croatia, which supplies steam and minor amount of heat to 3rd party located in the immediate vicinity.
[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)

61085

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

61085

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

12391

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

12391

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

637600

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

637600

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

67797

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

67797

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

471121

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

470518

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

70081

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

70081

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:

☑ Argentina

(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)

8417

(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:

☑ Argentina

(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)

1972

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Argentina covered 90% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Australia

(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 **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

629

(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:

☑ Australia

(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

Our offices in Australia covered 93% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes. Respective renewable electricity was supplied under 'green tariff' contact and is generated from different technologies, comprising Solar and Hydro. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Bangladesh

(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)

11400

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ TIGR

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

Select from:

☑ Bangladesh

(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

Our factory and offices in Bangladesh covered 19.5% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including TIGR. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Bangladesh

(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)

611

(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:

☑ Bangladesh

(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

Our factory and offices in Bangladesh covered 19.5% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including TIGR. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are collected via our on-line environmental reporting system.

Row 5

(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:

☑ Wind

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

12779

(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)

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Brazil covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 6

(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:

☑ Wind

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

76912

(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)

2018

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Brazil covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Bulgaria

(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 **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

29

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Bulgaria

(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

Our offices in Bulgaria covered 36% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes. Respective renewable electricity was supplied under 'green tariff' contact. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(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)

4320

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ 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

Our offices in Canada covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including US-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are collected via our on-line environmental reporting system.

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Costa Rica

(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)

767

(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:

☑ Costa Rica

(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

Our factory and offices in Costa Rica covered 92% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are collected via our on-line environmental reporting system.

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Chile

(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, Hydroelectric

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

10317

(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:

☑ Chile

(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

Our factory and offices in Chile covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Chile

(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)

2487

(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:

☑ Chile

(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

Our factory and offices in Chile covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(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)

120

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GEC

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

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our offices in China covered 28.9% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GEC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Colombia

(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)

574

(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:

☑ Colombia

(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)

1977

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Colombia covered 95% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Croatia

(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 **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

18854

(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:

☑ Croatia

(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

Our offices in Croatia covered 98.4% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 16

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Croatia

(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)

1612

(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:

☑ Croatia

(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)

1966

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our offices in Croatia covered 98.4% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 17

(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:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, Wind, Hydropower

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

7166

(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:

☑ 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

Our factory, retail and several offices across Germany consume 95.8% renewable electricity that is supplied under 'green tariff' contract. The electricity represents renewable energy mix and is generated from several technologies, including Solar, Wind and Hydro. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 18

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Honduras

(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)

3140

(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:

☑ Honduras

(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)

2011

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Honduras covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 19

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Hungary

(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 **:** Hydropower, biomass

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

12547

(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:

☑ Hungary

(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

Our factory and offices in Hungary covered 99.6% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes. Respective renewable electricity was supplied under 'green tariff' contact. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 20

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(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)

1276

(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:

☑ 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

Our factory and offices in Indonesia covered 99.6% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 21

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Geothermal

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

23058

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ TIGR

(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

Our factory and offices in Indonesia covered 99.6% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 22

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Hydropower (capacity unknown) / Sustainable biomass

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

660

(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

Our offices in Italy covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 23

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Hydropower (capacity unknown) / Sustainable biomass

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

1670

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our offices in Italy covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

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)

200

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ J-Credit (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:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our offices in Japan covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including J-Credit. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

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:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

126

(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:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our offices in Japan covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including J-Credit. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 26

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Jordan

(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)

1734

(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:

☑ Jordan

(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

Our factory and offices in Jordan covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 27

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Kazakhstan

(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)

176

(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:

☑ Kazakhstan

(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

Our offices in Kazakhstan covered 99% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 28

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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)

1402

(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:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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

Our factory and offices in South Korea covered 27.6% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including KREC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 29

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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)

4130

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Korean REC

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

Select from:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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

Our factory and offices in South Korea covered 27.6% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including KREC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are collected via our on-line environmental reporting system.

Row 31

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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)

978

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Korean REC

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

Select from:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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

Our factory and offices in South Korea covered 27.6% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including KREC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 32

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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)

4095

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Korean REC

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

Select from:

☑ Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(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

Our factory and offices in South Korea covered 27.6% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including KREC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 33

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(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)

700

(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:

☑ Malaysia

(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

Our factory and offices in Malaysia covered 60% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 34

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(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)

496

(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:
☑ Malaysia

(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

Our factory and offices in Malaysia covered 60% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 36

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(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 **:** Solar, Wind, Hydropower

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

32608

(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:

☑ Mexico

(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)

2016

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Mexico covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 38

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(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)

37

(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:

☑ Netherlands

(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

Our factory and offices in Netherlands covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 39

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Nigeria

(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)

10784

(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:

☑ Nigeria

(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)

1990

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Nigeria covered 45.8% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 40

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Norway

(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 :Retail green electricity contract

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

1

(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:

☑ Norway

(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

Our offices in Norway covered 9.1% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 41

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(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)

2273

(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:

☑ Pakistan

(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)

2016

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Pakistan covered 41% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 42

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(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)

8028

(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:

☑ Pakistan

(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

Our factory and offices in Pakistan covered 41% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 43

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Paraguay

(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:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :The default grid mix of low-carbon electricity is over 95%

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

174

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**The default grid mix of low-carbon electricity is over 95%

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

Select from:

☑ Paraguay

(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

Our offices are located in Paraguay, which is a country with default grid mix of low-carbon electricity which is over 95% and no mechanism for actively sourcing low-carbon electricity from the grid (i.e. energy attribute certificates or another attribute tracking system) - as per CDP definitions.

Row 44

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Poland

(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 **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

46070

(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:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Poland covered 97.9% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 45

(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 **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

38071

(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

Our factory and offices in Poland covered 97.9% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 46

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Russian Federation

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Project-specific contract with an electricity supplier

(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)

31490

(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:

☑ Russian Federation

(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

Our factory and offices in Russia purchased 95.3% electricity in 2023 under a 'green tariff' contract. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 47

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Serbia

(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)

4208

(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:

☑ Serbia

(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)

1970

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Serbia covered 98.5% of its purchased electricity in 2023. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 48

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(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)

2262

(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:

☑ South Africa

(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)

2006

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in South Africa covered 80% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 49

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(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)

7324

(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:
☑ South Africa

(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)

2014

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in South Africa covered 80% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 50

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

83

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our offices in Spain covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 51

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Sri Lanka

(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)

4742

(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:

☑ Sri Lanka

(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)

2016

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Sri Lanka covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 52

(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)

3900

(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:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Sweden covered 99.9% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are collected via our on-line environmental reporting system.

Row 53

(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:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

4724

(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

Our factory and offices in Switzerland covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including GO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 54

(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:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

12428

(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)

2012

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Turkey covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 55

(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:

☑ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

1323

(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)

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Turkey covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 56

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Arab Emirates

(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)

486

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United Arab Emirates

(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

Our factory and offices in UAE covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 57

(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:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Retail green electricity contract

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

12965

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ REGO

(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

Our offices in UK covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including REGO. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 58

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Hydropower, sustainable biomass

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

228075

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in United States covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 59

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(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)

1059

(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:

☑ Viet Nam

(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

Our factory and offices in Vietnam covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are collected via our on-line environmental reporting system.

Row 60

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(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)

1368

(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:

☑ Viet Nam

(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)

2016

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Vietnam covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 61

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(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)

5808

(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:

☑ Viet Nam

(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

Our factory and offices in Vietnam covered 100% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

Row 62

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Zambia

(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)

2108

(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:

☑ Zambia

(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)

1976

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Our factory and offices in Zambia covered 97% of its purchased electricity in 2023 by renewable attributes including I-REC. Across BAT Procurement departments of respective sites hold contracts with utilities or suppliers of such electricity. The copies of corresponding certificates and/or other contractual documents for the reporting units claiming to purchase low carbon electricity are logged within the EHS Reporting Tool.

[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Albania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40

(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)

40.00

Algeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3009

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

84

(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)

3093.00

Angola

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1.00

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9349

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

41

(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)

9390.00

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

675

(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)

675.00

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24

(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)

24.00

Azerbaijan

(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

Bangladesh

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

61549

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

18994

(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)

21

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

80564.00

Belarus

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

141

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

141.00

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

153

(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)

153.00

Bosnia & Herzegovina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2680

(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)

2680.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

89691

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1209

(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)

90900.00

Bulgaria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

80

(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)

80.00

Cameroon

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

117

(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)

117.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4320

(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)

4320.00

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12804

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

141

(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)

12945.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

415

(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)

415.00

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

604

(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)

604.00

Costa Rica

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

832

(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)

832.00

Côte d'Ivoire

(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

Croatia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20798

(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)

20798.00

Cuba

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

11486

(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)

11486.00

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

63

(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)

63.00

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

38371

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

2031

(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)

40402.00

Democratic Republic of the Congo

(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

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

403

(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)

403.00

Fiji

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1547

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

101

(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)

1648.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

130

(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)

130.00

Ghana

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

53

(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)

53.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7475

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

10138

(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)

17613.00

Greece

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

152

(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)

152.00

Guyana

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26

(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)

26.00

Honduras

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3140

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

835

(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)

3975.00

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

74

(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)

74.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12598

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

6109

(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)

18707.00

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24432

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

62

(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)

24494.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16

(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)

16.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2330

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

579

(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)

2909.00

Jamaica

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

371

(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)

371.00

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

326

(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)

326.00

Jordan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1734

(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)

1734.00

Kazakhstan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

177

(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)

177.00

Kenya

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7234

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1368

(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)

8602.00

Latvia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

9.00

Malawi

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

39

(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)

39.00

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1987

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

93

(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)

2080.00

Mali

(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

Malta

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19

(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)

19.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

32608

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

5469

(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)

351

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

38428.00

Mozambique

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

228

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

23

(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)

251.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

37

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

380

(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)

417.00

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

97

(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)

97.00

Nigeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

23536

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1095

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1374

(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)

26005.00

North Macedonia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

34

(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)

34.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16

(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)

16.00

Pakistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

25004

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

5457

(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)

43

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

30504.00

Papua New Guinea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

511

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

5139

(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)

5650.00

Paraguay

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

174

(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)

174.00

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

111

(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)

111.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

47036

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

10

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

317

(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)

47363.00

Republic of Moldova

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1.00

Réunion

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

41

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

41.00

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

41162

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

485

(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)

41647.00

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33038

(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)

33038.00

Samoa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

167

(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)

167.00

Saudi Arabi

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2123

(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)

2123.00

Serbia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4272

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

8

(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)

41

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4321.00

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9010

(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)

9010.00

Solomon Islands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

259

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

114

(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)

373.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11963

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

21643

(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)

33606.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

83

(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)

83.00

Sri Lanka

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4742

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

442

(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)

5184.00

Sudan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3268

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

4648

(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)

7916.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3904

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

37

(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)

3941.00

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4724

(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)

4724.00

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

225

(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)

225.00

Trinidad and Tobago

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5258

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

393

(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)

5651.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13751

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

62915

(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)

76666.00

Uganda

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(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)

0.00

Ukraine

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13272

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

171

(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)

13443.00

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

486

(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)

486.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12965

(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)

12965.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

228075

(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)

228075.00

Uzbekistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13659

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

288

(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)

106

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

14053.00

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9902

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

351

(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)

10253.00

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8235

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1873

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

2926

(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)

13034.00

Zambia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2167

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

136

(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)

2303.00

Zimbabwe

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1085

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1652

(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)

17

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2754.00
[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

0.0000145

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

394375

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

27283000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

4.9

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Decrease by 4.9% vs 0.0000152 in 2022. Decrease is driven by decrease in combined Scope 1 and 2 (Market-based) emissions by 6.2% vs 2022, which was driven by emissions reduction activities as reported in 7.55.2, while revenue decreased by 1.3% vs 2022)

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.5908

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

394375

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

667580473

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

5.9

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Decrease by 5.9% vs 0.627 in 2022. Decrease is driven by decrease in combined Scope 1 and 2 (Market-based) emissions by 6.2% vs 2022, which was driven by emissions reduction activities as reported in 7.55.2, while total product weight decreased by 0.3% vs 2022).
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**% of sustainable wood

(7.52.2) Metric value

99.99

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

N/A

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

N/A

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.52.7) Please explain

BAT tobacco supply chain represents 23% of total scope 3 reportable emissions, mainly attributed to fuels used in the curing of flue cured tobacco, although also included other activities performed in the field such as crop inputs application, transport and mechanization. One of the most representative fuels used in the curing process is wood, with 99.9996% coming from sustainable sources. Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations to produce wood for tobacco curing. Considering the total volume of purchased cured tobacco, we have 85% of leaf volumes cured using renewable fuels and sustainable methods. Our Thrive Sustainable Agriculture and Farmer Livelihoods program guides and monitors the tobacco production to a more sustainable way. Through our field technician's technical visits we provide support and knowledge for farmers, encouraging them to apply more sustainable practices such as the use of recommended inputs (e.g. fertilisers, tobacco seed varieties, agrochemicals etc) and elimination of hazardous pesticides, the use of sustainable and renewable sources of fuel, no deforestation of native and natural vegetation, proper waste management, water preservation, and others. Taking all this into account BAT had more than 5% reductions of CO2 emissions reported in 2022 compared to 2021. 'Tobacco supply chain' refers to all tobacco we purchase for our products, which is used in our combustibles, Traditional Oral and Tobacco Heated Products.
[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

BRAM-UNI-003-OFF__Target Approval Certificate 1.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/18/2022

(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

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

11/30/2020

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

342034

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

198830

(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)

540864.000

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

11/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

270432.000

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

299209

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

95166

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

394375.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

54.17

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

BAT commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT commits that 20% of its suppliers by spend covering purchased goods and services will have science-based targets by 2025. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks. In alignment with the SBTi Forest, Land, and Agriculture (FLAG) Emissions Guidance published in 2022, and anticipating the forthcoming release of the final GHG Protocol Land Sector & Removals Guidance in 2024, BAT aims to establish SBTi FLAG-targets tailored to our value chain in 2024.*

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

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

BAT's strategy to achieve the 50% reduction target involves addressing Scope 2 emissions (market based) through the implementation of green electricity procurement methods (EAC's, green contracts, and PPA's) tailored to the specific characteristics of each market. Moreover, we aim to further enhance on-site generation to minimize Scope 1 emissions. This entails transitioning from coal or diesel to cleaner burner fuels like natural gas and, whenever feasible, embracing biomass alternatives. Additionally, we are committed to continuously advancing our energy efficiency initiatives and expanding on-site solar. In 2023, we made

substantial progress by effectively executing our plan, resulting in a 27% reduction in both Scope 1 and Scope 2 (market-based) emissions compared to our 2020 baseline (394,375 / 540,864) -1 -27%.

(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

BRAM-UNI-003-OFF__Target Approval Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/18/2022

(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

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

11/30/2020

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

5119936.9

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

348283

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

756206.6

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

231111.7

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

6455538.200

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

6455538.200

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.45) 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)

100.0

(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)

100.0

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

93.4

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

93.4

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

11/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3227769.100

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4301105.7

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

369524.8

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

768615.5

(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)

161192.5

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

5600438.500

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

5600438.500

(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

26.49

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

BAT commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT also commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, upstream transportation and distribution, use of sold products, and end of life treatment of sold products 50% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. BAT commits that 20% of its suppliers by spend covering purchased goods and services will have science-based targets by 2025. *The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks. In alignment with the SBTi Forest, Land, and Agriculture (FLAG) Emissions Guidance and the draft GHG Protocol Land Sector & Removals Guidance, we have submitted our revised, FLAG aligned science-based targets to the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) and awaiting formal validation. Our revised targets are in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway.*

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

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

Scope 3 GHG emissions (including biogenic emissions and removals) comprise most of our total carbon footprint, contributing to 93% of our total value chain emissions in 2022. In order to reduce Scope 3 emissions, we are focusing our efforts on the most carbon intensive categories first, taking the following approach: 1. Collaborating with tobacco farmers through our carbon-smart farming initiative; 2. Using sustainable fuels for tobacco curing; 3. Building a more climate-resilient supply chain partnership with direct and indirect suppliers; and 4. Fostering a circular economy throughout our value chain by simplifying the design of our products to improve recyclability and implementing product Take-Back schemes for our New Category products. Due to the complexity of consolidating and verifying Scope 3 data in accordance with the GHG Protocol, we report on Scope 3 one year behind. Therefore, please note that current emissions populated above are related to our reporting year 2023 (Dec-22 to Nov-23) for Scope 1 and Scope 2 while Scope 3 emissions correspond to the reporting year 2022 (Dec-21 to Nov-22). The 2023 reporting period Scope 3 emissions figures are underway.

(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
☑ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Low 2

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

07/18/2022

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:
☑ All energy carriers

(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

11/30/2020

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

2568143

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

26.8

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

11/30/2030

(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

38.1

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

48.71

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

No

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The parameter is: Percentage (%), share of renewable energy used (Mwh) in direct energy used (MWh), i.e. energy used by our sites & offices and fleet vehicles. Renewable energy use (MWh) covers the use of renewable fuels as well as purchased green electricity, heat and steam. Use of renewable fuels helps to reduce Scope 1 CO2e emissions since emissions factors associated with renewable fuels are significantly lower than that of non-renewable fuels. Use of purchased renewable electricity, heat and steam allows to reduce Scope 2 CO2e emissions as per Market-Based method since emissions factors associated with renewable electricity are zero or significantly lower than that of standard grid electricity. Thus, actions to achieve this target contribute to achievement of Emissions Target Abs 1. There are no exclusions in the scope of the target and parameter monitored against it.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

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

The plan for achieving the Renewable energy target includes: 1/ energy generated from renewable fuels at our sites (e.g. wood fuel, bio mass fuels) and in fleet vehicles, owned or leased (e.g. biodiesel), 2/ purchased renewable electricity, hot water and steam 3/ renewable energy generated on site using non-fuel technology (e.g. with photovoltaic installations or solar water heaters) These focus on 1/ opportunities to purchase of electrical energy that is by 100% generated from renewable sources with proper substantiation thereof and 2/ opportunities for on-site renewable energy generation such as biomass.

Row 2

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 3

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

11/30/2020

(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

11/30/2017

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

982285

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

10.71

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

11/30/2030

(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

75.2

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

72.23

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

No

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The parameter is: Percentage (%), share of renewable electricity (MWh) in total electricity purchased (MWh) by our Operations. Operations sites refers to all BAT-owned cigarette manufacturing factories, sites manufacturing other tobacco products, snus, modern oral and liquids and green leaf threshing (GLT) tobacco processing sites. Use of purchased renewable allows to reduce Scope 2 CO2e emissions as per Market-Based method since emissions factors associated with renewable electricity are zero or significantly lower than that of standard grid electricity. Thus, actions to achieve this target contribute to achievement of Emissions

Target Abs 1. The target and parameter monitored against it does not cover 1/ electricity generated on site for consumption from both renewable (e.g. solar installations) and non-renewable sources (e.g. diesel used by stand-by generators).

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

The target is to achieve 100% green purchased electricity in our operations by 2030. Curently we are exploring different opportunities to purchase renewable electricity for our Operations facilities including purchase of renewable energy attribute cetificates under national (e.g. GoO, REC) and international (e.g. I-REC, TIGR) schemes, buying electricity under 'green tariffs' as well as concluding power purchase argeements.

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

The target is to achieve 100% green purchased electricity in our operations by 2030. Curently we are exploring different opportunities to purchase renewable electricity for our Operations facilities including purchase of renewable energy attribute cetificates under national (e.g. GoO, REC) and international (e.g. I-REC, TIGR) schemes, buying electricity under 'green tariffs' as well as concluding power purchase argeements.
[Add row]

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

11/30/2018

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ metric tons of waste generated

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

11/30/2017

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

160124

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

11/30/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

136105

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

114945

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

188.0969232691

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

CO2e emissions associated with managing waste generated constitute a minor part of Scope 3 emissions, thus there are no additional targets focussing on this category specifically.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target is to decrease the absolute volume of waste generated by 15% by 2025 In monitoring the parameter against the target we follow the GRI 306 Waste 2020 Standard namely Disclosure 3063 for waste generated from our direct operations as well as data from BAT facilities this also includes construction waste generated in BAT premises from onsite constructions building modifications or extensions. Our 2017 baseline figure is 160124 tonnes Baseline is not adjusted in case of closure or acquisition of new sites Target covers all waste generated across our direct operations without any exclusions

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

(7.54.2.21) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

The target to decrease the absolute volume of waste generated by 15% by 2025, which was achieved 3 years in advance of the target horizon in 2022. It was then replaced with Oth2 (decrease the absolute volume of waste generated by 25% by 2025). The early achievement of the target was driven by various waste-reduction activities, such as improvements in machinery efficiency and material management. We are committed to maintaining our target and exploring further waste reduction initiative within our direct operations, with our Global Waste Centre of Excellence (CoE) team, that applies our Integrated Work System tools to identify and address our "waste top losses" and to amplify solutions within our operations as Global Best Practices for Waste Management. These activities have continued to drive further reduction in absolute volume of waste generated, in 2023, we achieved a 28.2% reduction.

Row 3

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 2

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

07/18/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ metric tons of waste generated

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

11/30/2017

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

160124.0

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

11/30/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

120093

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

114945

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

112.8600334741

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

CO2e emissions associated with managing waste generated constitute a minor part of Scope 3 emissions, thus there are no additional targets focussing on this category specifically.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target is to decrease the absolute volume of waste generated by 25% by 2025. The target was newly set in 2022 in replacement of the target to decrease the absolute volume of waste generated by 15% by 2025, which was achieved 3 years in advance of the target horizon. In monitoring the parameter against the target we follow the GRI 306: Waste 2020 Standard, namely Disclosure 306-3 for waste generated from our direct operations. As well as data from BAT facilities, this also includes construction waste generated in BAT premises from on-site constructions, building modifications or extensions. Our 2017 baseline figure is 160,124 tonnes. Baseline is not adjusted in case of closure or acquisition of new sites. Target covers all waste generated across our direct operations, without any exclusions.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

(7.54.2.21) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

In 2023, we achieved a 28.2% reduction in waste generated. This means that we exceeded our target of 25% reduction in waste generated (vs 2017 baseline), two years ahead of schedule. This was driven by various waste-reduction activities, such as improvements in machinery efficiency and material management. We are committed to maintaining our target and exploring further waste reduction initiative within our direct operations, with our Global Waste Centre of Excellence (CoE) team, that applies our Integrated Work System tools to identify and address our "waste top losses" and to amplify solutions within our operations as Global Best Practices for Waste Management

Row 5

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 3

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

11/30/2018

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ Percentage of total waste generated that is recycled

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

11/30/2017

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

81.58

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

11/30/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

90

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

87.57

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

71.1401425178

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

CO2e emissions associated with managing waste generated constitute a minor part of Scope 3 emissions, thus there are no additional targets focussing on this category specifically.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target is to achieve a 90% recycling rate of waste generated within our direct operations by 2025. In 2022, the target was revised by changing the commitment from 95% to 90%. The previous target was set before alignment with new GRI 306 Waste 2020 Standard stipulating to no longer include waste to energy including incineration for energy recovery and converting waste into fuel as a form of recycling. Our revised target of 90% is in line with the targets of our industry peers and is considered reasonable taking into account our current performance and action plan to drive the glidepath to our 2025 commitment. Our definition of Waste generation is aligned with GRI 306 Waste 2020 Standard. The definition of Waste Recycled covers both Waste Recycled and Waste Preparation for Reuse as per GRI 306 Waste 2020 Standard Recycling and is the operation applied to items or materials that have become waste to ensure they fulfil a purpose in place of new items or materials that would otherwise have been used for that purpose. This does not include energy recovery neither via incineration nor via conversion into fuel. Each our reporting unit reports the total amount of waste generation and its breakdown by final destination including recycling. Recycling rate is calculated as Waste Recycled tonnes divided by Waste Generated tonnes.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

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

In 2023, our waste recycling rate increased to 87.6%, driven by waste segregation and recycling programmes across our operations sites. This was driven by various waste-recycling projects, such as improvements in machinery efficiency and material management. We are committed to achieve our target and exploring further waste recycling opportunities within our direct operations, with our Global Waste Centre of Excellence (CoE) team, that applies our Integrated Work System tools to identify and address our "waste top losses" and to amplify solutions within our operations as Global Best Practices for Waste Management.

Row 6

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 4

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

11/30/2020

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ Percentage of sites operating at zero-waste to landfill

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

11/30/2017

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

23.88

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

11/30/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

100

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

74

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

65.8434051498

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Retired

(7.54.2.14) Explain the reasons for the revision, replacement, or retirement of the target

In 2022 the targets was retired and replaced by another target addressing the same performacne metric: less that 1% waste to landfill across Group direct operations by 2025. This metric is more holistic, as it covers all our direct operations, including offices, warehousing facilities, R&D centres etc., rather than only Operations sites. Further, it focusses on total amount of waste to landfill rather than on count of individual sites.

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

CO2e emissions associated with managing waste generated constitute a minor part of Scope 3 emissions, thus there are no additional targets focussing on this category specifically.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

"The target to have all of our Operations sites at zero waste to landfill was set 2020. Operations sites refers to all BAT-owned cigarette manufacturing factories, sites manufacturing other tobacco products, snus, modern oral and liquids and green leaf threshing (GLT) tobacco processing sites. Thus, offices and other facilities apart from those at Operations sites are out of scope of the target. Each reporting unit reports the total amount of waste generation and its breakdown by final destination,

including landfill. Whenever site reports all waste as recycled or incinerated with or without energy recovery and no waste sent to landfill, it is considered being at site at zero waste to landfill. Due to difference in infrastructure maturity in different geographies, the types of waste that are sent to landfill vary from one reporting unit to another. In 2022 the targets was retired and replaced by another target addressing the same performacne metric: less that 1% waste to landfill across Group direct operations by 2025. This metric is more holistic, as it covers all our direct operations, including offices, warehousing facilities, R&D centres etc., rather than only Operations sites. Further, it focusses on total amount of waste to landfill rather than on count of individual sites"

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

Row 7

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 5

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

07/18/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☑ Other waste management, please specify :Percentage of total waste generated that is sent to landfill

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

11/30/2017

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

10.11

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

11/30/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

1

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

1.79

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

91.3282107574

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

CO2e emissions associated with managing waste generated constitute a minor part of Scope 3 emissions, thus there are no additional targets focussing on this category specifically.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target is to decrease the percentage of waste generated across our direct operations that is sent to landfill to less than 1% by 2025. This is the target newly set in 2022 on the account that that landfilling is the least preferable option in waste management hierarchy because of its negative impacts on the environment and human health. The target complements our target for achieving 90% waste recycling rate by 2025 and replaces that target for 100% of Operations site at zero waste to landfill as it extends the commitment to the whole scope of our direct operations while taking into consideration that at certain geographies landfill is the only legally appropriate option of disposing certain types of waste. In monitoring the parameter against the target we follow the GRI 306 Waste 2020 Standard namely Disclosure 3065 for waste directed to disposal Each reporting unit reports the total amount of waste generation and its breakdown by final destination including landfill. Our 2017 baseline figure is 1011 Baseline is not adjusted in case of closure or acquisition of new sites. Target covers all waste generated across our direct operations without any exclusions.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

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

In 2023, we achieved a 1.78% in waste to landfill. This was driven by various waste-reduction and recycling activities, such as improvements in machinery efficiency, material management, circular economy processes Re-utilization of products etc. We are committed to maintaining our target and exploring further waste reduction and recycling initiatives within our direct operations, with our Global Waste Centre of Excellence (CoE) team, that applies our Integrated Work System tools to identify and address our "waste top losses" and to amplify solutions within our operations as Global Best Practices for Waste Management.
[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

03/02/2023

(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

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

11/30/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and the target is currently being reviewed by the Science Based Targets initiative

(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

BAT has affirmed its commitment to taking decisive action on climate change. As part of this commitment, BAT is dedicated to establish a long term/net zero science-based targets that aim for net-zero emissions across its entire value chain by 2050. The urgent need to prevent the average global temperature from rising beyond 1.5C above pre-industrial levels necessitates substantial and widespread efforts. As a company, BAT recognizes that it must manage its climate change risks and impacts and is therefore aligning its existing sustainability targets with this critical trajectory. Our ultimate objective is to achieve net-zero emissions throughout our value chain no later than 2050. We have submitted our long term/net zero science-based targets to the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) and awaiting formal validation. Our targets are in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway and aligned with the SBTi Forest, Land, and Agriculture (FLAG) Emissions Guidance and the draft GHG Protocol Land Sector & Removals Guidance.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

We recognise that our business and wider society relies on natural resources which will be impacted by the effects of climate change, and that we must work to adapt to those effect. Our targets are set under the Paris Agreement in-line with the 1.5-degree pathway with the objective of decarbonising both our direct operations and value chain and achieving Net Zero GHG emissions by 2050 at the latest.

(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

In order to fulfil our ambitious climate objectives, we have developed a comprehensive climate strategy that encompasses not only our own business operations but also our broader value chain. Our milestones consist of short-term targets, approved by SBTi, aimed at achieving a 50% reduction in Scopes 1, 2, and 50% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2030 compared to a 2020 baseline. Additionally, we are committed to achieving carbon neutrality in our direct operations by 2030. To achieve a 50% reduction in Scopes 1 and 2 emissions, we have established a renewable energy use target of 50% by 2030. This target is supported by an increase in the utilization of renewable energy sources and power purchase agreements (PPAs). We are also investing in on-site renewable energy generation projects such as solar and biomass. Furthermore, we are accelerating our Energy Conservation (ENERCON) program, which focuses on energy efficiency, through investments in energy-efficient projects and management systems. Additionally, we are actively expanding the deployment of electric, plug-in hybrid, and hybrid vehicles to minimize emissions from our fleet. To address Scope 3 emissions, we are working on establishing a climate-resilient supply chain that involves both direct and indirect suppliers. This effort is reinforced by our objective of having 20% of our suppliers set Science-Based targets by 2025. Building on the expertise of our Global Leaf Agronomy Development team we have launched Carbon Smart Farming. Through this initiative we are working with farmers to find more efficient and sustainable fuel alternatives for tobacco curing, as an example in 2022 we met our internally set milestone for BAT Group's own leaf operations to not use energy generated from coal in the curing process. Through the same initiative we are looking at practices in farming to build resilience against climate change. Finally, we are committed to fostering circularity throughout our value chain by incorporating design concepts that consider the end-of-life phase of our products and increasing the utilization of more recycled / recyclable materials. This will help us reduce product waste and make progress towards our goals.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Our approach to managing Climate Change impacts is shaped by our climate strategy, which is aligned to our Group Environment Policy, as well as our Climate Change and Energy Standard. We continue to drive progress towards our near-term 2030 science-based targets across Scope 1,2 and 3 emissions, through which we aim to achieve our long term/Net Zero target. We track progress against these targets on an annual basis and we publish the progress within our BAT Integrated report.
[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	*110*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*77*	*38027*
Implementation commenced	*25*	*12601*
Implemented	*64*	*18243*
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

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

227

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

36764

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

256261

(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

Implementation of metering systems to monitor energy, compressed air and vacuum for further addressing key consumers based on the measurements; detection and early fixing of leakages/ losses

Row 2

(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)

515

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

115081

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

645966

(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

Modernization of HVAC systems in key and auxillary departments, incl. replacement of HVAC components where losses of energy were identiified. Implemented at certain factories & GLTs in line with 5-year energy saving plans

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Insulation

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

557

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

10955

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

181474

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Improved insultation of steam valves and distribution sytems

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

423

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

125362

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

471791

(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

Lighting management, incl. LED lighting installation & use of natural lighting, equipping buildings with insulation panels. Implemented across factories and GLTs.

Row 5

(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)

492

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

246575

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

410963

(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

Replacement and improvement of compressed air generation system to improve efficiency and reduce losses. Implemented at certain factories & GLTs in line with 5-year energy saving plans

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Motors and drives

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

41

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

3683

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

20000

(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

Replacement of motors and drives for more efficient models. Implemented at certain factories & GLTs in line with 5-year energy saving plans

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Other, please specify :Steam

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

351

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)
☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

4189

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

436935

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Upgrade of steam generation and supply system to recover and reuse steam; flash steam recovery in boliers. Implemented at certain factories & GLTs in line with 5-year energy saving plans

Row 8

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1344

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

471450

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

573704

(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

Set of energy efficiency initiatives, equipment utilisation optimisation, VSD's, control improvements, harmonics reduction, others

Row 9

(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)

2354

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

157047

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

984000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Solution for automatic control of HVAC and boilers in some factories and GLTs (Artificial Intelligence)

Row 10

(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)

98

(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)

116000

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

34000

(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

Recovery of waste heat through heat exchangers. Implemented at certain factories in line with 5-year energy saving plans

Row 11

(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)

5025

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

2142728

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

8295355

(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

Installation of solar panels for on-site electricity generation

Row 12

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solid biofuels

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

6816

(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)

1087000

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

2828676

(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

Installation of biomass boilers for steam production. All of the biofuels derived are from sustainable biomass.
[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

At a site level there is an allocated budget to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements and standards (including those related to climate change). Budgetary requirements are reviewed on an annual basis during a planning and budget allocation process; and as and when a new regulatory requirement/standard is introduced. An example is the investment in emissions reduction activities driven by compliance with both the UK Streamlined Energy and Carbon Reporting (SECR) and the European Union Energy Savings Opportunity Scheme (ESOS). We observe that a growing number of companies outside the EU are beginning to develop clearer commitments which favour local partners for implementation of emissions reduction technologies.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We continue to fund a dedicated ESG capital investment budget for use in delivering our ESG objectives and external commitments including investment in projects to improve the efficiency of our factory infrastructure (emissions, water, waste), drive product innovation related projects which improve our environment credentials (increased use of recycled material), and projects to enhance our social performance (farmer livelihoods via mechanisation, yield improvement projects, and others).Internal Carbon Price and marginal abatement cost metrics are used as a means of prioritising projects and allocating the dedicated budget.The Capital investment budget amounted to 20mn in 2021 and is set to rise to 42mn in 2023.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Employee engagement and related initiatives are a critical element in how we reduce energy consumption/CO2e emissions. Such initiatives have an allocated budget at a site level. This is reviewed on yearly basis during a planning and budget allocation process. Awareness and communication campaign are in place to imbed energy saving and waste reduction culture. World Earth Day & Environment Day are celebrated annually across BAT to trigger related local campaigns.
[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:

☑ MP5

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Reducing energy use

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Via trials supported by our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre we identify the most efficient curing methods resulting in reduced energy use.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Engagement via technical assistance directly in the field (scheduled periodic visits) for 100% of directly contracted farmers, sharing innovative solutions and possibilities to increase their energy efficiency.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fossil fuel (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

In the areas from which we purchase tobacco, the main driver of energy consumption on the farms is during the curing process. Our Field Technicians provide advice to our directly contracted farmers on ways to improve curing efficiency. Upgrading curing barns to automated 'loose leaf' models can enable at least a 30% reduction in fuel use. These innovative curing technologies have been introduced to our directly contracted farmers in 4 countries. E.g. In Brazil, 58% of our directly contracted farmers benefit from this technology and 35% use other types of efficient air forced barns. As well as making the curing process more efficient, it is also 45% less

labour intensive. In Sri Lanka, where the farmers already have sustainable sources of curing fuel, (by implementing an automated paddy husk feeder in the Loose-leaf barns) a 37% reduction in fuel consumption has been achieved. 59 units have been delivered to these farmers, helping to reduce operating costs.

Row 2

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

In the tobacco curing process it is common to use wood as a fuel. As we rely upon this natural resource, we have programmes in place to avoid and also combat deforestation, promoting the use of sustainable wood sources as well as enhancing farmers' self-sufficiency. To support this, we provide farmers with seedlings, where possible, to encourage them to meet future fuel needs without causing deforestation.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

We provide training and education for farmers in order to explain the importance and benefits of reforestation. We also provide saplings of trees to our directly contracted farmers to encourage reforestation in most of the areas from which we source tobacco. BAT has set a target to achieve 100% of wood used by directly contracted farmers for tobacco curing to be from sustainable wood source. In 2023 we had 99.9996% of the tobacco volume cured with wood from a sustainable wood source. Ongoing work in this area, complemented with deforestation risk assessments, maintain our focus and allow us to improve year on year. In 2023, we also ran a proof of concept for a new technology, remote sensing deforestation monitoring, to improve the accuracy of our current monitoring.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

We provide our directly contracted farmers with tree saplings to grow and develop as sources of sustainable fuel for tobacco curing, as well as training in forest and biodiversity management. Our third-party suppliers are expected to follow similar practices with their own contracted farmers. Since the 1970s, we have provided more than 415 million saplings to our directly contracted farmers and their local communities in Brazil, Kenya, Bangladesh and Pakistan to promote wood self-sufficiency. The largest programs are run in Pakistan and Bangladesh (e.g. our Bonayan afforestation programme through which we have distributed over 115 million free saplings to rural communities since it started).

Row 3

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Field technicians from our Leaf operations, perform field visits to our directly contracted farmers approximately once a month for the entire season. The technicians act as a direct link between the farmers and BAT, building trusted relationships and working with the farmers to develop their skills, promote better yields and maintain standards by providing agronomy support and recommending sustainable curing technologies and alternative fuels. Our third-party leaf suppliers follow a similar approach with their own contracted farmers, providing them with training to help build their skills, knowledge and awareness on a range of topics including natural resources preservation. In 2023, it was reported through Thrive assessments that there were more than 458,000 attendees engaged via farmer training, covering topics including natural resources preservation which includes forest conservation, soil management, sustainable wood, integrated pest management, water management and also themes relating to biodiversity.

(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

Engagement via technical assistance directly in the field (scheduled periodic visits) which is delivered for 100% of farmers.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Reduced demand for fossil fuel (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

Field technicians act as a key, direct link between farmers & BAT. They build trusted relationships and work with the farmers to develop their skills, promote better yields and maintain standards. The BAT Global Leaf Agronomy Centre develops innovative farming techniques and technologies which are deployed to our contracted farmers by our expert field technicians. These technologies and solutions (including sustainable conservationist soil best practices, hybrid tobacco seed varieties) offer greater yields and higher quality, helping boost farmers' profits at the same time as minimising additional land requirements for tobacco growing, reducing demand for fuel in the curing process and changing to more sustainable types of fuel. Sustainable farming practices bring environmental and social benefits. For example, technical support provided to contracted farmers in Brazil, over a period of 10 years, has led to a 40% increase in yields, in terms of kilogram per hectare.

Row 4

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP8

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Crop diversity

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

If farmers continuously grow the same crop on the same area (land 'monocropping') it risks depletion of soil nutrients and an increase in the probability of diseases and pest occurrence. Crop rotation is recognised as one of the best practice approaches to protecting and enhancing soil health and also reducing pressure from pests and diseases. We encourage crop diversification; this not only increases farmers' resilience by preventing reliance on just one crop but also helps to enhance food security and preserve soil health.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Implementation is encouraged via agricultural technical assistance visits from our technicians at the farms of our directly contracted farmers.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

In 2023, 93% of tobacco farmers in our supply chain were reported to grow other crops in addition to tobacco. This is monitored by our field technicians and reported in our Thrive program. Thrive is our tobacco sustainability programme where all elements around sustainable tobacco production are tracked - it provides us with a high level of understanding on how our suppliers and farmers are responding to our priorities.

Row 5

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Integrated pest management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Solutions vary according to the growing region, type of property, options available from market to market, eventually property by property.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Engagement via technical assistance directly in the field (scheduled periodic visits), showing the benefits of integrated pest management, through demonstration in the field or training. BAT encourage their directly contracted farmers and also their strategic suppliers to implement integrated pest management techniques. One of these techniques in the use of natural biocontrol agents. Our Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre works to continuously enhance integrated pest management strategies, which are then deployed to the farmers by our Field Technicians. Ongoing developments include - selection of disease-resistant tobacco varieties, the use of biological control strategies that can lead to a reduction in the use of agrochemicals and biodiversity preservation, and usage of digital tool to identify pests by a smartphone.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

In Brazil, 33% of our directly contracted farmers use some form of biological control techniques for pest control, e.g. the use of natural predators for specific seedbed pests for insect control. In Bangladesh we have introduced, with our contracted farmers, bio-fungicides in seedbeds & pheromone traps. BAT continues to map commercially available biocontrol alternatives globally and look to introduce these to our directly contracted farmers where appropriate. BAT also delivers tailored training on integrated pest management techniques to support directly contracted farmers to implement biocontrol techniques. In addition to the biocontrol, BAT is helping to reduce agrochemical use and contamination risk through decreasing chemical run-off and water-pollution risks, disposal schemes for empty agrochemical containers, higher-yielding & more disease-resistant tobacco seed varieties.

Row 6

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Diversifying farmer income

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We encourage our farmers to grow others crops in addition to tobacco, towards a diverse portfolio of crops that can also be rotated with tobacco crop. BAT's position is that this will improve food security and increase farmers' resilience by providing additional sources of income. In 2023, 93.6% of our farmers in the Tobacco Supply Chain were reported to be growing other crops.

(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

Educating and supporting our directly contracted farmers to grow other crops for food or as additional sources of income, providing free seeds, crop inputs and training, as well as help accessing markets to sell their production. Encouraging cultivation of corn, wheat and pastureland after the tobacco harvest. The Group's

own Leaf Operations and strategic third-party suppliers educate and support tobacco farmers on crop diversification, with more than 91,817 people engaged via training delivered in 2023.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

Rural poverty is recognised as a primary root cause for issues such as child and forced labour, as well as poor safety and environmental standards. Enhancing farmer livelihoods helps tackle such issues and strengthen our supply chain. Profitable farms with good incomes mean farmers are more likely to adhere to safety and environmental standards. Training on crop diversification and rotation practices supports this by encouraging additional sources of income for the farmers.

Row 7

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP7

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Fertilizer management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Soil management practices, preparation of land for crop growth and the technique used to apply fertiliser can support carbon emissions reduction. This is the concept of our Carbon Smart Farming initiative which takes a strategic approach, focused on reducing emissions from tobacco farming and leveraging the positive effect that agriculture can have in removing carbon from the atmosphere. The latter may be achieved by planting trees, as well as through methods such as cover crops and conservation tillage that can keep the soil covered and undisturbed. This can lead to reductions in the need for fertiliser application and losses from nitrogen volatilization. Nitrogen fertilisers with lower emissions were tested on Air Cured Burley and showed similar performance to traditional fertiliser. Use of High Wide Base with Mulching to grow tobacco is a technology that reduces the losses of soil to surrounding areas, enhancing the efficiency of fertiliser usage. Higher efficiency in fertilisation reduces the need for additional fertiliser application and the related CO2 emissions. The technological package for fertilisation takes into consideration

each soil type and its nutrient stocks when reducing the use of nitrogen fertiliser. In countries like Brazil, Chile and Mexico, nitrogen fertilisation needs to follow a more tailored solution which considers soil organic matter content and the current availability of nutrients, in preventing application of excess of nitrogen. In the ongoing search for new solutions, we are evaluating new management strategies that allow for the elimination of nitrogen use.

(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

Implementation of smarter use of fertilizers is encouraged via agricultural techniques and also best practices for soil and water conservation which is shared through our field technicians' field visit of our directly contracted farmers.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

☑ Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

In 2022, 82% of tobacco hectares in our tobacco supply chain were reported to have appropriate best practice soil and water management plans implemented. In 2023, 81% of tobacco hectares in our tobacco supply chain were reported to have appropriate best practice in regard to soil and water management practices. These percentages were reported via Thrive in respect of the total reported tobacco volume. The 1% reduction in 2023 was due to a wider coverage compared with the previous year. We aim to achieve 100% of hectares (entire tobacco supply chain) following these best practices.

Row 8

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Waste management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

Solutions vary according to the growing region, type of property, options available from market to market, programs in place by municipalities, industry approach programs and others.

(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

Engagement via technical assistance directly in the field (scheduled periodic visits), encouraging safe disposal of agrochemicals to prevent harm to health, safety and the environment.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

BAT's Leaf Supplier Manual (LSM) requires all tobacco farmers to implement best practices and participate in a collection and disposal program for empty agrochemical containers. In some countries, BAT provides additional support to collect and safely dispose of empty containers for pesticides and other agrochemicals. For example, in Brazil, BAT partners with an industry scheme that collects and recycles containers from over 100,000 farms across the country. Chile, Kenya, Fiji, Uzbekistan, Mexico, USA and China are some of our markets where 100% of our directly contracted farmers reported to have safely disposed of Crop Protection Agent containers in 2023. In Croatia, almost 80% of our directly contracted farmers participate in a municipal waste programme for recycling seedling trays and empty agrochemical containers. This allows them to dispose of waste safely and also reduce uncontrolled waste incineration without energy recovery.
[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:

☑ 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

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Forests are natural sources for carbon sequestration, improving social and environmental climate resilience. At the same time, reforestation activities establish and preserve forests, being habitats for animals and plants, thus have positive effects on biodiversity.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

The impact is positive, thus no response is required

Row 2

(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

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Coverage: BAT's directly contracted farmers and those of strategic suppliers cover 84% of sourced tobacco. BAT, leveraging on the many years of experience from its Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre, works with its directly contracted farmers to train them and develop their skills to promote better yields and higher quality, soil and water best practices, as well as to encourage the use of sustainable fuel for curing. Applying sustainable farming practices and use of sustainable fuel allows to reduce environmental impact of the activities in farms and curing, thus reducing negative impact on the natural habitat at the adjacent areas and preserving species of fauna and flora presented in these areas.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

The impact is positive, thus no response is required

Row 3

(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

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Coverage: contracted farmers and those of strategic suppliers cover more than 80% of sourced tobacco. BAT, leveraging on the many years of experience of the Global Leaf Agronomy Development Centre, works with the directly contracted farmers to train them and develop their skills to promote better yields and higher quality, soil and water best practices as well as to encourage them for using sustainable fuel for curing. Applying sustainable farming practices and use of sustainable fuel allows to minimize environmental impact of the activities in farms and curing, thus minimizing negative impact on the natural habitat at the adjacent areas and preserving species of fauna and flora presented in these areas.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

The impact is positive, thus no response is required

Row 4

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Water

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

BAT Global Leaf Agronomy Centre develops new tobacco seed varieties that offer greater yields, as well as higher quality and resistance to diseases. This helps to boost farmers' profits as well as to grow leaf more efficiently using the same area of land and similar amounts of water while applying less pesticides. Overall yield improvement is linked with improved social metrics which are also essential to our farmer's livelihood approach.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

The impact is positive, thus no response is required
[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:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits canceled by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS2087: Chudu Afforestation Project is located in Xichuan County, Nanyang City, Henan Province of China. The project aims to plant native species on barren lands for GHG removal whilst contributing to local sustainable development goals. 36,500 ha of the forest was planted on barren lands in Xichuan county which used to be poor sustainable ecological environment and rocky desertification. The implementation of the project activity has provided 33,000 jobs for local villagers, among which 23,100 are women accounting for 70%, and 100 technicians. There is no natural renewal and reforestation before the project, and all sites were covered by the barren hill and rocky desertification lands.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

21223

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2017

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Besides the main of the project to sequester greenhouse gas and mitigate climate change; the the project activity would also enhance biodiversity conservation by increasing the connectivity of forests; improve soil and water conservation in the rocky desertification lands; generate income and job opportunities for local communities.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 2

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS2112: The grouped project aim is to recover degraded grasslands in Vichada, Colombia, through the establishment of timber plantations. The first instance consists of the afforestation of 30,605 ha of low-fertility grasslands that have been degraded by livestock in the municipalities of Puerto Carreño and La Primavera, it includes the planting of Eucalyptus (Eucalyptus pellita) and Acacia (Acacia mangium) as timber species. Through afforestation activities to recover degraded lands, the project aims to promote connectivity between ecosystems.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1550

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2019

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Besides the main of the project to sequester greenhouse gas and mitigate climate change, the project is expected to provide more than 200 full-time employment opportunities (with equal access to women and men) in a zone historically affected by poverty.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 3

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

ACR509: The Kite Hammock IFM project is a forest conservation project utilizing the Improved Forest Management methodology. The project is composed of 5,274 acres of mature Bottomland Hardwood Forest that has been historically part of a harvest rotation in the West Central Florida region known as the Nature Coast. By forging harvest the project will strengthen the integrity of the watershed that is home to a multitude of flora and fauna including nesting habitat for the Swallow-tailed Kite (Elanoides forficatis).

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

7432

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2017

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ ACR (American Carbon Registry)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Program supports family forest landowners in collaboration with local conservation groups, government agencies, university extensions, associations, and landowner groups to improve forest management on both certified and uncertified lands.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 4

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

ACR508: The Otter Creek IFM project is a forest conservation project utilizing the Improved Forest Management methodology. The project is composed of 4,511 acres of mature Bottomland Hardwood Forest that has been historically part of a harvest rotation in the West Central Florida region known as the Nature Coast. By forging harvest the project will preserve the integrity of the watershed that is home to a multitude of flora and fauna including River Otters, Black Bears and several important avian species.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

987

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2017

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ ACR (American Carbon Registry)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The identified risks and potential impacts resulting from the project activities include; climate change mitigation/adaptation, biodiversity, air quality, water quality, soil quality, ozone quality, and natural habitat protection/conservation/restoration. All impacts are identified as positive or neutral.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 5

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

ERF115667 Duff Carbon Farming Project, (QLD). This project establishes permanent native forests through assisted regeneration from in-situ seed sources (including rootstock and lignotubers) on land that was cleared of vegetation and where regrowth was suppressed for at least 10 years prior to the project having commenced

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

430

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2017

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ Other regulatory carbon crediting program, please specify :ACCU (Australian Carbon Credit Units)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Projects addresses number of issues: sequester greenhouse gas and mitigate climate change; enhance biodiversity conservation by increasing the connectivity of forests; improve soil and water conservation in the rocky desertification lands; generate income and job opportunities for local communities

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 6

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

ERF104646 Paroo River North Environmental Project (QLD). This project establishes permanent native forests through assisted regeneration from in-situ seed sources (including rootstock and lignotubers) on land that was cleared of vegetation and where regrowth was suppressed for at least 10 years prior to the project having commenced.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2016

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ Other regulatory carbon crediting program, please specify :ACCU (Australian Carbon Credit Units)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Project addresses number of issues: sequester greenhouse gas and mitigate climate change; enhance biodiversity conservation by increasing the connectivity of forests; improve soil and water conservation in the rocky desertification lands; generate income and job opportunities for local communities

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 7

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Reforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS799: The ARR project activity of the Bukaleba Forest Project (BFP) is implemented on land within the Bukaleba Central Forest Reserve (BCFR) in the administrative district of Mayuge, Eastern Uganda. The project activity will establish and manage exotic and indigenous reforestation on approximately 2,061 ha of degraded shrub and grassland.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

986

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2012

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Besides the main aims of the project which are i) To establish and manage forest plantations to meet the growing demand for high quality wood products and ii)To sequester carbon dioxide through forest planting, the project is also aimed: i) To promote environmental conservation such as soil conservation, protection of water sources and enhancement of biodiversity through the protection and management of existing indigenous flora and fauna and where possible enrichment planting with indigenous tree species. ii) To facilitate socio-economic development of the local communities through: - Promotion of tree planting/afforestation activities in the local communities; - Provision of employment opportunities; - Support for development initiatives for the communities through the sale of carbon credits; - Establishing of community woodlots in the villages around BFP on community owned land, with the objective of increasing fuel and timber supply within the communities; - Designating 10% of the carbon revenues generated by the project to community development initiatives in the villages surrounding BFP; ii) To develop local infrastructure including roads, health centers, water supply and communication systems.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 8

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Project VCU2404: India, Odisha, Andhra Pradesh and Chhattisgarh, Reforestation of degraded land by Mangalam Timber Products Limited, Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use. The project activity involves carbon sequestration of degraded lands through reforestation activities. Many discrete parcels of degraded land that is owned by small and poor farmers/ tribal who do not have the capability of plantation without any external financial support and technical guidance are reforested under Farm Forestry Scheme.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

2224

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2011

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Besides increasing the forest cover and improvement in biodiversity in the area, the project activity would also provide enhanced sources of livelihood and income in rural areas by generating large employment opportunities. The project has been undertaken to protect the land which was severely degraded or degrading. Prior to the project activity the lands were wastelands due to severe soil erosion without considerable flora. The reforestation under the proposed project activity is on degraded land which was lying barren since decades. The farmers who own the land are mainly poor farmers/tribal who do not have the capability of growing plantation of their own without any external financial support and technical guidance. In absence of the project activity the land would have continued as degraded land or degrading would continue further.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 16

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS1864: Puzhen Afforestation Project in Guizhou Province is located in Puding County and Zhenning County, Anshun City, Guizhou Province, China. The project is to establish forest on the barren land to generate GHG emission reductions and contribute to local sustainable development. The project is jointed implemented by Forestry Bureau of Puding County and Forestry Bureau of Zhenning County. 26,551ha of forest was established by direct planted on degraded lands in two counties. Puding County and Zhenning County, belongs to Anshun City, Guizhou Province.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

8

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2020

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The project activity aims to: sequester greenhouse gas and mitigate climate change; enhance biodiversity conservation by increasing the connectivity of forests; improve soil and water conservation in the River basin; generate income and job opportunities for local communities. There is no natural renewal and afforestation before the project, and all sites were covered by the barren hill. The main objective specie is Cypresses which is native species according to the baseline survey.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 17

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS1825: Afforestation Project in Xining Cit is located in the suburbs of Chengdong District, Chengbei District, Chengzhong District, and Datong County, Xining City, Qinghai Province of China, whose aim is to increase carbon sequestration and contribute to local sustainable development by planting trees on the barren or degraded lands. The project is implemented by Qinghai Forestry Ecological Construction and Investment Co., Ltd. 12,874.08ha of forest is to be planted by direct planting on degraded lands in Xining City, including three suburbs and one county: Chengdong District, Chengbei District, Chengzhong District, and Datong County. All the project sites were previously degraded grassland and barren land.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2020

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The implementation of the project would generate GHG emission removals and improve local environment through growing of the trees, increase income of local residents by offering job opportunities from the project, enhance the capabilities of local communities and residents by providing their relevant technical skills and training, and increase local biodiversity as a result of establishing a forest of native trees (Picea crassifolia, Sabina przewalskii, Pinus tabulaeformis, Populus, Betula).

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process.

Row 18

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS1935: The Hubei Hongshan IFM (conversion of logged to protected forest) Project is implemented in Hongshan County, Suizhou City, Hubei Province of China by Zhejiang Zhongzheng Forestry Development Co. Before the implementation of the project activity, the trees are logged based on a valid and verifiable government-approved timber management plan for harvesting the project area. The implementation of the project activity converses the trees to protected forest to reduce the GHG emissions.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1503

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2015

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The Standardized Benefits including GHG removals, improvement of forest cover, providing employment opportunities and well-being. Additional Project Benefits include: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate climate change; Improve soil and water conservation and contribute to sustainable development; Provide experience of forest management and risk prevention and control for local stakeholders; Improvement of the biodiversity and ecological environment of the project area and its surrounding area; Increase employment opportunities and raise the income level of local residents.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for our facilities for the PAS2060 carbon neutrality verification process and for Carbon Neutrality on the back of an assured LCA and verified by third party.

Row 19

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS2326: Guangxi Jinxiu IFM (conversion of logged to protected forest) in China. The Guangxi Jinxiu IFM (conversion of logged to protected forest) Projec is implemented in Jinxiu Yao Autonomous County, Laibin City, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region of China by Jinxiu Forestry and Grassland Bureau, which includes the Improved Forest Management (IFM) of the forests in the conversion of logged to protected forest. The area of the project activity is 6,572 ha, including 249 subcompartments spreading over Jinxiu Forest Farm, Jinxiu Town, Toupai Town, Dazhang Township, Liuxiang Township, Luoxiang Township, Sanjiang Township, Sanjiao Township, Changdong Township, Zhongliang Township of Jinxiu Yao Autonomous County. All these forests are state-owned forests or privately-owned or collective-owned, and have the legal right to forest ownership. The species involved in the project are Broad-leaved tree, Chinese fir and Pinus massoniana. Before the implementation of the project activity, the trees are logged based on a valid and verifiable government-approved timber management plan for harvesting the project area.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

6021

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2016

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The key mitigation action of the project activity is avoiding the illegal harvest of the forest, which can protect and improve the surviving environment, keep the ecological balance, save the species resources and enhance homeland security. The project provides thousands of employment opportunities for managing forest workers are not discriminated against in employment on the basis of their ethnic group, race, sex or religious belief. Women enjoy equal rights with men in employment, and employers are prohibited from recruiting minors under the age of 16. The increase of employment opportunities and the provision of jobs make the project implementation closely related to the interests of local stakeholders, so as to promote the active participation of local stakeholders in the project.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for Carbon Neutrality on the back of an assured LCA and verified by third party.

Row 20

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

VCS2327: The Guangxi Huanjiang IFM (conversion of logged to protected forest) Project is implemented in Huanjiang Maonan Autonomous County, Hechi City, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region of China. Projects includes the Improved Forest Management (IFM) of the forests in the conversion of logged to protected forest. The area of the project activity is 9,346.72 ha, including 1,306 sub-compartments spreading over Huashan forest farm, Chuanshan Town, Dongxing Town, Luoyang Town, Minglun Town, Shuiyuan Town, Si'en Town, Da'an Township, Lonyan Township, Tiancai Township, Xianan Township, Xunle Township, Changmei Township of Huanjiang Maonan Autonomous County. All these forests are state-owned forests or privately-owned or collective-owned, and have the legal right to forest ownership. All the owners authorized the project proponent to access the project to their behalf. The species involved in the project are Broad-leaved tree, Chinese fir and Pinus massoniana. Before the implementation of the project activity, the trees are logged based on a valid and verifiable government-approved timber management plan for harvesting the project area.

(7.79.1.4) Credits canceled by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

22327

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of cancelation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at cancelation?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at cancelation

2016

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Consideration of legal requirements

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Market penetration assessment

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The key mitigation action of the project activity is avoiding the illegal harvest of the forest, which can protect and improve the surviving environment, keep the ecological balance, save the species resources and enhance homeland security. The project provides thousands of employment opportunities for managing forest workers are not discriminated against in employment on the basis of their ethnic group, race, sex or religious belief. Women enjoy equal rights with men in employment, and employers are prohibited from recruiting minors under the age of 16. The increase of employment opportunities and the provision of jobs make the project implementation closely related to the interests of local stakeholders, so as to promote the active participation of local stakeholders in the project.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Offsets for Carbon Neutrality on the back of an assured LCA and verified by third party.
[Add row]

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Timber products	*1018756.6*	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced	*1018756.6*

[Fixed row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Kenya

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Migori County

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

13579

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Kenya, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 97.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Victoria Basin Forest Savanna ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used via Thrive, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Our Thrive Digital Platform collects data and indicators across a number of issues. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This

definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop. Our Thrive Supply Chain represents over 94% of our tobacco volumes sourced in 2023 from our directly contracted farmers and those of our third-party suppliers.

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

Chottogram - South Leaf Region

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

53071

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests & Sundarbans. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the

BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Paraná

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

77721

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Brazil, that represents 30% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Salta

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

47

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Argentina, that represents 1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood. This jurisdiction is in Andrean Mountain Forest & Valleys ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Argentina, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in Thrive, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by farmers in Argentina is from sustainable wood sources. Additionally, they perform a periodic third-party assessment to check compliance of wood usage. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Rio Grande do Sul

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

82733

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Brazil, that represents 30% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Santa Catarina

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

113259

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Brazil, that represents 30% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

São Paulo

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

28632

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

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

Rio de Janeiro

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

6848

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

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

Minas Gerais

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

8836

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

This 0.69% comes from tobacco processing plants is wood fuel used by our factory in Brazil. The wood fuel originates from commercial eucalyptus plantations that are managed in line with applicable legal requirements, have all the necessary authorities permits and are subject to monitoring as legally required. Traceability to plantation is in place. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome.

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

Jujuy

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

29

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Argentina, that represents 1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood. This jurisdiction is in Andrean Mountain Forest & Valleys ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Argentina, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Argentina's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Additionally, they perform a periodic third-party assessment to check compliance of wood usage. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Austria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Tyrol

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

11215

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Austria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Styra

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

43

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

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

Chottogram - North Leaf Region

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

29758

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests &

Sundarbans. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Allardorgah

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

4881

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests & Sundarbans. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Chechua

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

8224

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests & Sundarbans and Tropical & Subtropical Moist Broadleaf Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Jhenaidah

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

4361

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests & Sundarbans. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Meherpur

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

5193

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests & Sundarbans. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Manikginj

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2793

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests & Sundarbans. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with

clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Rangpur

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

5578

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Bangladesh, that represents 18% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 33% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in North Indian Tropical Forests & Sundarbans. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the

BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Bulgaria

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Plovidiv

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1784

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ China

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Heilongjiang

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1589

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ China

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Shandong

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

45737

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Croatia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Virovitica

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

144

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Croatia, that represents 1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 4% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses (2.4%) and fossil fuels (95.6%). This jurisdiction is in Pannonian Mixed Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Croatia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Kutjevo

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

144

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Croatia, that represents 1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 4% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses (2.4%) and fossil fuels (95.6%). This jurisdiction is in Pannonian Mixed Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced

from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Fiji

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Suva

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

270

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

This 0.03% comes from tobacco processing plants is wood fuel used by our factory in Brazil. The wood fuel originates from commercial eucalyptus plantations that are managed in line with applicable legal requirements, have all the necessary authorities permits and are subject to monitoring as legally required. Traceability to plantation is in place. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Finland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Western Finland

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

41350

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Finland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Southern Finland

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

25093

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ France

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Rennes

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1800

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Stuttgart

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

7829

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Bremen

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

11368

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Rheiland-Pfalz

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

845

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Bavaria

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

739

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

This 0.07% comes from tobacco processing plants is wood fuel used by our factory in Brazil. The wood fuel originates from commercial Eucalyptus plantations that are managed in line with applicable legal requirements, have all the necessary authorities permits and are subject to monitoring as legally required. Traceability to plantation is in place. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. A portion of the sustainable biomass is used in our own Operations, it is verified by SURE certificate, REDII certificate.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Germany

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Baden-Wurtenberg

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

39

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

This 0.004% comes from tobacco processing plants is wood fuel used by our factory in Brazil. The wood fuel originates from commercial Eucalyptus plantations that are managed in line with applicable legal requirements, have all the necessary authorities permits and are subject to monitoring as legally required. Traceability to plantation is in place. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. A portion of the sustainable biomass is used in our own Operations, it is verified by SURE certificate, REDII certificate.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Guatemala

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Escuintla

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

689

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Guatemala, that represents 0.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the wood usage from this jurisdiction is for build curing barns for Air cured tobacco types. This jurisdiction is in Central American Dry Forests and Sierra Madre De Chiapas Moist Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Guatemala, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Guatemala's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests

(deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Guatemala

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Suchitepequez

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

376

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Guatemala, that represents 0.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the wood usage from this jurisdiction is for build curing barns for Air cured tobacco types. This jurisdiction is in Central American Dry Forests and Sierra Madre De Chiapas Moist Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Guatemala, use

their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in Thrive 2023 consolidated data and it shows that 100% of the wood used by Guatemala's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Guatemala

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

San Marcos

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

34

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Guatemala, that represents 0.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the wood usage from this jurisdiction is for build curing barns for Air cured tobacco types. This jurisdiction is in Central American Dry Forests and Sierra Madre De Chiapas Moist Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Guatemala, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Guatemala's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ India

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Karnataka

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

33990

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In India, that represents 7% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 71.5% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Malabar Coast Moist Forests, Southwestern Ghats Montane Rain Forests, and Southwestern Ghats Moist Deciduous Forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in India, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. Additionally, they perform a periodic third-party assessment to check compliance of wood usage. The results are reported in Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by India's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ India

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Andhra Pradesh

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

18848

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In India, that represents 7% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 71.5% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Malabar Coast Moist Forests, Southwestern Ghats Montane Rain Forests, and Southwestern Ghats Moist Deciduous Forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in India, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. Additionally, they perform a periodic third-party assessment to check compliance of wood usage. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform 2023, our consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by India's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

West Nusa Tenggara

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

12707

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Indonesia, that represents 3.1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 46.3% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Southeast Indonesian Dry Forest Islands ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Indonesia, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Indonesia's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

East Java

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2010

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Indonesia, that represents 3.1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 46.3% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Javan-Bali Tropical Rainforests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Indonesia, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Indonesia's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Banten

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2982

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

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

West Java

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3420

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

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

Central Java

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

477

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Indonesia, that represents 3.1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 46.3% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Javan-Bali Tropical Rainforests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Indonesia, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Indonesia's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

North Sumatera

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2609

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

This 0.26% comes from tobacco processing plants is wood fuel used by our factory in Brazil. The wood fuel originates from commercial Eucalyptus plantations that are managed in line with applicable legal requirements, have all the necessary authorities permits and are subject to monitoring as legally required. Traceability to plantation is in place. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. A portion of the sustainable biomass is used in our own operations, it is verified by SUCOFINDO certificate

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Italy

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Umbria

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

330

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Italy, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 4.3% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Forests, Woods and Mediterranean scrub ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Italy, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Plaform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Italian suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Italy

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Veneto (Treviso)

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Italy

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Udine

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1073

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Japan

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Hyogo

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

18632

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Kenya

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:
☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Homa-Bay County

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

285

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply
☑ Independent smallholders
☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)
☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Kenya, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 97.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Victoria Basin Forest Savanna ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Kenya

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Busia County

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2610

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Kenya, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 97.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Victoria Basin Forest Savanna ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Kenya

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Bungoma County

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3893

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Kenya, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 97.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Victoria Basin Forest Savanna ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Selangor

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1526

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Malaysia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sabah

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

359

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

This 0.04% comes from tobacco processing plants is wood fuel used by our factory in Brazil. The wood fuel originates from commercial eucalyptus plantations that are managed in line with applicable legal requirements, have all the necessary authorities permits and are subject to monitoring as legally required. Traceability to plantation is in place. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. A portion of the sustainable biomass is used in our own Operations, it is verified by FSC certificate.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Nayarit

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

11416

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Mexico, that represents 4.1% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 20.8% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy. Our third-party suppliers in Mexico use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in Thrive, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by Mexican suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

State of Mexico

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

241

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

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

Tete

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

100

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Mozambique, that represents 2.6% of our total annual leaf purchases, 87% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 4.3% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Forests, Woods and Mediterranean scrub ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Mozambique, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 90%% of the wood used by Mozambique's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Punjab

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

11008

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Pakistan, that represents 8.5% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood. This jurisdiction is in Temperate Coniferous Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

82342

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Pakistan, that represents 8.5% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood. This jurisdiction is in Temperate Coniferous Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Poland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Lodz

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2304

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Mpumalanga

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

98

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In South Africa, that represents 1.4% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 0.7% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Grassland, savanna and sub-tropical ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in South Africa, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 100% of the wood used by South Africans suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Gauteng

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

5974

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Republic of Korea

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Ulsan

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

5359

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Jura

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

230

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

This 0.53% comes from tobacco processing sites is wood fuel used by our factory in Brazil. The wood fuel originates from commercial eucalyptus plantations that are managed in line with applicable legal requirements, have all the necessary authorities permits and are subject to monitoring as legally required. Traceability to plantation is in place. This jurisdiction is in Atlantic Forest biome. A portion of the sustainable biomass is used in our own Operations, it is verified by FSC certificate.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Dalarna

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

19240

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Slovenia

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Osrednjeslovenska

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1829

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Sri Lanka

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

North Central

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

0.05

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Sri Lanka, that represents 0.5% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the wood is used for build or repair curing barns for Air Cured tobacco types. This jurisdiction is in Sri Lanka Dry Zone - Dry Evergreen Forests. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

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

Ratchaburi

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1433

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Kentucky

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

14173

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In United States of America, that represents 7.9% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 19.5% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Northeast American Forests ecoregions. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Tennessee

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

38801

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In United States of America, that represents 7.9% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 19.5% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Northeast American Forests ecoregions. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

South Carolina

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2351

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Virginia

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

40872

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Michigan

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1958

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Maine

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

478

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Cojedito

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Venezuela, that represents 0.8% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the wood is used for build or repair curing barns for Air Cured tobacco types. This jurisdiction is in Central Llanos ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Caicara Guanaguana

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Venezuela, that represents 0.8% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the wood is used for build or repair curing barns for Air Cured tobacco types. This jurisdiction is in Central Llanos ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from on or off- farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Altagracia de Orituco

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Venezuela, that represents 0.8% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 100% of the wood is used for build or repair curing barns for Air Cured tobacco types. This jurisdiction is in Central Llanos ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Cao Bang

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1011

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Viet Nam, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 98.7% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Northern Indochina Subtropical Forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Dak Lak

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2008

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Viet Nam, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 98.7% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Northern Indochina Subtropical Forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Lang Son

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1535

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Viet Nam, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 98.7% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Northern Indochina Subtropical Forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Tay Ninh

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2087

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Viet Nam, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 98.7% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Northern Indochina Subtropical Forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Gia Lai

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

8342

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Viet Nam, that represents 1.3% of our total annual leaf purchases, 100% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 98.7% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood, the remaining is cured with other types of biomasses. This jurisdiction is in Northern Indochina Subtropical Forests ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Wood global data is provided for 100% of 91,000 of the BAT directly contracted famers who monitor curing fuel type, including use of wood for tobacco curing and construction with our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system (95% of contracted farmers monitoring coverage). FSM captures data on type and volume of wood and origin, if from or off-farm. Monitoring results in 2023 demonstrate that around 41,000 (45%) use wood for curing and 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were observed as from sustainable wood sources. Our Leaf Operations report the total volume of wood used in our Thrive Digital Platform, with breakdown per sub-national jurisdiction and at country level. Data reported in Thrive is validated by an independent third-party consultancy.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Binh Duong

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

6160

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

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

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

8506

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Zimbabwe, that represents 3.6% of our total annual leaf purchases, 53% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 70.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood,3.5% is cured with biomass and 25.6% with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Dry Miombo Woodlands ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Zimbabwe, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 83% of the wood used by Zimbabwe's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Mashonaland Central

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1554

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Zimbabwe, that represents 3.6% of our total annual leaf purchases, 53% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 70.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood,3.5% is cured with biomass and 25.6% with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Dry Miombo Woodlands ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Zimbabwe, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 83% of the wood used by Zimbabwe's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Mashonaland East

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

1088

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Zimbabwe, that represents 3.6% of our total annual leaf purchases, 53% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 70.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood,3.5% is cured with biomass and 25.6% with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Dry Miombo Woodlands ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Zimbabwe, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 83% of the wood used by Zimbabwe's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

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

Mashonaland West

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

431

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Independent smallholders

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

In Zimbabwe, that represents 3.6% of our total annual leaf purchases, 53% of the farmers were monitored for wood use and traceability. 70.9% of the Flue Cured Virginia tobacco type is cured with the use of wood,3.5% is cured with biomass and 25.6% with fossil fuels. This jurisdiction is in Dry Miombo Woodlands ecoregion. We consolidate the global numbers based on the data reported for each jurisdiction and country. Our third-party suppliers' users of wood in Zimbabwe, use their own monitoring systems to monitor their farmers and collect relevant information about wood source, origin, forest management, sustainability, legality, and accordance with local regulations. The results are reported in our Thrive Digital Platform, our 2023 consolidated data shows that 83% of the wood used by Zimbabwe's suppliers is from sustainable wood sources. Note: Sustainable wood sources are defined as wood resources harvested legally from planted sources in such a way that does

not cause any detrimental social, environmental, or economic impact. This may include wood sourced from identified invasive exotic species that have not been planted; and wood sourced from existing legal plantations. In all cases it must be monitored as wood not associated with clearing of native forests (deforestation), for both harvesting the wood or clearing for growing tobacco. This definition does not include conversion of natural forests to plantations in order to produce wood to be used for tobacco crop.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Italy

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Lombardia

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

22

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (processors)

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Poland

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Sosnowiec

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

10092

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Hungary

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Nagykáta

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

8522

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

☑ Romania

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

☑ States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Popesti-Leordeni

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

3977

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

☑ Contracted suppliers (manufacturers)

(8.5.7) Please explain

Pulp & Paper materials suppliers for primary packaging, specialty papers and/or acetate cellulose
[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"

BAT's definition of no-deforestation and no-conversion aligns to AFi (accountability framework initiative). Definition of DCF for Leaf area: no wood used for curing tobacco or constructing barns came from deforestation or conversion of natural forest and no tobacco was planted in areas that used to be natural ecosystems after 2020. For pulp & paper, purchased volumes are assessed following AFi guidelines, focusing on traceability and recognized forest certification schemes (e.g. FSC/PEFC).

(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 **:**AFI and SBTi FLAG requirements

(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:

☑ Disclosure volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

☑ % of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

☑ Sourcing area, but not to production unit

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2016

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2016

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0.01

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2025

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

93.7

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

93.70

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Organisation wide

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

Leaf suppliers are requested to report via Thrive (our sustainable agriculture & farmer livelihoods programme covering over 94% BAT directly contracted farmers & third-party tobacco suppliers) information about wood used including origin, and indirectly reported suppliers' self-assessments and STP reports. Data from 2023 shows that 56% of the wood used was traceable back to state or sub-national jurisdiction (from 57% in 2022). 44% is traceable back to forest plantation (from 34% in 2022). This level of traceability allowed to confirm that 96% of the wood used in 2023 had evidence of DCF status. We have glidepaths in place & assigned budget to increase this to 100% aligned with our forest-related targets. To support this, we work with our leaf suppliers to have 100% of the wood monitored and traceable back to at least the sub-national jurisdiction. To support the progress, this requirement was included in our Biodiversity Operational Standard released in 2023, and as a minimum for off-farm wood, we ask farmers to provide a receipt of buying or inform wood provider information, type and amount of wood. Aiming to substantiate our claims with strong evidence, we are working to get to a more granular traceability level with our suppliers with the following actions: a big portion of the farmers we work with are based in remote areas (e.g. in Pakistan and Bangladesh) and 99.6% of farmers using wood are small scale farmers regularly purchasing wood from local smallholders. Having full traceability to demonstrate DCF status in such cases can be challenging and we are engaging with them to increase traceability granularity, develop wood supply chain studies and provide training to the farmers regarding protection of natural resources & wood sustainability. In 2023, BAT Bangladesh developed an app to support the field technicians in performing a detailed wood fuel survey with the farmers, providing details around the wood source and supplier contact & adding photos of the evidence the farmer holds. This information is then verified by the local sustainability team, who contact the supplier to collect further evidence of the origin of the wood. We are aiming to have 100% of the local wood suppliers mapped & classified according to their transparency level. A similar approach is being followed by Pakistan & Vietnam. Towards the end date of the target, we aim to trigger location specific actions in order to evidence required traceability levels.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

In 2021 BAT adopted the targets of Zero gross deforestation of primary native forests (ongoing), net zero deforestation of managed natural forests by 2025 and net positive impact on forests in our tobacco leaf supply chain by 2025. In 2022 we added a goal for no conversion of natural ecosystems in our Tobacco Supply Chain by 2025. In 2023, we have consolidated the targets into Deforestation and Conversion Free tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline). The target figure for 2023 was calculated based on the volumes sourced in 2023 reporting year. Target 1 supports our strategy to get to 100% Deforestation and Conversion Free Tobacco Supply Chain by 2025 by tracing the wood used for curing and construction back to its origin and through the stages of the supply chain, providing insights on where deforestation and conversion could be occurring. This supply chain data is key to evaluate and prioritize the risks and implement mitigation and strengthening preventive measures.

Timber products

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(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:

☑ Disclosure volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Engagement with Tier 1 suppliers

☑ % of Tier 1 suppliers engaged

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2016

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/31/2023

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Sustainable Development Goals

☑ Planetary Boundaries

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Organization-wide

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Our business operations, including conventional agricultural practices, rely on the use of natural resources, such as firewood which are necessary for the farmers to dry Flue Cured and Dark Fire Cured tobacco leaves, representing more than 70% of our total tobacco purchases. To achieve our DCF targets we need to engage with our contracted farmers to prevent deforestation and conversion and ensure that our wood supply chain is sustainable and resilient, coming at no risk to cause deforestation either on-farm or off-farm. We aim to frequently engage with 100% of our leaf suppliers (especially the ones depending on wood for tobacco curing) to ensure alignment of targets and the implementation of required DCF standards, including cascade of policies, operating standards, and request to monitor performance and wood use data from our leaf supply chain. These reports must be submitted via Thrive, STP and suppliers' self-assessments directly reported to BAT and in 2023 100% of the suppliers were engaged in these reports. Thrive and STP were deployed in 2016. Thrive covered 94% of our tobacco volume procured by volume in the 2023 reporting year. 100% of our leaf suppliers are required to participate in STP, annually. We ask our suppliers for detailed information about wood usage. In total, Thrive and STP suppliers using wood represent 93% of the tobacco volume procured in 2023 and 100% of the wood use data was reported, out of which 99.8% is covered by Thrive assessment and 0.2% by STP. This engagement target is ongoing, and we will continue to provide trainings in forest and biodiversity management and cascade best practices particularly in tobacco curing and fuel usage. In 2023, more than 152,000 people were engaged via farmer trainings delivered by our leaf operations and strategic third-party suppliers, covering topics of natural resource preservation and environmental best practices (136,000 in 2022). Our suppliers were also engaged on trainings regarding BAT Biodiversity Operational Standard for tobacco farming, with more than 1592 people being trained on the requirements.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

Target 2 is a maintenance target and is based on 2023 reporting year.
[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:

☑ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

☑ Value chain mapping

☑ Supplier engagement/communication

☑ Internal traceability system

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

We monitor wood traceability to the farm & tree production unit level. Our field technicians provide on the ground technical assistance to 91,000 directly contracted farmers, visiting them at every crop stage, monitoring various aspects, including use of wood as curing fuel in tobacco production; data is reported in our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system. In 2023, results showed that of 41,000 farmers (45%) used wood for tobacco curing & 99.9% of contracted farmers' wood fuels were identified as from sustainable wood sources; and that 65.4% of the wood sourced by directly contracted farmers was from on & off-farm production forests with formal evidence of traceability, the remaining was monitored as coming from planted production forests and not from primary native forest, sourced from off-farm suppliers with no formal evidence of traceability. As a minimum for off-farm wood traceability we ask farmers to provide a receipt of buying or inform wood provider name & address, type & amount of wood. We ask 3rd party suppliers to follow similar methods. Data from our directly contracted farmers and those of our third-party suppliers covering over 94% of BAT's tobacco purchased by volume in 2023 are consolidated annually in our Thrive system. Remaining wood data was reported via suppliers' self-assessments shared with BAT directly or via the industry programme STP. For traceability in our pulp & paper supply chain we focus on source of origin from forest via mill to converter and into BAT factories and we have minimum standards in place with our suppliers. This includes: 1) annual review of certification status 2) bi-annual direct data gathering from key Tier1 and Tier 2 suppliers in high impact categories (85% of total wood-based materials volume): volumes delivered from each location, mill name, CoC certificate code, country, state, total volume delivered to BAT by factory/location and if applicable, split by certification scheme. Actual volumes & sourcing footprint are verified annually against our ERP by category and material type. We complement this process by prioritising where possible, sourcing from suppliers with CoC certifications by leading international forest certification programmes.
[Fixed row]

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

34

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

64

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

1

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

1

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00
[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

61.93

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

4.63

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

32.09

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

25.22

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.

Timber products

(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification
☑ FSC Chain-of-Custody certification (any type)

(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

4.63

(8.9.1.3) Comment

In 2023, 5% of our pulp & paper materials were FSC CoC certified and 20% PEFC CoC certified. For the last 3 years, we have been mapping our supply chain based on the intensity of pulp & paper related materials and have engaged closely with key primary and secondary packaging, fine/specialty papers, and cellulose acetate tow materials suppliers. We prioritise sourcing from suppliers with chain of custody certification from international forest certification programs such as FSC, PEFC and SFI and track and monitor their certification status to mill, to ensure they are supporting BAT's deforestation commitments and management of the extended supply chain. Our factory in Switzerland uses wood fuel pellets that are FSC Chain of Custody certified under and have the 'Schweizer Holz' ('Swiss Wood') label. The label allows consumers to identify the origin of wood products and ensures such product have been sourced legally. Also, in 2023 1.53% of the wood used to cure tobacco and build or repair curing barns are coming from FSC Chain of custody certified sources. We are continuously working to increase this percentage in a prevalent small-scale scenario where 99.8% of the farmers using wood are small scale farmers.

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

SWM_FSC-C117894.pdf
[Add row]

(8.9.2) Provide details of third-party certification schemes not providing full DF/DCF assurance.

Timber products

(8.9.2.1) Third-party certification scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Chain-of-custody certification

☑ PEFC Chain-of-Custody (any type)

(8.9.2.2) % of disclosure volume certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

19.8

(8.9.2.3) Additional control methods in place to determine DF/DCF status of volumes certified through scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance

Select all that apply

☑ No

(8.9.2.4) Comment

Since 2021 we have been mapping our supply chain based on the intensity of pulp & paper related materials and have engaged closely with key primary and secondary packaging, fine/specialty papers, and cellulose acetate tow materials suppliers. We prioritise sourcing from suppliers with chain of custody certification from international forest certification programs such as FSC, PEFC and SFI and track and monitor their certification status to mill, to ensure they are supporting BAT's deforestation commitments and management of the extended supply chain. In 2023, 5% of our pulp & paper materials were FSC CoC certified and 20% PEFC CoC certified.

(8.9.2.5) Certification documentation

Metsa_PEFC_Husum.pdf
[Add row]

(8.9.3) Provide details of production unit monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Timber products

(8.9.3.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

32.09

(8.9.3.2) Production unit monitoring approach

Select all that apply

☑ Geospatial monitoring or remote sensing tool

☑ Ground-based monitoring system

(8.9.3.3) Description of production unit monitoring approach

We monitor our contracted farmers monthly during the crop season on the use of sustainable wood & no deforestation and conversion. Our leaf operations use the Farmer Sustainability Management system. At the end of every visit farmers acknowledge consent with a digital signature. If non-compliance is found, Prompt Actions

are raised & tracked for resolution including farmers geo-coordinates & photos. Unannounced visits are conducted to check the consistency & accuracy of the data captured and to ensure Prompt Actions are resolved. All third- party suppliers follow similar processes using their own systems. All leaf suppliers are required to report performance on no deforestation at least once a year, in Thrive, STP & by suppliers' self-assessments. In 2023, farmers located in high-risk areas for deforestation receive reinforced monitoring & were assisted to create action plans where required. To progress towards our DCF target in the tobacco supply chain, various technologies have been explored, including satellite monitoring with alerts of potential deforestation. As a complement to "on the ground farm visits", we explored different technologies to increase and improve our field technicians monitoring capacity and the detection of potential deforestation cases in BAT tobacco farms. A successful pilot for satellite monitoring was done in 2023 in Brazil and Bangladesh and the innovative solution will be rolled out in H2 2024.

(8.9.3.4) DF/DCF status verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.3.5) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ First party

☑ Third party

(8.9.3.6) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit and is verified as DF/DCF

25.21

(8.9.3.7) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

We apply a multi-monitoring approach to monitor compliance and implementation of DCF commitments. At least every three years we conduct geospatial assessment of deforestation risk at the farm level in our Leaf Operations and for the growing regions of the third-party leaf suppliers, prioritizing action plans for high-risk farmers and areas. Ground based monitoring at farm level is carried out by our field technicians along the crop season. They monitor implementation of recommended practices, outcomes related to DCF status and protection of natural ecosystems. They record data from the forest production units, the species and amount of wood used and, wood sources. Non-compliance is recorded, and any deforested or converted area should be restored by the next crop for the farmer to keep the contract. Data from monitoring is reported via Thrive, direct self-assessments and STP, covering 100% of the tobacco volume purchased. This data is validated and limited assured by an independent 3rd party. Additional third-party verification may be used at least every three years at supplier level to assess the comprehensive current state, check supply chain compliance and verify results in community/ landscape level. This verification can be performed by different parties, such as universities and other experts with appropriate skills, knowledge experience, and expertise forestry and issues concerning logging from natural forests, as well as the specific geographical context In Brazil this was done in partnership with a Federal University. In Vietnam an assessment and mapping was performed to assess the wood supply chain against FSC standards and create action plans. For BAT's pulp & board-based materials we review certification status and volumes annually.

[Fixed row]

(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.

Timber products

(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area

25.22

(8.9.4.2) Monitoring approach used for determining that sourcing areas have no or negligible risk of deforestation or conversion

Select all that apply

☑ Ground-based monitoring

☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial data

☑ Third-party assessment tool

(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment

To identify, understand and assess forest-related risk we do multi-monitoring approach such as farmer monitoring on the ground, geospatial risk assessment and 3rd parties' assessment. The combination of methods allows us to assess current and longer-term risks in the forest landscape. In 2023, 95% of our 91,000 contracted farmers were monitored through our Farmer Sustainability Management (FSM) system, with data collected by field technicians during on-farm visits, which take place approximately once a month during the crop season. Monitoring is based on physical observations of forest coverage on the farm at any point in time. The main risk to our leaf supply chain is the deforestation to harvest wood for tobacco curing and barn construction or clear land to plant the crop. We conduct a wood supply chain risk assessment using Global Forest Watch Pro forest cover maps every year to assess the forest change over time. In 2023, the risk assessment was performed with the data source for all the indicators was the Tree Cover and Forest Loss Data Layer, and we use the results of the risk classification system and of the farmer monitoring to prioritize development and deployment of action plans and initiatives like in depth assessment of the wood sustainability and afforestation programmes to provide saplings to farmers to produce their own wood used in tobacco production. In addition, at least every 3 years we perform a geospatial Biodiversity Risk Assessment of directly contracted farmers against deforestation indicators. As part of the scope of the study the potential deforestation risks associated with direct supply farms and 3rd party leaf suppliers growing regions was assessed. Deforestation risk was assessed against four global indicators, all of which were selected from peer review: Tree Cover (Identify areas of high forest cover), Forest Loss (Identify areas of high forest loss between 2002 and 2020), Deforestation Hotspots

(Identify areas of significantly increasing deforestation) and Forest Landscape Integrity Index (FLII, measure the significance of forests based on the degree of modifications). The assessment was done at the tobacco farmer level for the vertically integrated BAT Leaf Operations and for the sub-national jurisdiction level for the 3rd party leaf suppliers. Each farm (direct suppliers) or administrative area (3rd party suppliers) was scored from Low (1) to High (3) across the four indicators to assess deforestation risk. As there were four criteria, the minimum possible score is 4 (score of 1, low, for each criterion) while the maximum is 12 (score of 3, high, for each criterion). Scores for all criteria were combined to give an overall score of Low, Medium, or High for the level of deforestation risk associated with the farm or the growing region. For the directly contracted farmer base 81% of farms (81% of the total area) were classified as Low deforestation risk. 8% of farms (3% of the total area) were classified as High deforestation risk. 11% of farms (16% of the total area) were classified as medium deforestation risk. For the 3rd party suppliers, 49% of the area is likely to have Low deforestation risk, 30% Medium and 21% High risk. The output of the deforestation risk assessment is used in conjunction with the results of the farmers monitoring results, which is reported by leaf suppliers in our Thrive platform. For 100% of the leaf suppliers using wood, we expect such suppliers to monitor 100% of the farmers, to help ensure wood used is sourced from sustainable and traceable sources, provide farmers training, deploy afforestation programmes and supply 100% DCF tobacco volume to BAT. In our tobacco supply chain, we aim to have a net positive impact on forests by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline).

(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin

Select all that apply

- ☑ India
- ☑ Italy
- ☑ Brazil
- ☑ Pakistan
- ☑ Viet Nam
- ☑ Bangladesh
- ☑ South Africa
- ☑ United States of America
- ☑ Zimbabwe
- ☑ Argentina
- ☑ Guatemala
- ☑ Indonesia
- ☑ Sri Lanka

(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas

We monitor our contracted farmers during the crop season on the use of sustainable wood & no deforestation and conversion. Our leaf operations use the Farmer Sustainability Management system. We combine different levels of evidence to trace DCF wood and classify it on the following criteria: Certified, from on-farm or off farm production or natural managed forests with formal evidence of no deforestation and conversion, or off farm wood, traceable to at least a sub-national jurisdiction level, from production forests assessed with a monitoring system as from sustainable wood sources. All leaf suppliers are required to report performance on no deforestation at least once a year, in Thrive, STP & by suppliers' self-assessments. For the off-farm wood volumes with evidence to at least a sub-national jurisdiction level, we perform a tailored risk assessment for wood used in the tobacco supply chain. All volumes are assessed for risk using Global Forest Watch Pro forest indicators, combined with additional location specific context to determine sourcing areas to have no or negligible risk of deforestation and/or conversion: wood volumes in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Brazil, US, India, Zimbabwe & Vietnam were determined as with negligible risk for deforestation and/or conversion based on the monitoring of the species, sources, and harvesting cycle information collected at farmer level. In Brazil, around 90% of the wood has formal evidence (deliver notes/receipts notes) that connect the wood to the specific wood supplier, enabling monitoring at a more granular level. In Pakistan, the overall risk for deforestation

and conversion is low, and 98% of the wood is also coming from overall negligible risk areas based on GFW Pro indicators, and 30% of the wood volume has formal evidence (deliver notes/receipts notes, transit permits) that connect the wood to the specific wood supplier, enabling monitoring at a more granular level. In US, 100% of the wood volume can be tracked back to local wood supplier (mills/sawmills) that provide sawdust to the farmers in a free base. In India and Argentina, the wood supply chain for tobacco was assessed by an external consultancy on sustainability and deforestation/conversion risk. In Zimbabwe, Italy, South Africa, Guatemala and Indonesia the off-farm volume has formal evidence (deliver notes/receipts notes, transit permits) that connects the wood to the specific wood supplier or wood source, enabling monitoring at a more granular level.

(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.9.4.7) Type of verification

Select all that apply

☑ First party

☑ Third party

(8.9.4.8) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through sourcing area monitoring and is verified as DF/DCF

32.09

(8.9.4.9) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status

We apply a multi-monitoring approach to monitor compliance and implementation of DCF commitments. At least every three years we conduct geospatial assessment of deforestation risk assessment at the farm level in our Leaf Operations and for the growing regions of the 3rd party leaf suppliers, prioritizing action plans for high-risk farmers and areas. Ground based monitoring at farm level is carried out by our field technicians along the crop season. They monitor implementation of recommended practices, outcomes related to DCF status and protection of natural ecosystems. They record data from the forest production units, the species and amount of wood used and, wood sources. Non-compliance is recorded, and any deforested or converted area should be restored by the next crop for the farmer to keep the contract. Data from monitoring is reported via Thrive, direct self-assessments and STP, covering 100% of the tobacco volume purchased. This data is validated and limited assured by an independent 3rd party. Additional third-party verification may be used at least every three years to assess the comprehensive current state, check supply chain compliance and verify results in community/ landscape level. In Brazil this was done in partnership with a Federal University. In Vietnam an assessment and mapping was performed to assess the wood supply chain against FSC standards and create action plans. For BAT's pulp & board-based materials we review certification status and volumes annually. We gather learnings and agree actions to achieve our targets.

(8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

Based on the risk assessment performed in the different locations of our supply chain, we can design location-specific action plans for our suppliers and farmers. Farmers that are located in high-risk areas for deforestation receive reinforced monitoring and training, and were assisted to create action plans where required. The high-risk sourcing areas are the priority in terms of increasing the traceability level of the wood, so we engage with our Leaf suppliers in such locations to improve their processes, educate the farmers and engage with local wood suppliers to implement mitigation measures and gather granular information about the source and sustainability of the wood, collaborate with local communities to reduce deforestation risks and promoting a sustainable supply chain, which also minimize the risk of exposure for smallholder farmers, wood suppliers and local communities to negative consequences of less income because of limited traceability. Wherever available, we encourage the leaf suppliers in high-risk locations to prioritize wood suppliers with certification schemes and engage with others to obtain it.
[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint.

Timber products

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

☑ We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

☑ Since a specified cutoff date

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2020

(8.10.1.6) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since the specified cutoff date (hectares)

0.24

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

BAT monitor contracted farmers on an ongoing basis combining on-the-ground checks and remote sensing to understand the risk profile of farmers based on location. In 2023, 95% of our 91,000 contracted farmers were monitored in our Farmer Sustainability Management system, with data collected by field technicians during on-farm visits (approximately once a month during crop season). Results are submitted annually to our Thrive platform, covering 94% of the total volume purchased. The remaining data points are collected via the Sustainable Tobacco Programme (STP) initiative. In 2023, 100% of the wood used by leaf suppliers was assessed for deforestation risk. A Deforestation Risk Assessment carried out by an external consultancy mapped contracted farms and 3rd party supplier growing regions against 4 indicators: Tree Cover, Forest Loss, Deforestation Hotspots and Forest Landscape Integrity Index. We then worked with the leaf suppliers to develop plans to increase traceability of off-farm wood and maintain wood self-sufficiency. In our pulp & paper supply chain, purchased volumes are assessed focusing on traceability and forest certification schemes (e.g. FSC or PEFC). We monitor this via direct engagement of T1 and T2 suppliers: 1) annual review of certification status 2) bi-annual direct data gathering from key Tier1 and Tier 2 suppliers in high impact categories. Actual volumes & sourcing footprint are verified annually against our ERP by category and material type.
[Add 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:

☑ Engaging and working collaboratively in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

59.6

(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

☑ Greater community support to facilitate sustainable agriculture

☑ Increased knowledge on commodity driven deforestation, forest degradation and/or conversion

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

Since the 1970s, we have provided more than 400 million saplings to our contracted farmers and their local communities with the aim to promote wood availability and reduce pressure on natural forests in Brazil, Kenya, Bangladesh and Pakistan. We also developed alternative sources of tobacco curing fuel, to minimize deforestation risk that may be present in the growing regions and in the farms. In 2023, 46.86% of our contracted farmers used alternative, locally available biomass fuels for tobacco curing. This includes sugarcane bagasse briquettes in Kenya and jute sticks and rice husks in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. Also in 2023, as part of our Thrive programme, we continued to engage with farmers on training, with 288,240 people participating. Training was delivered through farm visits and communication material, covering best practices on natural resources preservation, forest and biodiversity. Regular, scheduled farm visits are used alongside unannounced visits. Before we enter into a contract with new farmers, we undertake due diligence to check for no deforestation, no natural ecosystems conversion and relevant biodiversity practices. If any cases of deforestation are observed, the relevant farmer will be put under remediation to reforest in the same eco-region and/or jurisdiction. We ask our third-party suppliers to take equivalent steps.

Timber products

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Increasing production unit monitoring

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

24

(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

☑ Investment in monitoring tools and traceability systems

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

To progress towards our target of Deforestation and Conversion Free tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline), various technologies have been explored, including satellite monitoring with alerts of potential deforestation. As a complement to "on the ground farm visits", we have been looking into different ways and technologies to increase and improve our supplier's monitoring capacity and the detection of potential deforestation cases in tobacco farms with directly contracted farmers.

Timber products

(8.11.1.1) Action type

Select from:

☑ Increasing traceability

(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action

76

(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

☑ Greater supplier awareness/engagement

☑ Improvement in data collection and quality

(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges

A big portion of the farmers we work with are based in remote areas, e.g. Pakistan and Bangladesh rural areas and 99.8% of farmers using wood are small scale farmers that regularly buy wood from their local smallholder suppliers. Having full traceability to demonstrate DCF status from smallholders can be challenging and we

are engaging with them to support increasing the traceability granularity and develop wood supply chain studies, often combined with training for the farmers regarding protection of natural resources and wood sustainability and traceability. In 2023, BAT Bangladesh developed an app that supports the field technicians in performing a detailed wood fuel survey with the farmers, providing details around the wood source, wood suppliers contact and address and adding pictures of the evidence the farmer holds. This information is then verified by the local BAT sustainability deployment officers, who contact the wood suppliers to collect further information and evidence around the source of the wood.
[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:
☑ Yes

(8.12.2) Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

Select from:
☑ No

(8.12.3) Primary reason certification details are not available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

Select from:
☑ No requirement from customers to track certification levels in the past

(8.12.4) Explain why certification details are not available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members

We have not received a request from any CDP Supply Chain members re. Forest Commodities.
[Fixed row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

	GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members

[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

☑ Labor rights

☑ Human rights protected under international law

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

☑ Certification
☑ First party audits
☑ Third party audits
☑ Ground-based monitoring
☑ Supplier self-declaration
☑ Remote sensing or other geospatial monitoring

(8.14.5) Please explain

All BAT leaf suppliers are expected to comply with the BAT's Supplier Code of Conduct (SCoC), including providing us with 'received and read' confirmations of the Leaf Supplier Manual, which is reviewed and submitted to 100% of leaf suppliers on an annual basis. Requirements in SCoC include the need for suppliers to comply with all applicable laws, codes and regulations wherever they operate. Suppliers are also expected to submit Sustainable Tobacco Programme and Thrive self-assessments, including requests to the suppliers to state how they ensure legal compliance with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards in the jurisdictions where they operate. In Kenya we ensure legal compliance for the Forest Conservation and Management Act and the Tobacco Growing & Marketing Regulation, which requires businesses to provide farmers annually five hundred seedlings per hectare. We distribute more seedlings than required by law and monitor the survival rate. In Vietnam, there are clauses in farmer contracts and our field technicians monitor use of sustainable wood. In Indonesia wood used for curing is sourced from state-owned unproductive rubber wood plantations that need regeneration; wood suppliers are geo-localized, monitored by drones and are required to comply with regulations, including a certificate that the wood used by the farmers is sourced from legal sources. In Croatia, farmers that cure tobacco on wood are required to have an invoice for wood issued by Hrvatske šume d.o.o., aligned with the Ministry of Agriculture which confirm that it is from sustainable wood sources, and we are monitoring and collecting evidence of it via FSM, our farmer monitoring system. In Philippines wood plantations should be registered under the Certificate of Tree Plantation Ownership, issued by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. In India farmers are monitored for sustainability of the wood and trained on how to comply with laws and regulations related to deforestation. In Zimbabwe wood used for curing tobacco is either sourced from legally implemented commercial plantations or through a permit to collect wood from the Rural Council or the Environmental Management Agency who allocate where wood can be collected as per the Zimbabwe Forest Act requirement. In Mozambique, farmers are trained and monitored regarding compliance with Mozambique Forestry Legislation. In Brazil, 100% of our directly contracted farmers are enrolled in the Rural Environmental Registry, which establish conditions to the wood and land use. Our Leaf Supplier Manual requires all suppliers of leaf to BAT to comply with generally accepted international standards as well as all local laws and regulations. Comprehensive farmer monitoring complements the above programmes, on the ground verifying and assessing compliance with local legislations regarding no deforestation. Wood used in factories come from legal production forests. For pulp and paper materials in Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Malaysia, Mexico, Argentina, Nigeria, and Thailand we use a combination of supplier and sourcing control mechanisms including traceability up to mill level via FSC/PEFC CoC and checking compliance with forest regulations. [Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.

(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Risk of biodiversity loss

☑ Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems

☑ Commodity sourcing footprint

☑ Risk of supplier non-compliance in area

☑ Organization has operational presence in area

☑ Opportunity to protect and restore natural ecosystems

(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement

To prioritize landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement we use a mix of strategic, operational, and environmental aspects of our tobacco supply chain and wood use footprint. We first start with our internal targets and actions required to meet the targets in the specific jurisdictions in which we source tobacco cured with wood and / or where wood is used in curing barns construction. We monitor the leaf suppliers' performance and adherence against standards and indicators through our Thrive Digital Platform and our sustainable agriculture and farmer livelihoods programme where BAT Leaf Operations and third-party suppliers report assessments e.g. compliance with DCF status. Since 2016, we have used Thrive to track performance of our leaf suppliers, data reported in Thrive is based on on-the-ground farmers monitoring. We also prioritise action according to the volume of tobacco sourced and highest volume of wood as well to the highest deforestation and biodiversity risks, based on risk assessment. Our most recent risk assessment included a combination of indicators for both biodiversity and forests. We apply this risk/opportunity screening to our landscape prioritization to ensure we are implementing activities where they have the best chance of mitigating risk, reducing harm, and securing positive outcomes for biodiversity. Beyond this initial screening we are evaluating how we can maximize our efforts and positive impact, considering geographical

complexity and local/regional requirements to engage with other players in the market as well as local organizations and regulatory bodies. BAT is committed to be Forest Positive in our tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline), meaning that the adverse impacts to biodiversity/forests from business activities are outweighed by positive outcomes from actions to avoid and minimize impacts, restore affected biodiversity as well as from offsetting the business impacts. Leaf suppliers forest programmes shall be developed to have positive impact in the landscape of the growing regions, considering the natural conditions and native species that can work to maintain and / or enhance biodiversity functions on the areas where the initiatives will be realized. Forest programmes shall be tailored and developed by the leaf suppliers themselves or they should seek to participate in existing forest conservation programmes developed by other stakeholders.
[Fixed row]

(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.

Row 1

(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ1

(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative

Bonayan

(8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Bangladesh

(8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

Chottogram North Leaf Region, Chottogram South Leaf Region, Allardorgah, Chechua, Jhenaidah, Meherpur, Manikginj, Rangpur

(8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:
☑ Yes

(8.15.2.7) Area covered by the initiative (ha)

6300

(8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

☑ Convener: Leads or facilitates the design, set-up, and high-level management of the initiative

☑ Funder: Provides full or partial financial resources

(8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

1980

(8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

4180000

(8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

☑ Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

☑ Biodiversity protected and/or restored

☑ Ecosystem services maintained and/or enhanced

☑ Increased and/or maintained protected areas

☑ Natural ecosystems conserved and/or restored

Social

☑ Ensuring local communities and smallholders benefit from the outcomes of landscape/jurisdictional initiative

☑ Implementation of livelihood activities/practices that reduce pressure on forests
☑ Improved business models that enable inclusion (including smallholders)
☑ Income diversification amongst producers in area

(8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

☑ Co-design and develop goals, strategies and an action plan with timebound targets and milestones for the initiative
☑ Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation
☑ Help establish effective mechanisms for undertaking human rights due diligence, risk management, monitoring, verification, and grievance resolution

Enhance government and capacity

☑ Support local governments (or equivalent) to enhance landscape governance structure, and provide them with resources to develop and implement sustainable landscape policies and/or management plan

Support and incentivize sustainable production and community land use practices

☑ Capacity building for farmers, smallholders and local communities to implement good agricultural practices (including improved efficiency, crop diversification and adoption of certification)

(8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

Select all that apply

☑ National government
☑ Sub-national government
☑ Local communities
☑ Other, please specify **:**Academics / Researchers

(8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

BAT Bangladesh operates the country's longest-running private sector-driven afforestation programme. Now in its 42nd year, the programme has so far distributed 125 million fruit, forestry and medicinal plant saplings free of charge to diverse beneficiaries. formal partnership with governmental and non-governmental

organizations to promote production, distribution and plantation of native trees in public land and in farms and communities where tobacco is grown, with the goal to promote sustainable use of wood for different purposes and extra income generation to the farmers.

(8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

☑ Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

(8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

The programme has so far distributed 115 million fruit, forestry, and medicinal plant saplings free of charge to diverse beneficiaries. Its goal is to increase the tree-covered land area of Bangladesh by 2030. In 2023, our afforestation programme supported the livelihoods of over 6,000 beneficiaries through the distribution of 5 million saplings. At present, the project is operating in more than 18 districts across the country, with an estimated total area of 6,300 hectares of land covered with trees since the project started. We commissioned Nielsen Corporation for an independent survey in 2020 to assess the impact of the programme on the farmers & communities. 800 people were enlisted as part of the study, where 400 people (intervention area) received saplings & 400 people (control area) did not receive any saplings. Study results showed that ecological improvement has been witnessed across 97% of the Bonayan intervention areas, 77% of beneficiaries earn money from the tree plantations, while 49% state an increase in income & 33% of the beneficiaries invest money earned from the tree plantation in other businesses & ecological impact. BAT Bangladesh also monitors 100% of their contracted farmers regarding agricultural best practices implementation (like biological control), DCF status and sustainability of wood used by the applicable farmers. Farmer training is also a deployed initiative, 2023 had a total of 162,896 participations of farmers in 5,825 training sessions involving environmental, social & sustainable agriculture matters, e.g. workers' rights, use of sustainable wood, integrated pest management, farm business management, crop diversification & child labour prevention. Our afforestation programmes follow FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment Terms & Definitions, planted forests are defined as forests composed of trees established through planting and/or deliberate seeding & where the planted/seeded trees are expected to constitute more than 50 percent of the growing stock at maturity.

(8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are making a claim

(8.15.2.19) Type of claim made

Select from:

☑ Individual claim

(8.15.2.20) Provide further details on your claim

In our annual combined report, we provide overall information about how Bonayan have been supporting our journey towards Net Positive Impact by distributing saplings to our contracted farmers and local communities to use as part of their sustainable fuel wood sources for tobacco curing, aiming to promote wood self-sufficiency and protect the natural forests of the areas where we operate.
[Add row]

(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.

Row 1

(8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:
☑ LJ1

(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?

Select from:
☑ Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, and we are able/willing to disclose volume data

(8.15.3.3) Commodity

Select from:
☑ Timber products

(8.15.3.4) % of disclosure volume from this landscape/jurisdiction

11.18
[Add row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

☑ Engaging with communities

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Croatia

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Please specify :Virovitica, Kutjevo

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) - In Croatia just 4% of the crop volume was cured with wood in 2023 and 100% of the wood used in curing came from FSC certified sources. These initiatives allow us to enhance traceability, supporting our targets of Deforestation and Conversion Free in our tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline) and Forest Positive in our tobacco supply chain by 2025 (vs 2021 baseline) and connects with our Environment policy outlining the requirement for robust governance and collaboration with external partners.

Row 2

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Timber products

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

☑ Involved in industry platforms

☑ Engaging with communities

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

☑ Please specify :Cao Bang, Lang Son, Dak Lak, Tay Ninh, Gia Lai

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

In Vietnam, we engaged the Centre for Resources management & Sustainable development to conduct an independent assessment and map the wood supply chain of the tobacco production in country. In one of BAT's growing regions, farmers buy wood by-products to be used as curing fuel. These by-products are sourced from wood suppliers from the timber and rubber industry. The external partner helped us to map those suppliers and whether their chains of custody are sufficient to guarantee wood is sustainable and not associated with deforestation. In another growing region, farmers harvest wood on their own land, from plantations established years prior. An assessment was conducted with 669 farmers, equivalent to 401 hectares, to establish if they hold the necessary licenses granted by the government, permitting them to legally grow plantations and harvest at specific rates. Based on the assessment of the current state, the external partner provided advice and supported on an action plan creation to improve the sustainability of the supply chain and acquire FSC certification for specific Leaf Growing Areas where applicable by the end of 2025
[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:
☑ Natural regeneration

(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

The Private Natural Heritage Reserve - RPPN of UNISC (University of Santa Cruz) was created in 2005, from the donation of 221 hectares of land, by BAT Brazil (formerly called Souza Cruz) to the Associação Pró-Ensino in Santa Cruz do Sul - APESC. Within this area of natural beauty, the 221 hectares were officially transformed into an RPPN through Ordinance No. 16, of March 18, 2009, published in the Official Gazette on March 19, 2009, with the main function of preserving the environment region's environment. The area was declared as a private natural heritage reserve and since then 100% of the area was kept solely for restoration and conservation purposes. UNISC's RPPN is one of the largest in Rio Grande do Sul, being a refuge for several species of fauna and flora. And, in this way, the region has the privilege of having a sample of the Atlantic Forest biome, which will be preserved in perpetuity, encouraging the protection of biodiversity, and expanding the protected areas in the country. The area contributes to pollination of crops, to the regulation of air, climate, and water quality, among other ecosystem services. The UNISC RPPN is in the State of Rio Grande do Sul, in the municipality of Sinimbu, 25 km away from its downtown. The RPPN area cannot be managed for any other purpose than the natural conservation. Geolocation: GeoHack - Santa Cruz do Sul University Private Natural Heritage Reserve https://geohack.toolforge.org/geohack.php?pagenameSanta_Cruz_do_Sul_University_Private_Natural_Heritage_Reserve&params29_23_00_S_52_32_00_W_region:BR_type:landmark

(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

2005

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

☑ Indefinitely

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

221

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

221

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

-29.38

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-52.53

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

☑ Six-monthly or more frequently

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

620000

(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

When the RPPN it was created, much of the vegetation was secondary, in various stages of regeneration, with fragments of forest with numerous trails for human movement and the presence of exotic plant species. When the RPPN was created, the area was characterized by 60% of virgin areas, 20% of secondary areas and secondary forests in regeneration and 20% of land recently occupied by agriculture and livestock by small farmers. In satellite images it was possible to visualize the access road and numerous trails for human displacement. Since the donation of the area, in 2006, the University started a regular monitoring programme. Monitoring results show that currently, the vegetation is so dense that there are no more areas of undergrowth. Almost the entire RPPN is covered by vegetation in advanced stages of conservation. Current satellite images show that it is no longer possible to see the old trails and roads, which were covered by native vegetation. Scientific studies were carried out and later published on the fauna found in the RPPN. Sixteen species of wild mammals were recorded, eight of which are endangered, including the red howler monkey (Alouatta guariba clamitans), capuchin monkey (Cebus nigritus), tayra (Eira barbara), coati (Nasua nasua), black cat maracajá (Leopardus wiedii), water opossum (Chironectes minimus), otter (Lontra longicaudis) and paca (Cuniculus paca). Furthermore, 169 species of birds were identified in the area, most of which are forest species and 44 are endemic to the Atlantic Forest. Five species threatened with extinction in Rio Grande do Sul found, named uru (Odontophorus capueira), dove (Patagioenas cayennensis), squirrel thrush (Triclaria malachitacea), tovacuçu (Grallaria varia) and white parrot. (Amazona pretrei),

the latter threatened worldwide (IUCN Red List). In addition to these, other rare species or those in the “near threatened” (Near Threatened - IUCN) category of extinction are found. Activities of ecotourism and environmental education and reasearch are also realized in the area, coordinated by the University. [Add row] [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

At larger facilities data is taken at real time via Building Management Systems. For all other locations, metering and or invoice data is taken monthly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites collect water data based on metering & monthly invoices from water suppliers. Small offices estimate water withdrawn per headcount or area occupied. Metering data is taken monthly, while at major sites it is taken in real time via Building Management Systems (BMS). Sites report water withdrawn data via our global online reporting tool monthly. Data reported by sites is reviewed at regional & global level. Data is aggregated for appropriate geography & reported to a range of internal & external stakeholder groups. Water withdrawn is one of our Group KPIs, against which targets are set and monitored on a regular basis. Among other KPIs, water withdrawn is reported as per GRI and other reporting standards (DJSI) & published in the 2023 Combined Annual & Sustainability Report. BAT has adopted the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) standard and aims to have 100% of our operations sites certified by 2025. By the end of 2023, 44 operations sites (68.8%) had achieved certification.

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

At larger facilities data is taken at real time via Building Management Systems. For all other locations, metering and or invoice data is taken monthly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites are required to maintain water supply maps indicating all water sources. Sites collect water withdrawn data based on measurement (metering) and monthly invoices from water suppliers. Small offices estimate water withdrawn per headcount or area occupied. Metering is done at least monthly, while at major sites - in real time via Building Management System (BMS). Data of water withdrawn with breakdown by source are reported via our Global online reporting tool monthly. Water withdrawn data with breakdown by source are aggregated at the Group level and reported to a range of internal stakeholders and externally via our annual report. The 2023 group numbers for operations were 64% of water withdrawn in 2023 was from utility supplies, 1.5% was from fresh surface water sources, 35% from ground water sources.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water sampling, performed by certified independent laboratories

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites review all water withdrawals to ensure registrations &/or permits have been obtained & verified in line with local legal requirements as minimum. Sites ensure the quality of water complies with local regulations & our internal standards, depending on its purpose through selection of source of water withdrawn & appropriate treatment. Measurement of water quality is performed through sampling by independent certified laboratories and, at major sites, continuously controlled via sampling by utilities depts. Frequency of measurements is as per legal requirements. Annually all operations sites review their self-assessment as per our internal water roadmap assessment tool, which regulates requirements for water withdrawn quality when submitted via our online environmental reporting system. Data is reviewed at regional & global level.

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

All sites collect water discharge data based on measurement (metering) and invoices from water suppliers and wastewater service providers. Smaller sites may estimate water discharge based on water withdrawn.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Monitoring frequency: Monitoring is done at least annually. At major sites - monthly, while at some of them - in real time via Building Management Systems (BMS). Sites report water discharge data via our Global on-line reporting tool monthly. Review and use of the data: The data reported by sites are reviewed by Sustainability

teams at Regional and Global level. Water discharge data with breakdown by source are aggregated at the Group level and reported to a range of internal stakeholders and externally.

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

At larger facilities data is taken at real time via Building Management Systems. For all other locations, metering and or invoice data is taken monthly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Sites collect water discharge data through metering and invoices. Smaller sites estimate discharge based on water withdrawn. Destinations are mapped, and permits obtained. Monitoring varies: real-time in some sites, monthly in most, and annual in others. Monthly reports follow GRI standards using an online tool. Water discharge breakdown is tracked, reflected in the environmental reporting manual, and covered in team trainings. Annually, units review water quality management requirements. Regional & Global EHS review reported data, aggregated at the Group level for internal and external reporting (e.g. DJSI). BAT has adopted the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) standard and aims to have 100% of our operations sites certified by 2025. 68.8% of relevant operations sites were certified by the end of 2023.

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

At larger facilities data is taken at real time via Building Management Systems. For all other locations, metering and or invoice data is taken monthly

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites review water discharges to ensure registrations and/ or permits have been obtained and verified in line with legal requirements, incl. regulating water treatment on site and regulating water discharge quality and quantity by destination to ensure treatment on site is sufficient prior to discharge. As per our Global Water Management Standard, sites are required to document Water Discharge Inventory, including volume discharged by treatment method and include corrective actions wherever any abnormalities are detected. Improved global reporting means are tracking water discharge broken down by type of treatment and collected from the sites monthly. Annually all operations sites are required to review their self-assessment against the Water Roadmap, which regulates the requirements for water discharge. Results of self-assessments and updates on actions plan are submitted by sites annually thorough on-line environmental reporting system.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water sampling, performed by certified independent laboratories.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites review water discharges to ensure registrations and/or permits have been obtained and verified in line with legal requirements, incl. those regulating water discharge quality in terms of standard effluent parameters, as the minimum. Standard effluent parameters as per legal requirements are periodically measured by

sampling by external certified laboratories and, at the major sites, controlled internally by Utilities depts. When any abnormalities are detected, sites are required to implement corrective actions to get back on track. Annually all operations sites are required to review their self-assessment against the Water Roadmap, which regulates the requirements for water discharge. Results of self-assessments, updates on actions plan are submitted by sites annually through online environmental reporting system. Further, annually all reporting units complete an EHS compliance Roadmap assessment, stipulating the requirements for discharged water quality management

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:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water sampling, performed by certified independent laboratories.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge quality is managed and monitored locally dependent on the wastewater quality parameters defined as per any permits, licenses or agreements with water authorities or regulators. In addition to this, in 2022, globally we performed a screening for priority substances and pesticides, phosphates and nitrates. 100% of our operational sites reported no process use of these substances, and 38% reported not using them in any on-site ancillary or support services.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Yearly – Although not fixed and carried out as and when required as part of all relevant regulatory requirements, as a minimum water quality will be measured annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites review their water discharges to ensure registrations and/or permits have been obtained and verified in line with legal requirements, incl. those regulating water discharge quality in terms of temperature, as the minimum. Temperature of discharged water is periodically controlled by external certified laboratories as per legal requirements and, at major sites, continuously controlled by Utilities depts. Wherever any abnormalities are detected, sites are required to implement corrective actions to get back on track. Annually all operations sites are required to review their self-assessment against the Water Roadmap, which regulates the requirements for water discharge results of self-assessments and updates on actions plan are submitted by sites annually through on-line environmental reporting system. Further, annually all reporting units complete an EHS compliance Roadmap assessment stipulating the requirements for discharged water quality management.

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

At larger facilities data is taken at real time via Building Management Systems. For all other locations, metering and or invoice data is taken monthly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Sites track water consumption based on data for water withdrawn and water discharged (C W – D, where C – consumption, W – water withdrawn, D – water discharged). Measurements are completed based on metering and/ or monthly invoices from water suppliers and wastewater services providers. All sites are required to report water consumption data, monthly via our Global on-line reporting tool. The data reported by sites are reviewed by Sustainability teams at regional and global level. Water consumption performance data aggregated for appropriated geography are reported to a range of internal and external stakeholder groups

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

At larger facilities data is taken at real time via Building Management Systems. For all other locations, metering data is taken monthly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Sites collect water recycled/ reused data via metering. Wherever measurement capabilities are not fully in place, these are based on estimates prepared by Engineering/ Utilities departments. Measurements at the major sites monitor parameters in real time via building management systems, with other sites reporting monthly. Monthly water recycled/ reused data is reported by all sited via our global online reporting tool. Data reported by sites is reviewed by Sustainability teams at regional & global level. Water recycled performance data aggregated for appropriate geography is reported to a range of internal and external stakeholder groups. Water recycled/ reuse is one of our Group KPIs for which 2025 targets are set. Among other KPIs, water recycled data are aggregated at the Group level and reported as per GRI to DJSI and in publications including our Combined Annual and Report.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

EHS compliance self-assessment, completed locally and validated globally as part of the corporate audit cycle.

(9.2.4) Please explain

All sites are required to complete self-assessment as per our Water Roadmap, the document for self-assessment for compliance to our Global EHS standards. Relevant standards stipulate that personnel hygiene & welfare facilities must be in accordance with legal hygiene standards & covers sanitation, washrooms and food areas control as well as control over hygienic quality of drinking water. Requirement for providing access to proper water & sanitation facilities to employees & other personnel at premises is stipulated in the water section of our Group Environment Policy Statement. Annually all reporting units complete a Water Roadmap stipulating the requirements for hygiene, incl. WASH services. All operations sites review their self-assessment against the Water Roadmap, which regulates the requirements to social water, incl. sanitary installations, water use in canteen & maintenance of the systems. Self-assessments, updates are submitted annually via online reporting system.
[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)

3160

(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:

☑ Other, please specify :combination of Water withdrawn and Water discharge trends

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We follow GRI 303: Water and Effluents 2018 Standard for defining & measuring water withdrawn. This includes water from various sources such as surface water, groundwater, rainwater, and third-party suppliers, utilized in our direct operations for manufacturing, utilities, and social purposes. However, irrigation activities in agriculture, such as leaf growing, are not considered. To collect water withdrawn data, we utilize an online reporting system (Credit360). Major sites employ real-time monitoring through Building Management Systems, while smaller offices estimate their water withdrawn based on occupied area or headcount. In 2023, we achieved a 23% reduction in water withdrawn compared to the previous year. This reduction was primarily driven by implementing water efficiency initiatives, conducting water loss analyses, and adopting water-saving technologies at our factories and Green Leaf Threshing plants (GLTs). Additionally, we have focused on replacing fresh water with recycled water in non-production processes, where possible. Factors such as changes in production volume and divestments in certain regions also contributed to the reduction in water withdrawn. Looking ahead, we anticipate a gradual decrease in water withdrawn within the same reporting scope, aligned with our target of reducing water withdrawn by 35% compared to our 2017 baseline by 2025. Having achieved this target, we are working to continue to surpass our original target with the implementation of water-smart technologies, process optimization, continued efforts to eliminate water losses, and enhanced control of water usage by area or specific processes within our facilities. Collaboration with the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) will enable us to explore further opportunities for water stewardship. Consistently applied trend thresholds classify any year-on-year change of over /-5% as "Higher" or "Lower," while changes exceeding /-30% are categorized as "Much higher" or "Much lower".

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

1528

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We follow GRI 303: Water and Effluents 2018 Standard for water discharge definition, encompassing effluents, used and unused water released to various water sources. Data on water discharge with destination breakdown is collected via our online reporting system (Credit360). Sites obtain data through internal metering or supplier invoices. Estimates are employed when metering is unavailable, based on water withdrawn volumes and equipment/process water consumption averages. A 5.6% reduction in water discharge was achieved compared to 2022, driven by water-saving technology, efficiency measures, and lower production output. Optimization of water use for social needs, cleaning, and recycling contributed to the decline. Water discharge decreased more than water withdrawn due to increased water recycling for irrigation and product incorporation. Anticipated is a gradual decrease in water discharge in alignment with reduced water withdrawn. Water-smart technologies, optimized processes, and sustained water recycling efforts will facilitate this transition. Consistently applied trend thresholds encompass anything over /- 5% as 'Higher'/'Lower' YoY, and anything exceeding /- 30% as 'Much higher'/'Much lower'

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

1632

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Consumption remains flat with more recycled water usage

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Consumption remains flat with more recycled water usage

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

"0.7% decrease compared to 2021. Water consumption is calculated as per the following formula: C W - D Where, W total withdrawals, D total discharges, C total consumption. Water storage on site is negligible. Trend in water consumption follows trends in both water withdrawn and water discharged, both of which were downwards, though water discharge decreased at a higher rate. We've seen only a slight decrease in water consumption due to additional or intensified water recycling activities, specifically those where recycled water was used for irrigation instead of being discharged. In the future we expect water consumption to continuously decrease following the expected decrease in water withdrawn. The key enabler envisioned are chilling technology that use minimal amount of water. Yet the rate or the decrease is expected to be lower than that of water withdrawn due to increased water consumption for being incorporate into product (e.g. modern oral) at certain facilities. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'."
[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)

1440.3

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

45.58

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Defining facilities in water stress areas via Word Resource Institute (WRI) Aqueduct tool: To identify facilities located in water stress areas, we maintain the list of exact geographical coordinates (latitude, longitude) of our Operations sites (factories and Green Leaf Threshing plants) based on the information from local sites' teams via our environmental reporting system. The information is updated annually. The same environmental reporting system (Credit360) is used to collect information on water withdrawal volumes by each of the facilities. We define facilities as being in 'water stress' zone as per WRI Aqueduct map using the aforementioned geographical coordinates. Our approach is based on the default scheme for baseline water stress and selecting the sites in the "Extremely High" or "High" zone, i.e. equals or exceeds 40%, as recommended by the CDP guideline. Offices, warehouses and other locations are out of scope of the mapping due to being non-material compared to Operations in terms of water use. WRI Aqueduct tool also allows us to identify water basins for the locations of each of our facilities. Due to updates from 2022 to 2023 on the WRI Aqueduct tool more of our sites are in water stress areas than in 2022, we have also re-run 2022 numbers so that it is a like for like comparison. Based on re-running 2022 withdrawal numbers through 2023's Aquaduct database 1,657,797 m3 of water is withdrawn from water stressed areas in 2022, in 2023 the number is 1,440,303 m3 which is a 13.1% decrease vs 2022 numbers.
[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

As part of our ambition to trace pulp and paper to forest we will be able to overlay basin level data once this is achieved.

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:

☑ 11-25

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

In 2023 BAT had 25% of the tobacco volume sourced from water stressed areas, staying within the same band as in 2022. The water stress locations were mapped through the use of WRI Aqueduct Water Tool, which is done in an annual base. In the future we expect the percentage of tobacco sourced from water stressed areas to reduce or remain in the same range. In this sense we perform tests and research in order to introduce our directly contracted farmers with best and more efficient alternatives, as an example we are introducing drip irrigation technology in eight countries. These include Brazil, Mexico and Pakistan, with upcoming trials planned for the next crop cycle in three more countries. This specific irrigation system has been shown to increase water-usage efficiency by up to 50%, as well as reducing soil erosion and salination, ultimately boosting yields.
[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)

46.6

(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:

☑ Other, please specify :Remained flat

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Fresh surface water constitutes only 1.5% of our water supply. We track water sources globally and measure volumes through metering. In 2023, usage remained flat at around 46 ML compared to 46 ML in 2022. Moving forward, we aim to minimize surface water intake, except for harvested rainwater, which accounted for 48% of our fresh surface water in 2022. Rainwater harvesting reduces peak demands, preserves treated water for other uses, and mitigates stormwater runoff.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We do not use brackish water in our manufacturing process because of concerns that brackish water may adversely impact the quality of our product, thus failing to meet consumer expectations. We do not expect brackish water to be relevant in the future.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1104.98

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Groundwater supplies 35% of our water, and we comply with local regulations for authorized sources. We track water sources globally and measure volumes through metering or estimation based on equipment needs. In 2023, groundwater usage decreased to 1104 ML compared to 1200 ML in 2022 (-8%). This reduction is attributed to measures such as improved metering, water recycling projects, smart HVAC systems, and optimized water use. Over the next 5 years, we anticipate a continuous decrease in groundwater usage through smart water technologies, efficiency measures, maintenance improvements, and minimizing water losses Our trend thresholds classify differences of /- 5% as 'Higher' or 'Lower', and anything exceeding /- 30% as 'Much higher' or 'Much lower'

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We do not use non-renewable groundwater. Sustainable supply of water is crucial for our operations, thus before developing or using a source of groundwater, research is done to ensure that underground water level is stable, and water withdrawn is easily replenished. This is crucial for both continuity of operations and minimizing environmental impact of our operations. We do not anticipate non-renewable groundwater to be relevant in the future.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

As per the specifics of our manufacturing process, there are no major processes associated with water generation. On top, we cannot use produced water in our manufacturing process because of concerns that produced/entrained water may adversely impact the quality of our product, thus failing to meet consumer expectations. We do not expect produced/ entrained water to be relevant in the future.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2008.59

(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

Municipal water accounts for 64% of our water withdrawal. Our Global reporting units document all water sources and volumes, aggregated in an online reporting system (Credit360). Municipal water volumes are mainly based on internal measurements or supplier bills. Small offices estimate usage based on headcount or occupied area. The decrease to 2,008 ML in 2023 from 2,252 ML in 2022 (-11%) is due to water-saving initiatives at sites reliant on municipal water. These include water loss analysis, minimizing losses, adopting water-saving technology for utilities, social purposes, and irrigation, and increased water recycling. However, this was partially offset by production increases at sites using third-party water or switching to other sources. We expect water supplied by third parties to remain the primary source, with volumes continuously decreasing in the next 5 years. Trend thresholds: /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower', and /- 30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.
[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)

189

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to fresh surface water is relevant as 12% of water is discharged to this destination. Units report destinations of water discharge & respective volumes in our online reporting system (Credit360). Volumes of water discharge to surface water are based on internal metering or estimates based on volumes of water withdrawn and consumption in processes. The decrease to 189 ML in 2023 vs 195 ML in 2022 is due to reduction in water withdrawal through water efficiency improvement and increased water recycling at several sites having surface water as water discharge destination. Sites are required to ensure the water is treated so that it's quality, temperature and other parameters are in line with applicable local regulations. In the next 5 years water discharge to fresh surface water is expected to decrease in line with overall water discharged volume. Trend thresholds: over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' vs previous year, over /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

4.5

(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:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Issue in 2022 accounting - showed increase vs 2021, issue now resolved.

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

In 2022 an issue with Cuba reporting caused an increase from 7 in 2021 to 22 in 2022. Having resolved the issue, we are now reporting decrease in line with glidepath of 4.5.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

28

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**About the same

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to groundwater is minor, yet relevant since 2% of water is discharged to this destination. Negligible change in water discharge over the past year. Our units report destinations of water discharge and respective volumes in our global online reporting system (Credit 360). Volumes of water discharged to groundwater are estimated based on volumes of water withdrawn and consumption in processes. Whenever discharge to groundwater is done, sites are required to ensure the water is treated so that its quality, temperature and other parameters are in line with applicable local regulations. In the future (next 5 years) we expect the volume water discharge to groundwater to stay about the same. Trend thresholds: over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' vs previous year, over /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1306

(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:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

This is the main destination for 86% of our water discharge. Units report discharge destinations and volumes in our online reporting system (Credit360). Discharge to municipality/3rd party are based on internal metering, bills, or estimates as per volumes of water withdrawn and consumption in processes. 2022: 1414 ML vs 2023: 1306 ML Reduction (-7.6%) due to water-saving tech, efficiency, lower output. BAT has reduced supply needs and discharged volumes on site. Initiatives that influenced water discharge include optimizing water use, cleaning, recycling at factories and GLTs. Social needs and cleaning had biggest impact. Future: major discharge destination, expect gradual volume decrease in 5 years. Trend thresholds: /-5% is 'Higher'/'Lower', /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.
[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)

62.9

(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:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 21-30

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

"Relevance: Tertiary water treatment is relevant since 5% of water discharged is treated to this highest level. Tertiary treatment is done at 26% of our operations sites (factories and green leaf threshing plants), where the % of water treated to such extent varies from 10 to 100%. Tertiary treatment is done whenever required by legislation and if discharge to municipality/3rd party is not possible, in most cases for discharge to surface water. Quality of discharged water (e.g., BOD/COD, pH, harmful substances, etc.) is periodically controlled as per applicable regulations by sampling analysis (mostly by third party laboratories). BAT complies with all applicable international, national and sub-national regulatory standards required by the local and national water bodies and authorities relevant to each BAT facility Change in volume: The amount of water subject to tertiary treatment showed decrease (-61%) vs 144 in 2022. The decrease is driven by change in water management practices and significant increase in water recycling at several of our facilities (e.g. Nigeria) reducing the amount of water discharged. Our definition for change: Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'. Anticipated future trend: In the future we expect the amount of discharged water subject to tertiary treatment to remain at the same level as no significant alterations are being planned for the production processes. "

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

261.8

(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:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Relevance: Secondary water treatment is relevant since 19.6% of water discharged is treated to this level. Secondary treatment only is done at 33% of our operations sites (factories and green leaf threshing plants), where the % of water treated to such extent varies from 1 to 100%, as well as at a few warehouses and R&D centres. Secondary treatment is done as required legislation and/or if discharge to municipality/3rd party is not possible. Quality of discharged water (e.g., BOD/COD, pH, harmful substances, etc.) is periodically controlled as per applicable regulations by sampling analysis (mostly by third party laboratories). BAT aims to comply with all applicable international, national and sub-national regulatory standards required by the local and national water bodies and authorities relevant to each BAT facility. Change in volume: The amount of water subject to secondary treatment is lower (11%) vs 294 in 2022. The change is driven by decrease of water withdrawn, hence water discharge Our definition for change: Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'. Anticipated future trend: In the future we expect the amount of discharged water subject to secondary treatment to remain at the same level or slightly increase since no significant alterations are being planned for the production processes, while some water may be redirected from primary treatment only to secondary treatment.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

22

(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:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 11-20

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Relevance: Primary water treatment only is relevant for us, though only a minor amount of water discharged (1.2%) is treated to this level only. Primary treatment only is done at 11% of our operations sites (factories and Green Leaf Threshing plants), where the % of water treated to such extent varies from 1,3 to 97%, as well as at a few offices and warehouses. Primary treatment only is done in case no higher level of treatment is required by regulations. Quality of discharged water (e.g., BOD/COD, pH, harmful substances, etc.) is periodically controlled as per applicable regulations by sampling analysis (mostly by third party laboratories). Change in volume: The amount of water subject to primary treatment only decreased (-25%) vs 29 in 2021. The decrease is driven by decrease in water needs by facilities doing primary water treatment only, hence decrease in amounts of water withdrawn and discharged. Our definition for change: Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'. Anticipated future trend: In the future we expect the amount of discharged water subject to primary treatment only to decrease by arranging secondary treatment for water or redirecting this water to municipality/3rd party for treatment.

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)

59

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(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

Relevance: Discharge of water to the natural environment is relevant for us, though only a minor amount of water discharged (1.7%) as such. Water is discharged without treatment at 6% of our operations sites (factories and green leaf threshing plants), where the % of water treated to such extent varies from 3 to 100%. Such discharge is done only in case it is allowed by legislation for water upon certain types of uses (e.g. cooling). Quality of discharged water (e.g., BOD/COD, pH, harmful substances, etc.) is periodically controlled as per applicable regulations by sampling analysis (mostly by third party laboratories). BAT Group companies are responsible for complying with all applicable regulatory standards required by the local and national water bodies and authorities relevant to each BAT facility Change in volume: The amount of water discharged without treatment showed increase (44%) vs 40 in 2022. The increase is driven by a increase in water used by one of our facilities using river water for cooling compressors, the facility withdraws water from the river and discharges water of the same quality, but at slightly higher temperature. Another increase is due to some of our offices (non-operations sites) starting to report watering of ornamental gardens. Our definition for change: Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'. Anticipated future trend: With our ongoing investments in water treatment plants, in the future we expect the amount of water discharged without treatment to decrease.

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)

1118

(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 efficiency

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 71-80

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Relevance: Discharge of water to third party (e.g. municipality) is relevant for us, and it's the option applied to over the two thirds (71%) (of discharged water. The amount of water discharge to 3rd party without treatment remained flat (-1%) vs 1130 in 2022. The option is exercised for factories and green leaf threshing plants located within the boundaries of the cities and industrial complexes that have connection to municipal water sewers as well as in rented offices. Water is discharged to 3rd party or municipality without treatment by some of our operations sites (factories and green leaf threshing plants), where the % of water discharged to municipality without treatment to such extent varies from 2 to 100%, as well as by most of our offices, R&D, TM&D and warehousing locations. Such discharge is in line with applicable legislation and subject to all the required authorizations and agreements with 3rd party. BAT Group companies are responsible for complying with all applicable regulatory standards required by the local and national water bodies and authorities relevant to each BAT facility Treatment applied by third party: municipal sewage water treatment plants apply secondary treatment in most cases acting in line with local water regulations. Depending on the geography, information on their compliance may be available publicly or not. Change in volume: The decrease is driven by overall decrease in water withdrawn and hence water discharge. Our definition for change: Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'. Anticipated future trend: In the future we expect the amount of water discharged under such option to increase due to improved municipal infrastructure at the locations where we operate and as we reduce the number of sites where we operate.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Other treatment category is not relevant for us as we don't discharge water using any specific treatment techniques that cannot be described as either primary, secondary, or tertiary water treatment. Anticipated future trend: In the future we expect this category to remain not relevant as no significant alterations are being planned for the production processes.
[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)

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☑ Nitrates

☑ Phosphates

☑ Pesticides

☑ Priority substances listed under the EU Water Framework Directive

(9.2.10.3) List the specific substances included

48 priority substances as per the list of priority substances as defined in Article 2(30) of Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as well as other nitrates, pesticides and phosphates.

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Across the Group, we track water discharge destination, treatment method, quantity and quality. In 2022, we performed a screening for priority substances and pesticides, phosphates and nitrates. 100% of our operational sites reported no process use of these substances, and 38% reported not using them in any on-site ancillary or support services. BAT operates control measures globally in line with its Group procedures for hazardous substances management designed to avoid any uncontrolled emissions to water, soil or groundwater across its operations – including for ancillary and support processes.

[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

9

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

The biggest water risks and opportunities in owned operations are from the management of water in our water stressed sites. As of 2023, 24 of our operation sites are located in water stressed locations based on WRI Aquaduct's database. However, only 9 facilities (14% of operations) across 7 basins are considered 'substantiative' as each facility represents greater than 1% of BAT's group production volume. Effective water stewardship in manufacturing operations can results in operational resilience, improved relationships with local stakeholders and reputational benefits. We are already putting large efforts into efficiency gains – on track to reduce 50% vs a 2017 baseline, reduce/avoid groundwater usage and are aiming at a dry factory type operation.

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

We have already conducted impact and dependency screening on our upstream supply chain at a category level (excluding tobacco growing), and water was not highlighted as a material pressure. In tobacco growing water risk, we have already assessed farms at a country level for water stress, however as part of our 2024 Biodiversity risk assessment updated methodology, risks, impacts and dependencies will be assessed at farm level.
[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)

Casablanca - Chile

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Other, please specify **:**Major water basin' is North Chile, Pacific Coast, respective 'minor water basins' is Maipo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.305433

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.408689

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

19

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

19

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

19

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water withdrawn volumes were much lower (-41%). The total water discharge was nearly negligible, measuring close to 0 at 0.1. This can be attributed to the effective implementation of water recycling and reuse practices within our operations. The negligible level of water discharge remained consistent with the previous year. By prioritizing the recycling and reuse of water on-site, whether treated or untreated, we significantly minimize the need for external water discharge. Water consumption also decreased due to much lower withdrawals, aligning with the overall trends observed in water withdrawal and discharge. The close-to-zero water discharge underscores our approach to responsible water management and the conservation of this valuable resource. These practices, along with the consistent application of trend thresholds, ensure that our businesses strive to operate within sustainable parameters. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Bayreuth Germany

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

☑ Rhine

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

49.962578

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

11.600995

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

36.48

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

36.48

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

18.2

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

18.2

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

18

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water withdrawn volumes were lower by 14%. The total water discharge also reduced by 14%. This can be attributed to the effective implementation of water recycling and reuse practices within our operations. By prioritizing the recycling and reuse of water on-site, whether treated or untreated, we significantly minimize the need for external water discharge. Discharges were also 14% lower, however the withdrawal volume difference continued to reduce consumption. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Monterrey - Mexico

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.686275

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-100.339819

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

78.81

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

21.8

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

56.9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

54.7

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

54.7

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

24

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water withdrawn volumes were lower by only 4%. The total water discharge also reduced by 7%. This can be attributed to the implementation of water recycling and reuse practices within our operations. By prioritizing the recycling and reuse of water on-site, whether treated or untreated, we significantly minimize the need for external water discharge. As discharges were 7% lower the consumption remained largely flat. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Jhelum Factory - Pakistan

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.976389

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.686944

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

43.39

(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

43.39

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

43

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water withdrawn volumes stayed about the same (1%). The total water discharge was nearly negligible, measuring close to 0 at 0.1. This can be attributed to the effective implementation of water recycling and reuse practices within our operations. Despite a marginal increase in water withdrawal volumes (1%), the negligible level of water discharge remained consistent with the previous year. By prioritizing the recycling and reuse of water on-site, whether treated or untreated, we significantly minimize the need for external water discharge. Additionally, water consumption also experienced a slight increase (1%), aligning with the overall trends observed in water withdrawal and discharge. The close-to-zero water discharge underscores our approach to water management in our direct operations and the conservation of this valuable resource. These practices, along with the consistent application of trend thresholds, help ensure that our businesses strive to operate in

line with best practice water management. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Samarkand Factory - Uzbekistan

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Uzbekistan

☑ Amu Darya

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.70064

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.06399

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

33.28

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

33.2

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

23

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

23

(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)

10

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water withdrawn volumes stayed about the same (1%). The total water discharge was nearly negligible, measuring close to 0 at 0.1. This can be attributed to the implementation of water recycling and reuse practices within our operations. Despite a marginal increase in water withdrawal volumes (1%), the negligible level of water discharge remained consistent with the previous year. By prioritizing the recycling and reuse of water on-site, whether treated or untreated, we significantly minimize the need for external water discharge. Additionally, water consumption also experienced a slight increase (1%), aligning with the overall trends observed in water withdrawal and discharge. The close-to-zero water discharge underscores our approach managing water risk and the conservation of this valuable resource. These practices, along with the consistent application of trend thresholds, ensure that our businesses strive to operate within sustainable parameters. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Dhaka - Bangladesh

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Bangladesh

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.780553

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

90.396645

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

99.32

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

99.3

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

99

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Water withdrawn volumes reduced (-24%). The total water discharge was nearly negligible, measuring close to 0. This can be attributed to the implementation of water recycling and reuse practices within our operations. The negligible level of water discharge is a large decrease vs the previous year by close to 100%. By prioritizing the recycling and reuse of water on-site, whether treated or untreated, we significantly minimize the need for external water discharge. Water consumption was also much lower due to the lower withdrawal volumes, aligning with the overall trends observed in water withdrawal and discharge. The close-to-zero water discharge underscores our approach to responsible water management and the conservation of this valuable resource. These practices, along with the consistent

application of trend thresholds, ensure that our businesses strive to operate within sustainable parameters. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Savar - Bangladesh

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Bangladesh

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.887236

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

89.108156

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

46.83

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

46.83

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

47

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As the facility was newly operational in 2022 water usage increased due to volumes transferred in (141%). The total water discharge was nearly negligible, measuring close to 0. This can be attributed to the state-of-the-art water recycling and reuse practices within our operations. The close-to-zero water discharge underscores our approach to responsible water management and the conservation of this valuable resource. These practices, along with the consistent application of trend thresholds, ensure that our businesses strive to operate within sustainable parameters. Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /- 5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Samsun - Turkey

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify :major water basin' is Black Sea, South Coast, respective 'minor water basin' is Corum / Amasya / Samsun

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.507833

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

36.110417

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

79.26

(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

37.72

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

41.5

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

31.3

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

31.3

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

48

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Both withdrawals (0% change) and discharges (4% increase) remained largely flat. (Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /-5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

RJRT Tobaccoville - US

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast, respective 'minor water basin' is Upper Yadkin.

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

36.255886

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-80.367906

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

397.55

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

397.55

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

264.57

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

264.57

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

133

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Both withdrawals (0.1% change) and discharges (o% increase) remained largely flat. (Trend thresholds are applied consistently to all our businesses: anything over /-5% is 'Higher'/'Lower' compared to the previous year, and anything /-30% is 'Much higher'/'Much lower'.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

BAT engaged KPMG to perform a limited assurance on selected sustainability data presented in our 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report. Total Water Withdrawn was one of the metrics Assured. The assurance engagement has been planned and performed in accordance with the International Standard on Assurance Engagements (UK) 3000 - 'Assurance Engagements other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information' ('ISAE (UK) 3000') issued by the Financial Reporting Council. Assurance is performed annually.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Although Water withdrawals with breakdown of volume by source in 2023 was not included within our KPMG Limited Assurance as it wasn't defined internally as an "associated target", we continued to monitor these parameters. We are progressing with certification of our Operations sites, focusing of facilities in Water Stress and

Water Risk areas, as per Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS). We are considering the needs to set additional targets at the Group or at the facility level and will consequently review the scope of 3rd party water-related data verification.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Information is collected at group level, but not assessed/assured by a third party.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

BAT engaged KPMG to perform a limited assurance on selected sustainability data presented in our 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report. Total Water Discharges was one of the metrics Assured. The assurance engagement has been planned and performed in accordance with the International Standard on Assurance Engagements (UK) 3000 - 'Assurance Engagements other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information' ('ISAE (UK) 3000') issued by the Financial Reporting Council. Assurance is performed annually.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Information is collected at group level, but not assessed/assured by a third party.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Information is collected at group level, but not assessed/assured by third party.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Information is collected at group level, but not assessed/assured by a single third party. Quality standards will be audited in a large number of our operation locations by local government bodies but we do not capture this information centrally.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Water consumption is a calculated field based on water withdrawn minus water discharged - as both metrics are assured this does not need assurance.
[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:
☑ We do not have this data but we intend to collect it within two years

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

27238000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

8619620.25

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

Water efficiency measured as revenue in GBP per m3 of water withdrawn is expected to improve over the foreseeable future as revenue is projected to continue to increase and BAT has a pipeline of initiatives in our glidepath to continue to reduce water withdrawals.
[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:

☑ No, not currently but we intend to collect/calculate this data within the next two years

(9.9.6) Please explain

We intend to extend the scope of measurements of environmental impact with suppliers beyond the current scope of climate and deforestation, and expand into water. We are planning to set up an engagement framework over the next 18 months, which we will use to collect primary data from supplier on water consumption, through which we will be able to calculate water intensity of this commodity.

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)

926

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawals

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.9.6) Please explain

Water usage incl. forecast planning to increase the use of more efficient irrigation systems & reduce water consumed per irrigated hectare (ha) & per ton of tobacco is closely monitored through our annual Thrive assessment, which includes our directly contracted farmers and those of our third-party suppliers, which represented over 94% of the tobacco we purchased by volume in 2023. "Thrive" is used to monitor that BAT's directly contracted farmers & those of those of our third-party suppliers have details about water consumed at each crop stage (seedbeds, soils preparation & crop development) & for each irrigation system. From total monitored, 32% are irrigated & 68% are rainfed. Water intensity value is total water withdrawn (m3) divided by tons of tobacco from the irrigated areas, a new methodology approach and more accurate information following BAT water monitoring protocol. In 2023 water intensity was 926 m3/tons, an increase by 12% vs 2022 (827 m3/tons). This is due to normal variations in weather patterns in the growing regions, mainly due to less rain in some key countries but also because of volume footprint variation. Internally, we track water intensity for monitoring water efficiency, understanding the trends & their drivers for further engagement to improve water efficiency. Special focus is made on water use by suppliers that provide tobacco from water stressed areas. We work closely with our main tobacco suppliers to educate them on water saving practices & encourage technical improvements for water saving. Future: we expect to continue improving the data accuracy, to develop more detailed plans to reduce the water intensity of tobacco. As part of our strategy to reduce water use for crop irrigation, improve water efficiency & data accuracy, the global agronomy team put in place a study to measure & evaluate the methodology used to calculate the water consumption of the supplier's farmers. The study's conclusion is helping to establish clear targets, with more accurate information. Additionally, we have already introduced drip irrigation technology to our directly contracted farmers in 8 countries, incl. Brazil, Mexico & Pakistan. Initial results have shown an increase in water-usage efficiency of between 25- 50% when compared to conventional irrigation system (furrow), as well as reducing soil erosion & salination, ultimately boosting yields.
[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

BAT Operations - water intensity Million Cigarette equivalent

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

3

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water withdrawn

(9.12.4) Denominator

Millions of Cigarettes-equivalents (MCE):1 cigarette equivalent is equal to 1 cigarette of any SKU.

(9.12.5) Comment

Water intensity in 2023 at group operations level was 3.0 m3/MCE this is a reduction of 0.2m3/MCE vs 2022. We are unable to split water withdrawal per SKU of Finished Goods and/or item of Semi-Finished Goods. We calculate water withdrawn intensity as water withdrawn divided by amount of manufactured Finished Goods. We standardised conversion factors for reporting non-cigarette products into 'cigarette equivalent' thereby being able to benchmark all factories against each other. We have information on intensity broken down by factory, for example U.S – ASC Clarksville has a water intensity of 10.6 m3/MCE in 2023 activity in this factory was not prioritised as it was not located in high stress basin. A factory where we have high levels of recycling, for example our Savar factory Bangladesh has a far lower intensity of 1.56m3/MCE. As we continue to reduce the amount of water withdrawn we forecast our intensity figures to go down. We are projecting a 2.9 intensity figure for 2024.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:
☑ Annex XVII of EU REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ 10-20

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Our total revenue for 2023 across all categories was 27.283bn. The hazardous substances noted are applicable to our New Category product for Heated Products, Vapour and Modern Oral. The revenue for 2023 for these categories was 3.347bn. This amounts to 12.27%

Row 3

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern for Authorisation above 0.1% by weight (EU Regulation)

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ 10-20

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Our total revenue for 2023 across all categories was 27.283bn. The hazardous substances noted are applicable to our New Category product for Heated Products, Vapour and Modern Oral. The revenue for 2023 for these categories was 3.347bn. This amounts to 12.27%

Row 4

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Annex XIV of UK REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ 10-20

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Our total revenue for 2023 across all categories was 27.283bn. The hazardous substances noted are applicable to our New Category product for Heated Products, Vapour and Modern Oral. The revenue for 2023 for these categories was 3.347bn. This amounts to 12.27%

Row 5

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern (UK Regulation)

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ 10-20

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Our total revenue for 2023 across all categories was 27.283bn. The hazardous substances noted are applicable to our New Category product for Heated Products, Vapour and Modern Oral. The revenue for 2023 for these categories was 3.347bn. This amounts to 12.27%
[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

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

(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**We are evaluating the water impacts of our New Categories portfolio of non-combustible products. This information might be used to benchmark our products and classify them as low water impact where applicable

(9.14.4) Please explain

Currently we are not defining any of our products or services as low water impact. But we are evaluating the water impacts of our New Categories portfolio of non-combustible products compared to similar products in the market. This information might be used to benchmark our products and classify them as low water impact where applicable.
[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.

	Target set in this category
Water pollution	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water withdrawals	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:*

	Target set in this category
	☑ Yes
Other	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water consumption

☑ Reduction in total water consumption

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

02/01/2018

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2017

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

5195000000

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

3377000000

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

316000000

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

268

(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

Our target is to reduce the total amount of water withdrawn by 35% by 2025 vs 2017 base year. Although our manufacturing processes (direct operations) are not particularly water intensive, we understand that water stress is a reality in many parts of the world where we operate. Thus, we have set the targets for water withdrawals reduction. In 2023, we achieved an absolute 39.2% decrease in total amount of water withdrawn (from 5 195 megalitres in 2017 to 3,160 megalitres in 2023).

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Every year, we evaluate processes at our operations facilities to identify our water losses. We also apply our internal management system, Integrated Work Systems (IWS), which helps us eliminate losses, and use inputs from the AWS (alliance for water stewardship) standards to detect areas that are not measured or have potential leakages. We evaluate all equipment or processes that consume water in our factories for the possibility of using treated recycled water in place of fresh water. We set the minimum water quality standards for the replacement where feasible.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

In 2023, we achieved an absolute 39.2% therefore achieving our target.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Substitution of hazardous substances with less harmful substances

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

02/01/2018

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2017

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

99.57

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100.0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC)

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers 100% of our direct and third-party tobacco suppliers.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

We share our Leaf Supplier Manual (LSM) with 100% of our third-party tobacco suppliers.). It is applicable to all suppliers of Leaf to BAT. The Leaf Supplier Manual is communicated to third party tobacco suppliers annually prior to each and every purchase for any member of the BAT Group. All third-party tobacco suppliers are required to read, understand and comply with LSM and BAT Supplier Code of Conduct. In the manual there is a specific section specific for agrochemicals compliance that should be followed and there is also a request to provide training for farmers on the topic, reinforcing the message and knowledge in the field. The use of active ingredients listed in "Agrochemicals non-endorsed (not to be used in tobacco production) is also shared in the manual. In 2023, 100% of suppliers had tobacco production with no detection of non-recommended agrochemicals.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

BAT is an active member of CORESTA's Agrochemicals Advisory Committee, which aims to promote the alignment and guidelines across the Tobacco Industry. By following WHO/FAO guidelines on pesticide classification by hazard and CORESTA Guide N27, BAT has programs to eliminate HHPs, including active ingredients listed by Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention and Montreal Protocol. BATs program requires all BAT Leaf Operations and third-party companies supplying tobacco to the company to cover the following steps annually: • Acknowledge the receipt of the Leaf Suppliers Manual latest version issued by BAT, which contains the Agrochemicals and Formulations not to be used in the tobacco production. • Suppliers subsequently submit the Agrochemical List, containing all the crop protection agents to be used in each step of the tobacco production. • They also submit the Agrochemicals Risk Assessment, by tobacco type. • Last, to check compliance, BAT completes the Agrochemical Residues testing in the packed product as per Risk Assessment approved by BAT. In 2023, 100% of total tobacco purchased and tested were free of quantifiable levels of HHPs; we continue monitoring suppliers adherence to the guidance. While the same standard applies to any tobacco consumed within the US, the above figures do not contain US and exotic tobacco data and we are working to integrate those going forward.

Row 3

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 4

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water recycling/reuse

☑ Increase in water use met through recycling/reuse

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

02/01/2020

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2017

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

13.3

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

30.0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

24.4

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

66

(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

Water recycling rate (%) is calculated as Water recycled (m3) divided by total water demand, which is Water recycled (m3) plus Water Withdrawn (m3). Our target is to achieve 30% water recycling rate by 2025. Water recycling/ reuse on site can help to reduce the amount of fresh water needed for our business, thus reducing water withdrawn. We continue to focus on water recycling, sharing examples of good practice across the Group with many being taken up by factories not previously undertaking any recycling and reuse activities. The target is achievable subject to water recycling/ reuse programs expansions at strategic sites. In addition to primary motivation, setting the target is driven by Risk mitigation, increasing freshwater availability for users, natural environment and Corporate social responsibility. In 2023 we achieved a % of water recycled/ reused of 24.4%, which is by 11.1 pp higher than 2017 figure of 13.3%.

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

We continue to focus on water recycling, sharing examples of good practice across the Group with many being taken up by factories not previously undertaking any recycling and reuse activities

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Our target is hampered by the large amount of reductions in withdrawals we have already achieved.

Row 4

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 5

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Other

☑ Other, please specify :100% operations sites Alliance for water Stewardship certified

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

03/09/2021

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

11/30/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

52

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

36

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

69

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Alliance for water stewardship

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

BAT has adopted the Alliance For Water Stewardship (AWS) standard and aims to have 100% of our operations sites certified by 2025. 36% of our operations sites were certified in 2022 this number increased to 68.8% of sites in 2023.

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

BAT has a further 10 Sites audits planned for 2024 with timing allowing 8 to be certified the remaining sites are planned for 2025 certification. BAT is currently monitoring the situations in Cuba, Sudan and Ukraine which may be excluded from the target in 2024 due to sanctions in Cuba and conflict in Ukraine and Sudan restricting auditors' ability to conduct the audits in person (a requirement for certification).

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Our AWS certified sites have performed a wide range of stakeholder engagement throughout the year, such as: – Involvement in advisory committees at water basin level to promote collaboration; – Awareness sessions for stakeholders and communities on water risks and stewardship; and – The construction of infrastructure to enable access to potable water and WASH facilities for local communities.

Row 5

(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, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Increase in the proportion of employees using safely managed drinking water services

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

02/01/2019

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

11/30/2018

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

90

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100.0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Fair Water Footprints

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

As part of our Global Water Management Standard, which was last updated and issued in 2019, it is a mandatory requirement for all BAT facilities to provide adequate WASH services. Annually all BAT operations sites complete a self-assessment (Water Roadmap) which includes compliance with WASH services. As of 2022, 100% of BAT locations were achieving this goal. We track the maintenance of this standard as part of the AWS programme. Stakeholder and community engagement is a fundamental requirement of the AWS Standard and important to BAT's activities in the local water basins in which we operate. WASH is an assessment criterion of AWS. To reflect the importance of this, we have set an ambitious target to have 100% of our operations (factories and GLTs) sites certified as per AWS Standard 2.0. This target was set in early 2021 and reflects our commitment to adhere to the international benchmarking for water management.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Comprehensive Global Water Management Standard and EHS yearly assessments

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

BAT has also been actively engaging with Communities to help build WASH facilities outside of our conventional value chain.
[Add 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

☑ Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ Pressure indicators ☑ Response indicators

[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

☑ Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

☑ Renewable fuel consumption

☑ 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

See page 119 to 120 of the 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report for full list of assured metrics and ESG Limited Assurance Report, containing the Audit Opinion.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

2023 ARA - UK Version.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Forests

☑ Traceability 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

See page 119 to 120 of the 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report for full list of assured metrics and ESG Limited Assurance Report, containing the Audit Opinion.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

2023 ARA - UK Version.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 discharges– total volumes

☑ Water withdrawals– total volumes

☑ Other data point in module 9, please specify :Total water recycled (million m3)

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

See page 119 to 120 of the 2023 Combined Annual and Sustainability Report for full list of assured metrics and ESG Limited Assurance Report, containing the Audit Opinion.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

2023 ARA - UK Version.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
	As of September 2023, BAT no longer has a presence in Russia and Belarus.

[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 Sustainability Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
[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